

CANADA

HOUSE OF COMMONS DEBATES

OFFICIAL REPORT

SECOND SESSION—THIRTIETH PARLIAMENT

26 Elizabeth II

VOLUME VIII, 1977

COMPRISING THE PERIOD FROM THE SIXTH DAY OF JULY, 1977,
TO THE SEVENTEENTH DAY OF OCTOBER, 1977, INCLUSIVE

INDEX ISSUED IN A SEPARATE VOLUME

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

Available from Printing and Publishing, Supply and Services, Hull, Québec, Canada K1A 0S9

80020—1½

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Wednesday, July 6, 1977

The House met at 2 p.m.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

PUBLIC SERVICE

REASON NAME OF ROBERT RABINOVITCH ON EXTRA PARLIAMENTARY OPPOSITION LIST—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Tom Cossitt (Leeds): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a matter of urgent necessity arising from the letter signed by the former solicitor general, the present Minister of Supply and Services (Mr. Goyer), dealing with an alleged extra-parliamentary opposition to which was attached a list of the names of 21 people whom the letter stated were suspected of being engaged in or sympathetic to EPO activity and suggested they should be watched in the interest of national security with more than normal care. I move, seconded by the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre (Mr. McKenzie):

That the Prime Minister advise the House as to why the name of Mr. Robert Rabinovitch, assistant secretary to the cabinet for priorities and planning, appears on this list, whether or not he has been cleared of all such insinuation and innuendo with a subsequent apology being given, and if not, whether the government is prepared to either substantiate the minister's allegations or to clear the name of Mr. Rabinovitch now and to dismiss the former solicitor general from the cabinet as an obvious total incompetent.

Mr. Speaker: Such a motion requires unanimous consent. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

* * *

FOREIGN INVESTMENT

SUGGESTED REFUSAL OF TAKEOVER OF DELIVRO CANADA BY UNITED PARCEL SERVICES—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Cyril Symes (Sault Ste. Marie): Mr. Speaker, I rise under the provisions of Standing Order 43 to move a motion of urgent and pressing necessity. In view of the fact the Foreign Investment Review Agency has allowed United Parcel Services of America Inc. through its subsidiary, UPS Ltd., to take over Delivro Canada Inc., despite objections from the Post Office, CN, CP Express and the governments of Ontario and Quebec, and in view of the fact that UPS of America has been convicted of monopolistic practices in the United States, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Cape Breton-East Richmond (Mr. Hogan):

That this House instruct the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce to intervene personally to stop this take-over, which will jeopardize Canadian companies and Canadian jobs.

Mr. Speaker: The presentation of such a motion pursuant to Standing Order 43 can be done only with the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

* * *

[*Translation*]

HOUSING

SUGGESTED REDUCTION OF MORTGAGE INTEREST RATES—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Eudore Allard (Rimouski): Mr. Speaker, under the provisions of Standing Order 43, I ask for the unanimous consent of the House to discuss an urgent matter of pressing necessity.

Since Statistics Canada reports that a great many Canadians are experiencing housing difficulties; since more than 280,000 Canadian families spend over half their income for housing; and since interest rates are the main reason for the high cost of housing in Canada, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Lambert):

That the House immediately take all necessary steps to reduce without delay the interest rates on mortgages so as to soften the impact of those excessive interest rates and to make the purchase of a house financially interesting for all Canadians.

Mr. Speaker: Under the provisions of Standing Order 43, this motion requires the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

* * *

● (1410)

[*English*]

ROYAL CANADIAN MOUNTED POLICE

REFERENCE TO COMMITTEE OF CORRESPONDENCE CONCERNING BREAK-IN AT L'AGENCE DE PRESSE LIBRE—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. F. Oberle (Prince George-Peace River): Mr. Speaker, I rise under the terms of Standing Order 43 to move a motion of

urgent and pressing necessity. Having regard to letters tabled yesterday by the Minister of Supply and Services (Mr. Goyer) relating to his involvement in the APLQ affair and having regard for discrepancies regarding the date of the RCMP's reply to Lieutenant Colonel Cameron, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Northumberland-Durham (Mr. Lawrence):

That the documents tabled by the Minister of Supply and Services on July 5, 1977 be referred to the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Presentation of such a motion for debate requires the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: No.

* * *

INCOME TAX ACT

REQUEST FOR AMENDMENTS TO CLOSE CERTAIN LOOPHOLES—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Dan McKenzie (Winnipeg South Centre): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a matter of urgent and pressing necessity under the provisions of Standing Order 43. My motion is prompted by the fact that the Department of National Revenue in information circular 76-4R under the sub-heading "Kickbacks, Bribes, etc." explains to businessmen how to turn a bribe into a tax write-off by obtaining a receipt and since this is another example of loopholes in our tax laws like the use of Section 18 of the Income Tax Act to write-off the costs of prostitution, I would like to move, seconded by the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Cossitt):

That this House direct the Minister of Finance and the Minister of National Revenue to take immediate steps to introduce new legislation to tighten up the loopholes in the Income Tax Act which allow write-offs on such questionable items as bribes and prostitution.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Presentation for debate of such a motion requires the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: No.

* * *

GOVERNMENT ADMINISTRATION

SUGGESTION CAPE BRETON BENEFIT FROM DECENTRALIZATION POLICY—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Andy Hogan (Cape Breton-East Richmond): Mr. Speaker, I rise under the provisions of Standing Order 43, on a matter of urgent and pressing necessity.

In view of the fact that the decentralization policy carried out by the government has been happily received in all regions of high unemployment and low average income, and in view of the fact that all five eastern provinces have profited from this program up till now except Nova Scotia and its most needy populous area, that is, Cape Breton County, and in view of the fact that the minister in charge has been saying that the language question in Quebec is preventing this now, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Sault Ste. Marie (Mr. Symes):

That heavily unemployed Cape Breton in Nova Scotia be now the recipient of such a decentralization policy.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Presentation of such a motion for debate requires the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: Oral Questions.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[*English*]

CONFEDERATION

PROPOSAL TO ESTABLISH JOINT COMMITTEE ON NATIONAL UNITY

Mr. Joe Clark (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I was impressed and intrigued by the Prime Minister's reference yesterday to the major role to be played by members of parliament in bringing Canadians together. In light of that endorsement of the major role of members of parliament given by the Prime Minister, I should like to ask the Acting Prime Minister whether the government will agree to establish immediately a special joint committee of the Senate and House of Commons on national unity to recommend such constitutional, economic and social measures as will allow the federal system to respond fully to the needs of all Canadians?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Acting Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, that question is presently before the House for debate. If and when it comes to a vote, we will make the position of the government known at that time.

Mr. Clark: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I thought the Acting Prime Minister might be a little more slick in his reticence. I wonder if he might not come clean and tell the House of Commons whether the government of Canada intends to allow this parliament to become engaged in a continuing way in bringing together the people of this country and whether it is the intention of the government to establish the special joint committee that was referred to yesterday—yes or no?

Mr. MacEachen: The same answer, Mr. Speaker.

POSSIBILITY OF MEETING OF FIRST MINISTERS ON NATIONAL UNITY

Mr. Joe Clark (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, there appears to be a reversion on the government side from the position where, yesterday, there was the prospect held out by the Prime Minister that we were somebodies again, to the

present situation in which the Acting Prime Minister refuses to state the position of the government of Canada on the position of this parliament in resolving the national unity problem. Since the Acting Prime Minister will not extend to this House the courtesy which he extended to a radio station earlier this morning when he answered there a question he refuses to answer in this House, let me try with another question. Let me ask if it is the intention of the government of Canada to convene immediately a meeting of first ministers, to call upon the continuing advice of the premiers of the various provinces of Canada concerning means to strengthen and reform the federal system?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Acting Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of any such plan to call a meeting of first ministers.

Mr. Paproski: What do you know? Resign.

An hon. Member: You don't look any too happy, Allan.

Mr. Clark: Mr. Speaker, I don't know what the House of Commons would be like if Allan MacEachen were alive.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

An hon. Member: That was nasty, Joe. You are getting careless.

PROPOSED PROGRAM OF CHEAP TRAVEL TO PROMOTE NATIONAL UNITY

Mr. Joe Clark (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, let me try another question. In his 1976 annual report the Commissioner of Official Languages proposed that the Prime Minister of Canada should meet with the presidents of Air Canada and CNR, to discuss the means by which there could be brought about a massive program of cheap, mass travel for Canadians, to allow Canadians to understand this country better. We know there has been a minor, little program introduced by the Secretary of State. I want to know if the Prime Minister has acted on that particular recommendation of the Commissioner of Official Languages and met with those officials to discuss the possibility of a program which would allow Canadians to better understand our common country.

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Acting Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, to answer that point, the proposals the Leader of the Opposition mentioned are presently under consideration and we hope to be able to make a statement on the point in future.

Mr. Clark: Mr. Speaker, that was not the question. My question was, has the Prime Minister met with those presidents?

Mr. Paproski: Why don't you go back to sleep, Allan?

TASK FORCE ON NATIONAL UNITY—INQUIRY AS TO REPORT

Miss Flora MacDonald (Kingston and the Islands): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Acting Prime Minister. Will the special task force on national unity be preparing reports on its work or making recommendations for parliament to consider formally or will it, as set out in its terms of reference, act solely as a private source of advice to the government on unity issues? If it is to report to parliament, will this be done on an interim basis or only at the conclusion of its term of office; or, in fact, is parliament further to be excluded?

Mr. Grafftey: It will report after the referendum.

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Acting Prime Minister): No, Mr. Speaker, parliament is not to be further excluded. Parliament is presently debating the subject matter.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. MacEachen: That has been the object of several questions. The debate will continue today.

Miss MacDonald: My question concerns the task force or commission.

Mr. MacEachen: The purposes and objects of the task force are to be found in the statement the Prime Minister made yesterday. Certainly, the members of the task force are free to carry out their responsibilities as they desire and if they make reports or statements, surely it is open to members of parliament to become aware of them and take any action which is desired.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): This is incredible!

ROLE OF PARLIAMENT IN NATIONAL UNITY ISSUE

Miss Flora MacDonald (Kingston and the Islands): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Given that the Acting Prime Minister has not said that the task force will report directly to this House and given that the present two-day debate on national unity was forced on the government by this opposition—

An hon. Member: Nonsense!

● (1420)

Miss MacDonald: Indeed it was. Given the obvious reluctance of the Prime Minister to involve this institution in any formal way on the greatest threat to our nation's survival, will the Acting Prime Minister say what he does consider the role of parliament as an institution to be in this issue, if he has considered the question at all?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Acting Prime Minister): First of all, Mr. Speaker, I should remind the hon. lady that the suggestion that a special debate be held on the subject of national unity was a suggestion by myself on behalf of the government.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. MacEachen: It was as a result of discussions which I had with members of the other parties that this debate has taken place. I am very pleased that the debate has had the effect it has had, that is to create this interest in the subject. Hon. members opposite had many opportunities in the course of this session to bring before the House on their allotted days the question of national unity and they failed to do so.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Miss MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, we in the opposition know what should be done on this particular question. What I am asking the Acting Prime Minister is what he thinks the government should be doing.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

* * *

TRADE

CANADA-UNITED STATES AUTO PACT—MEASURES TO ENSURE EQUITABLE SHARING OF GROWTH OF INDUSTRY

Mr. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Finance. No doubt the minister is aware that the first clause of the Canada-U.S. automotive agreement signed in 1965 states that the objective of that agreement is to ensure that both countries share equitably in future growth in the industry. A review of the pact which was tabled by the government last week shows that this country is losing out disastrously in many parts of the industry. Specifically, we have lost some 20,000 potential jobs in the auto parts industry. What was the government doing prior to the tabling of the report and, in particular, since then to redress this very important discrepancy in terms of the objective of the pact compared with its results?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I will have to defer to my colleague, the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce, who has had the primary carriage of these considerations of the structure of the Canadian auto industry and auto parts industry and also with regard to the offset change in the provisions of the auto pact in this regard. On the basis of the analysis, we are now in the position to continue the discussions with the Americans with regard to the possible arrangement. The precise timetable, as I say, is that which my colleague has been presiding over.

Mr. Broadbent: Mr. Speaker, the past four Ministers of Industry, Trade and Commerce, including the Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin, have been telling this House that they have been prepared to renegotiate the auto pact, at least ever since I have been here, and have done nothing. The Minister of Finance should be particularly concerned that we have had a $16 billion deficit in auto parts trade since 1965. Is the minister telling this House that as the financial minister, he has no direct input into proposed changes in the pact? If he is not saying that, can he tell us what kind of initiative the government is proposing?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Of course I am not saying that. I am pointing out to the hon. gentleman that the restructuring of this aspect of industry is dealt with by the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce.

Mr. Broadbent: They have done nothing.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): The auto pact, over its history, has been substantially beneficial to Canada; the result has been very much more beneficial than had the Canadian industry not received that kind of protection. With regard to changes in the pact, particularly in relation to the impact on the U.S. and Canadian market of competition from other producers of parts and of automobiles, this has naturally been of some concern, particularly to those preparing for the multilateral trade negotiations.

Mr. Broadbent: Considering that since 1965 the United States has gained substantially more investment in relation to equity in the industry than Canada, and that in the auto parts section the industry in Canada produces only 6 per cent of North American auto parts although we consume 12 per cent of total parts, would the minister explain to us why he considers the net result of the pact to be beneficial? In the context of that answer, would he tell us which aspect of the pact he finds disagreeable and what specific suggestions he has in mind with regard to improvements in the arrangement?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): The hon. gentleman is asking for a detailed explanation of the effect of the pact on the auto industry in Canada—

Mr. Broadbent: Any explanation.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): I would think that coming, as he does, from an area which is directly concerned he should be as familiar as anyone with the beneficial effect the pact has had on investment and employment in his own constituency as well as in other parts of southern Ontario. I would gladly arrange for a detailed explanation of the pact to be made to him; he would then have a better understanding of the whole subject and might be in a better position to inform his constituents.

* * *

[*Translation*]

CONFEDERATION

POSSIBILITY OF SUMMIT CONFERENCE TO DRAFT A CONSTITUTION

Mr. Adrien Lambert (Bellechasse): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Acting Prime Minister.

In view of the announcement made yesterday by the right hon. Prime Minister about setting up a committee to promote

harmony in our country, can the Acting Prime Minister tell the House whether that committee will be asked to meet the authorities of the various provinces to look into the possibility of holding a summit conference that would not be imposed by the federal government but would be agreed upon by the provinces and to which representatives of labour as well as business and finance would be invited in the hope that later on, at some other conference, a new constitution might be proposed that could be acceptable to all Canadians?

[*English*]

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (President of the Privy Council): I cannot go as far as that in predicting the outcome of the operations of the task force. As the Prime Minister stated yesterday, the primary purpose of the task force is to encourage the efforts of the general public, particularly of non-government organizations, in the field of national unity.

An hon. Member: Laughable!

[*Translation*]

Mr. Lambert (Bellechasse): Mr. Speaker, on a supplementary.

In 1970, the government asked a joint committee of the Senate and the House of Commons to study that constitutional problem. That committee reported to the House in March of 1972 and the governments, both federal and provincial have since seen fit not to take into account its recommendations. If the committee announced yesterday which will be asked to study the constitutional problem in our country, hands in an intelligent report, does the government promise to take it into consideration with a view to remedying the situation and restoring the confidence of Canadians so that we can live together in real harmony?

● (1430)

[*English*]

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Speaker, I doubt whether the task force will operate precisely in the same way as the committee to which my hon. friend refers, which did report on the constitution of Canada. I believe that that report did have some rather important effects on the subsequent thinking of the government and provincial governments as well.

* * *

ENERGY

DEMPSTER PIPELINE—INQUIRY AS TO ECONOMIC FEASIBILITY AND DATE WHEN NATURAL GAS CAN BE DELIVERED

Mr. James Gillies (Don Valley): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Acting Prime Minister. It arises out of the report of the National Energy Board and the fact that the cabinet must make a very important decision quite soon respecting development of northern resources. I should like to know whether the government will be able to provide to members of parliament before the time of the debate on the pipeline answers to the following questions: (1) Will the Dempster extension be economically feasible? (2) What will be the socio-economic impact of the Dempster pipeline if it is built? (3) Will the government be able to guarantee that Dempster can be finished so that natural gas can be delivered to Canada by 1982? Will we have answers to those three significant questions before we begin the debate on the pipeline in August?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Acting Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, as the Prime Minister indicated yesterday, the government has not yet had an opportunity to consider the National Energy Board report. We have undertaken that a decision will be reached following the presentation of all the reports, and that is likely to take place in the month of August. In the meantime we will make every effort not only to make information available to the House but to make available to the government itself information which will be required in making a reasonable decision. The questions which the hon. member has posed are questions that anticipate certain decisions by the government of Canada. At the present time no decision to build a pipeline or on the site of a pipeline has been taken by the government, but all the information will, of course, be accumulated in order to assist in that decision making process.

Mr. Gillies: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Is it the government's position that a decision can be made without answers to the questions I have just posed? In that regard, has the government underway at this moment, since time is so short, studies, a task force or anything which will give us a response to these questions, which I would argue must be answered before the government can make any sort of decision whatever on a pipeline?

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Speaker, I believe the hon. member has made some valid representations which the government will have to consider before it makes a decision, and it will have to assess the type of information required in order to make that decision. But as I said earlier, the government have not yet had an opportunity to discuss these particular points since the NEB report was tabled.

* * *

ENVIRONMENTAL AFFAIRS

POSSIBILITY OF COMPLETING ENVIRONMENTAL STUDY OF DEMPSTER PIPELINE PRIOR TO SEPTEMBER 1

Mr. Bill Jarvis (Perth-Wilmot): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question for the Minister of Fisheries and the Environment relating to the question which I put to the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources yesterday but which he was unfortunately unable to answer. In view of the emphasis placed by the National Energy Board upon the importance of the Dempster link in the Alcan proposal, and in view of the fact that there has been no environmental study prepared or commissioned on this 600 mile corridor, is the minister able to tell us whether his department has the capacity to complete an

environmental assessment of the Dempster link in an acceptable form before September 1 of this year?

Hon. Roméo LeBlanc (Minister of Fisheries and the Environment): Mr. Speaker, in fact the environmental assessment panel under Dr. Hill was given the mandate to include the Dempster link in its terms of reference. I expect its interim report—and I underline the word "interim"—before August 1, or on August 1. As I said in the statement which I made when the panel was set up, this initial report will be followed by a more thorough examination and details could be added to what would be environmental clearance if and when this is required. The panel will not necessarily terminate its work by August 1; it will give an interim report.

POSSIBILITY OF APPROVING ALCAN ROUTE PRIOR TO ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT OF DEMPSTER PIPELINE

Mr. Bill Jarvis (Perth-Wilmot): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Even on the basis of an interim report by August 1, is it the minister's position that the government may give a commitment to the Alcan route, an important part of which is the Dempster link, before receipt of an acceptable and thorough environmental assessment review of that link?

Hon. Roméo LeBlanc (Minister of Fisheries and the Environment): Mr. Speaker, I suppose the discussion will be on words like "acceptable". It is obvious that an environmental assessment report will identify the problems. Then, the work of putting in conditions which would overcome the problems could continue even after a decision is made. In other words, a decision can be made if something is "acceptable" on a given number of conditions, and this is the work which would continue.

* * *

NATIONAL DEFENCE

ALLEGED DIFFERENTIATION IN TREATMENT BY CUSTOMS BETWEEN FORCES PERSONNEL AND CIVILIANS

Mr. Robert McCleave (Halifax-East Hants): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of National Defence with, I hope, a side whistle to the beautiful ear of the Minister of National Revenue. Since Canadian customs is now using the practice of taking verbal declarations by Canadians returning to this country that their purchases abroad do not exceed $50 within the allowed period, would the minister ensure that armed forces personnel be treated the same way instead of exactly the opposite?

Hon. Barney Danson (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, that was a sort of double-pronged question. Certainly, I will yield to my colleague the Minister of National Revenue.

Hon. Monique Bégin (Minister of National Revenue): Mr. Speaker, I can assure the hon. member without any hesitation that the armed forces are treated equally, and if we were ever sinners in the past it was in giving them the chance of pre-clearance.

Mr. McCleave: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I do not know which way to direct my supplementary because I have seen some documents which state exactly the opposite of what the hon. lady said and I would not want to doubt her word. May I therefore put the question down for ten o'clock and send both ministers a copy of the telegram which has gone out from the Department of National Defence in Ottawa, which says—I hate to say this—exactly the opposite of what the hon. lady said.

* * *

CONFEDERATION

TASK FORCE ON NATIONAL UNITY—REQUEST FOR TABLING OF TERMS OF REFERENCE

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, I should like to address my question to the Acting Prime Minister. Yesterday the Prime Minister announced a task force, but today, as I understood the Acting Prime Minister, though perhaps I got it wrong, he indicated that there were no written terms of reference. Am I correct that there are no written terms of reference?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Acting Prime Minister): No, I did not say that, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Brewin: Then, if there are terms of reference, will they be tabled in the House and perhaps made available through *Hansard*? Since the task force is supposed to be directed to the public as much as anybody, I think it is of the utmost importance that the terms of reference be made clear.

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Speaker, it is my recollection that an order in council is required in order to establish the task force, and I will be happy to consider tabling that order in council.

* * *

● (1440)

[*Translation*]

BILINGUALISM

REQUEST THAT REPORT BY FÉDÉRATION DES FRANCOPHONES HORS QUÉBEC BE MADE PUBLIC

Mr. Roch La Salle (Joliette): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Secretary of State.

Since the two-year study commissioned by the Secretary of State on the situation of Francophones outside Quebec has been completed and filed with the Secretary of State, I believe, can the minister tell us whether he is willing to give the public access to that report or study, for it seems, according to one newspaper which has already commented on it, that it does in fact represent fairly well the proposals or recommendations

made by the Fédération des francophones hors Québec? Can the minister publish that study and if so, when?

Hon. John Roberts (Secretary of State): Of course, Mr. Speaker, I received that document yesterday. I read its recommendations last night. I have not all the document which is 500 pages long. I intend to send copies of it to all the regional offices and table it here in Ottawa so that hon. members, as well as the public, of course, can read it if they so wish.

REQUEST FOR COMMISSION TO STUDY POSITION OF FRANCOPHONES OUTSIDE QUEBEC—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Roch La Salle (Joliette): Mr. Speaker, on a supplementary.

Seeing that barely ten days ago the federation expressed its complete displeasure with the Tellier group and still recommended the setting up of a special commission by the Privy Council, can the minister tell us today, after having had, I believe, excellent communications with the federation, whether he is willing to recommend the establishment of the special commission so forcibly requested by the federation?

[*English*]

Hon. John Roberts (Secretary of State): Mr. Speaker, as far as I know, there has not been any communication from the FFHQ to me since the meeting at which the decision to establish the task force was made. I have not received any communication from them, at least one I am aware of along the lines the hon. member has suggested. If they write me, of course I will consider carefully whatever it is they suggest.

* * *

REGIONAL ECONOMIC EXPANSION

DEGREE OF SUPPORT FOR BRITISH COLUMBIA—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Bob Brisco (Kootenay West): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the minister responsible for DREE and his parliamentary secretary, I address my question to the Acting Prime Minister. In light of the fact that British Columbia has been nearly sucked dry by federal taxation policies, and in light of the fact that we have seen in excess of $400 million of DREE funding transferred to the province of Quebec, which needs it, including $95 million for highway improvements, much of which is to be spent in the minister's riding and that of his provincial counterpart, the two architects of this agreement, is the Acting Prime Minister now prepared to indicate the degree to which the federal government is going to provide support to the province of British Columbia under the subsidiary agreement to be signed by the Prime Minister later this week?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Acting Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I hesitate to regard the hon. member's question as serious, when he describes the policy of regional economic expansion as one of sucking the province of British Columbia dry. It is hardly in accordance with the noble sentiments we heard from his leader yesterday about national unity.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Brisco: Mr. Speaker, I invite the Acting Prime Minister to read the first part of my question in *Hansard*. Obviously, he was not listening.

As a result of the recent meeting relating to the critical and crucial water shortage of Castlegar and district, between the British Columbia director general for DREE and the British Columbia deputy ministers for economic development, environment and municipal affairs, is the minister prepared at this time to indicate whether this latest agreement, to be signed by the Prime Minister, is of sufficient scope to allow for DREE funding to be directed to this specific and serious problem?

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Speaker, I will make inquiries and advise the hon. member.

* * *

[*Translation*]

HOUSING

INQUIRY WHETHER GOVERNMENT WILL APPROVE IMPLEMENTATION OF MARATHON PROJECT IN MONTREAL

Mr. Jacques Lavoie (Hochelaga): Mr. Speaker, I wish to put my question to the Minister of State for Urban Affairs. Further to the question I asked in the House a few weeks ago concerning the site of the Angus shops, after meeting with the management of the firm Marathon and after noting that this project is of a cooperative nature and that it would create approximately 4,000 new permanent jobs, could the minister tell the House whether he is willing to give his support to the members representing the ridings of Maisonneuve, Lafontaine, Sainte-Marie and Hochelaga, to consider thoroughly the Marathon project with a view to urging its implementation?

Hon. André Ouellet (Minister of State for Urban Affairs): Mr. Speaker, yes I had the opportunity to consider the file which is most interesting, and I congratulate the hon. member for trying to speed it up. In this regard, he can count on the support of my department.

* * *

[*English*]

CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

REASON FOR OMISSION OF NEW BRUNSWICK FROM DOMINION DAY CELEBRATIONS

Mr. Leonard C. Jones (Moncton): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Secretary of State. Did the Prime Minister and the Secretary of State receive my telegram of July 1, which was Dominion Day, regarding the obvious omission of New Brunswick in that CBC three hour program on Dominion Day night, and particularly in the opening remarks? Can the Secretary of State now give a better expla-

nation for such an omission than that of the CBC, when it said it was because there was no mobile equipment available in New Brunswick? What equipment is necessary in order to say: "The province of New Brunswick"?

Hon. John Roberts (Secretary of State): Mr. Speaker, I welcome the hon. member's question. The hon. member for Saint John-Lancaster has been very vigorous in making similar presentations.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. McGrath: Romeo, Romeo, wherefor art thou?

Mr. Roberts: Of course, my hon. colleague sitting beside me has been involved as well.

Mr. Paproski: Dionne does not care, Roméo LeBlanc does not care.

Mr. Roberts: I should like to respond to these representations, Mr. Speaker, by telling the hon. member that I have communicated with the CBC and it indicated that in the planning of the program it was essential, because of the over-all demands on the system and the equipment, that events combining in one centre the appearance of a number of performers representative of various provinces be telecast. Such an event was available in the form of the Summerside lobster festival concert, which assured representation by artists from each of the maritime provinces, including the Jeunes Chanteurs d'Acadie from Moncton.

I should like to indicate to the hon. member, if any slight was taken to what happened, it was inadvertent since the producer for the entire program, Jack McAndrews, is a native New Brunswicker who is very conscious of the importance of New Brunswick in the celebration. He has apologized publicly for any slight which may have been taken, and I would do the same.

While I am on my feet, Mr. Speaker,—

Some hon. Members: Order, order.

Mr. Jones: Mr. Speaker, my supplementary is directed to the Secretary of State. I read the apology of the man which he mentioned, Jack McAndrews, who purports to be a native New Brunswicker. Nevertheless, he said that it was the lack of mobile equipment in New Brunswick. I should like to know why there is not equipment in New Brunswick, and what equipment is necessary to say: "The province of New Brunswick"? It can be said quicker than Pierre Elliott Trudeau or the Hon. John Roberts—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

[Mr. Jones.]

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS

REQUEST FOR EXPLANATION OF OVERSTATEMENT OF SUBSIDIES

Mr. Don Mazankowski (Vegreville): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Transport. On June 16 the minister acknowledged that an error was made in the calculation of the revenue of Canadian National Railways as a result of an overstatement of certain subsidies which were received from the Canadian Transport Commission under the provisions of the Railway Act. The minister undertook to provide a more detailed explanation to the House or to give a statement. I am wondering if he is in a position to expand upon his answer of June 16, or whether he is prepared to table such information as to what the amounts were, the timeframe in which these subsidies were overstated and the precise amounts?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would be glad to do that. The amounts which were overpaid related to the years 1974 and 1975, in the order of under $2 million in the first year and the balance of approximately $17 million in the second year. There was no impact upon the 1976 year, nor upon the business of the railway for 1977. The adjustments had already been made by the time I reported to the House the last time, as I have indicated. The appropriate adjustments will be made to the Canadian National accounts for the years in question.

• (1450)

Mr. Mazankowski: Am I to take it then that the minister is saying that the deficit for the years prior to 1976 will in fact be greater by the amounts that the minister has pointed out?

Mr. Lang: That is correct. In effect the deficit for 1974-75 will be larger by those amounts. The result is that CNR will be debited for those amounts in terms of its branch line subsidy program payments, but of course will be credited with identical amounts in terms of the additional payment by the Treasury of the deficit. The balanced financial position is therefore the same, but obviously the actual book deficits are larger for those two years.

* * *

MULTICULTURALISM

METHOD OF ARRIVING AT PAYMENTS FOR THIRD LANGUAGE TRAINING

Mr. Gus Mitges (Grey-Simcoe): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of State for Multiculturalism. In his speech to the Canadian Consultative Council on Multiculturalism in Vancouver two weeks ago, and in response to the council's recommendations, the minister announced some new programs regarding supplementary third language schools, such as the rate of $4 per hour for teachers up to a maximum of 50 hours a year, and, as well, for such teachers taking courses in personal development, $15 a day is to be allowed to cover

travel, accommodation and tuition costs. How were these figures arrived at, was it as a result of a government study or were the figures arbitrarily picked out by someone in the minister's department?

Hon. Joseph-Philippe Guay (Minister of State (Multiculturalism)): Mr. Speaker, the new cultural enrichment policy to provide increased opportunities for many Canadians is well appreciated and received by the various ethnic groups in our country, and I can assure the hon. member of that. We arrived at that particular conclusion after many representations made by ethnic groups, and finally it was recommended to us by the Canadian Consultative Council on Multiculturalism. It was as a result of their recommendation, which we studied, that we came out with the program. It is not an ideal program; we realize that, but it is a start, a beginning. I can assure the hon. member and other members of the opposition that this program is greatly appreciated by all who benefit from it, all good Canadians.

* * *

ROYAL CANADIAN MOUNTED POLICE

BREAK-IN AT PRAXIS CORPORATION—REQUEST FOR CO-OPERATION WITH ONTARIO INQUIRY

Mr. F. Oberle (Prince George-Peace River): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Solicitor General and it relates to the decision of the attorney general of Ontario to set up an inquiry into the break-in and arson at the offices of the Praxis Corporation in Toronto. I would like to ask the Solicitor General if he will take every step to co-operate with the inquiry in Toronto, and will he make available to the inquiry such things as files from his own office, officers and ministers attached to his office over the years to appear before the inquiry to testify?

Hon. Francis Fox (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, I have already indicated to the House and to the attorney general of Ontario our desire to co-operate fully with them in the conduct of the investigation which he has referred to the police commission in Ontario.

Mr. Oberle: I would like to ask the Solicitor General if it is the intention of the government to complement the inquiry into the involvement of the various police departments with an inquiry into the involvement of the various political agencies in the whole matter of the extra parliamentary opposition, particularly the involvement of the former solicitor general and the involvement of the committee on security and intelligence headed by the Prime Minister at that time to determine what effect the EPO concept and the letter that the Solicitor General wrote at that time had on the individuals that were named.

Mr. Fox: I am not sure what the hon. member is getting at. If there is any specific matter he wishes to draw to my attention, I will be pleased to have it and examine it.

TRANSPORT

REQUEST FOR INCREASE IN FEDERAL SHARE OF COST OF HIGHWAY PROGRAM FOR ATLANTIC REGION

Mr. Jack Marshall (Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Transport and it has to do with the $100 million highway strengthening program in the Atlantic region. The minister is aware that the ministers of highways in those provinces requested something more generous than the 50-50 cost-sharing which was offered by the minister. Has he had a chance to reconsider that decision, and will he be a little more generous in the cost-sharing with regard to the four depressed areas in the country?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): The ministers of highways have raised a number of issues. On most of them I was able to meet their wishes and adjust the program. On this one our position seems to be very reasonable since the highway programs we are talking about are essentially within provincial jurisdiction, and for us to offer 50-50 sharing seems reasonable. I have no change to make in that position.

Mr. Marshall: In view of the fact that one of the badly deteriorated highways is in the province of Newfoundland, in view of the fact that when the government built the Trans-Canada Highway it was on a 90-10 basis, and in view of the depressed state of the economy in Newfoundland, I wonder if the minister would consider for that particular part of the Trans-Canada Highway greater generosity in cost-sharing.

Mr. Lang: I am not sure that a previous generous treatment necessarily ensures its repetition at a later time. It might be difficult, when we are looking at highways from the transport point of view and the cost benefit analysis point of view, to justify different treatment for one province. In our analysis the improvements in these highways do indeed produce an economic benefit which justifies the expenditure. A great part of that benefit goes to the province, and the basic jurisdiction in relation to the highways lies with the province. That is the basis of our view in this matter.

* * *

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

INCARCERATION OF JAMES KENNEDY WITHOUT CHARGE—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Bill Clarke (Vancouver Quadra): My question is for the Minister of Justice, and I welcome him back from sunny Vancouver. I should like to refer the minister to my question on Monday at which time the acting Minister of Justice and the second acting minister were both absent, and therefore the Department of Justice was not represented in the House. My question concerns James Peter Kennedy who has been held in jail in Vancouver for over five weeks. I want to refer the Minister of Justice to a letter handed to me yesterday from the Minister of Manpower and Immigration in which he says:

The special inquiry officer conducting the hearing has decided to continue his detention.

Is it the policy of Canadian justice that any holder of a Canadian visa can be held for lengthy periods of time on the wish of a government bureaucrat, without charges being laid and without a public hearing?

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Justice): Any such holding would be pursuant to the Immigration Act and the law relating thereto. As I understand, the subject to whom the hon. member referred has taken habeas corpus proceedings in the courts in British Columbia. Obviously, it is a matter under inquiry and before the courts.

Mr. Clarke: The hearing that the minister refers to will be held tomorrow, but the question is: What is the charge on which Mr. Kennedy is being held?

Mr. Basford: As I understand—the Minister of Manpower and Immigration is not here unfortunately—it is a hearing under the Immigration Act being held pursuant to the Immigration Act.

* * *

PENITENTIARIES

SEARCH FOR PSYCHIATRISTS IN ENGLAND—REQUEST FOR ASSURANCE NONE AVAILABLE IN CANADA

Mr. Benno Friesen (Surrey-White Rock): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Solicitor General. Would he confirm that Dr. Craigan of his department, together with Jim Murphy of the Pacific region and Jim Phelps of the Saskatchewan region, went to England in order to interview psychiatrists, I presume to work in the penitentiary service. I wonder if the minister would confirm that he has worked together with the Department of Manpower to make sure there are no professional people in Canada who have been overlooked for this opportunity. It does seem strange that these officials went to England during the week of the Jubilee celebrations. Does the minister not think that that might not have been the most conducive time to conduct interviews?

Hon. Francis Fox (Solicitor General): I will be pleased to investigate the matter on behalf of the hon. member. I should point out, however, that traditionally there has been some difficulty in obtaining in this country that kind of high level psychiatric services.

* * *

POST OFFICE

PROPOSAL TO REFER MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONAL PROBLEMS TO COMMITTEE

Mr. Bruce Halliday (Oxford): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Postmaster General. It relates to the topic of parliamentary committees, on which the government has been very sensitive and wary in the last 24 hours. In light of the sympathy expressed by the Postmaster General last Thursday, as reported on page 7223 of *Hansard*, concerning the motion by my colleague, the hon. member for Brandon-Souris, under Standing Order 43 which urged the Postmaster General to name a parliamentary committee, would the minister now indicate to us if he favours the establishment of a parliamentary committee to investigate and report on all aspects of our postal system?

● (1500)

Hon. J.-J. Blais (Postmaster General): It is too early to say, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Halliday: In view of that answer does the Postmaster General feel that members of parliament, together with appropriate research staff, are incapable of making a valid assessment, and if not, why would he not have what could be potentially a four-party, unanimous report upon which he could base changes in our postal system?

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

* * *

PUBLIC WORKS

PLACE GUY FAVREAU—SUGGESTION PROJECT BE DISCONTINUED AND MONEY ALLOCATED TO LOW COST HOUSING

Mr. John Gilbert (Broadview): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Public Works. In view of the representations of the Chinese community in Montreal that the plans to construct the $200 million Place Guy Favreau would destroy Montreal's Chinatown, would the minister now stop the project and spend the $200 million on low-cost housing in Montreal?

Hon. Judd Buchanan (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, the area to which the hon. member refers has been classified historically by the government of Quebec, and we have undertaken that anything we do there will respect such classification. However, we are looking at possible modifications to the development of Place Guy Favreau.

Mr. Gilbert: In view of the lack of consultation on the project—and that has been emphasized by the Chinese community—would the minister keep the Chinese community and other interested groups informed of any anticipated developments?

Mr. Buchanan: That is something at which I am looking very seriously.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege. During the course of the question period in answer to a question by the hon. member for Kingston and the Islands (Miss MacDonald) the government House leader

left the impression with the House—I hope it was inadvertent; if it was not, he deliberately misled the House—that the idea of a debate on national unity was first proposed by him representing the government. So that we might be absolutely clear, I would like to draw to the attention of hon. members that the first suggestion concerning this kind of intervention by the House of Commons did not come from the government but in fact came from the official opposition on more occasions than merely one.

The matter was first brought to the attention of the House of Commons by the hon. member for Victoria-Haliburton (Mr. Scott) on January 27, 1977 by way of a motion under Standing Order 26 because of the emergency situation which we felt had developed at that time.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): The subject matter of that motion on that day was the failure of the government to counter the threat posed by the government of the province of Quebec. That was the first time this matter came before the House of Commons. On April 18, 1977 the right hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker) again asked that the matter be brought forward. On March 30, 1977 the hon. member for Edmonton-Strathcona (Mr. Roche) asked that there be a debate in the House on this matter. Again on March 31, 1977 the hon. member for Edmonton-Strathcona asked that we proceed with that matter and deal with the problems of our confederation as well as the matters raised by the government ultimately in its motion, but as well on the basis of the social and economic problems facing this country.

Finally, the hon. member for Kingston and the Islands raised the matter with the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) on April 28, 1977. At that time the Prime Minister said he was favourably disposed to the idea. The proposal for the establishment of a committee and the involvement of parliament in this debate has been in existence for a long period of time. It was first raised by Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition, and I hope it was not the intention of the government House leader to mislead the House when he indicated that he was the instigator of the idea. He was nothing of the sort; he sat silent.

Some hon. Members: Shame.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): The government House leader said we had opportunities to raise this matter on allotted days. As a matter of fact, we did raise the matter on allotted days. On May 19 on a motion standing in the name of the hon. member for Saint-Hyacinthe (Mr. Wagner) we had a debate here on national unity and on the failure of this government with regard to economic and social programs which has led to much of the distress we have in this country. In addition, when the government finally acceded, we gave up one of our allotted days for the debate. We pressed for extended hours for this debate. I asked the government House leader if he would give up one more day for the debate. There was no answer.

Some hon. Members: Shame.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): The reason this is important as a matter of privilege is that the government House leader knows I have pressed him. This is my personal matter of privilege. I have pressed him for a debate involving the kind of motion which was put in the amendment dealing with a parliamentary committee. I did this in various meetings we have had because I feel it is important. Like the hon. member for Kingston and the Islands, I feel it is important that parliament be involved in an ongoing way. That was suggested in the motion put yesterday in the excellent speech by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Clark).

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Nothing that occurred between my friend, the government House leader, and me indicated that this would not be acceptable to the government until June 9, 1977 when I was advised that, notwithstanding the suggestions I had made and the pressure I had applied with regard to the form of the debate and the proposal of a committee, the government was reconsidering the motion it would put. I am now advised that while the Prime Minister initially felt that a parliamentary committee would be a good thing, it was the government caucus that finally indicated that it did not want to have that kind of intervention.

Some hon. Members: Shame.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I am prepared to hear the hon. member on the question of privilege, but he is wandering to the debate on the subject matter.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): If the representation that it was the government which first dealt with this matter was innocent, and if the minister tells me that that is so, I accept that. However, if he is not prepared to say that, then I demand that he withdraw the statement that it was the government which first brought this matter forward because if he does not, the minister is misleading the House.

An hon. Member: Sit down.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): There is one other matter I want to raise.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I do not know if there are to be further contributions. By way of a question of privilege the hon. member has raised complaints about statements made by the President of the Privy Council (Mr. MacEachen) during the course of the question period this day.

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Speaker, I regret that so much time is being taken away from the all-important question of national unity by a debate over an item which, whether it is decided in one way or another, is really not very crucial.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

An hon. Member: National unity is not important?

● (1510)

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Speaker, when I made the comment in reply to a question that it was I who had suggested that there be a special debate on national unity, I made it in good faith and I still believe it to be an accurate statement. The hon. member for Edmonton-Strathcona (Mr. Roche) did raise the question on March 10, 1977.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): No; January.

Mr. MacEachen: The first reference is quite irrelevant to the question of a special debate—

Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): The truth is clearly crucial.

Mr. MacEachen: —because the Standing Order 43, as I heard the hon. member read it, made no request for a special debate on the question of national unity.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): No, it was Standing Order 26.

Mr. MacEachen: Maybe I did not hear the full motion.

Mr. Clark: Ralph will explain it.

Mr. MacEachen: On March 30 the hon. member for Edmonton-Strathcona invited the government to bring before parliament some measure or measures "which will allow members to express their ideas and convictions about ways to hold the country together". He invited the government to bring forward some measures that would allow members to express their views. Maybe that was a suggestion for a debate and if it was, I give the hon. member full credit for it.

I referred to a statement that had been made in another forum by the right hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker) and I referred to statements made earlier by the hon. member for Don Valley (Mr. Gillies) about the relevance of parliament, and I went on to say it was my desire to bring forward opportunities to deal with special issues, including the question of national unity. That is the first occasion I can find when the matter was dealt with, and I think it justifies the comment I made earlier.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton (Mr. Baker) has done something again today which has rarely been done by persons who carry the responsibility of House leader of their party and that is to refer to private and confidential discussions.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

An hon. Member: Nonsense.

Mr. MacEachen: I would simply point out to him that if he wishes to continue the valuable forum that we have had as House leaders, then he had better learn a very simple rule and that is, to keep matters confidential.

[Mr. MacEachen.]

Mr. Clark: Both sides of your mouth!

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I rise just to ask one question. Would it not be better to get on with the debate rather than argue over who fathered it?

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Scott: Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on this question because I expected just what we have heard from the government House leader. This is why we are sitting here now instead of being out in our constituencies where we should be—it is because of his mismanagement and the excuse he has given to the House. I want to draw his attention to this, Mr. Speaker. On January 27 I moved, under Standing Order 26—I will not read the whole thing because if government members do not value the time of this House I do, with respect, and that is why I am on my feet now—but in part I said, as reported at page 2448 of *Hansard:*

> This question must be transferred from the public arena to its proper place, the chamber of the House of Commons, where it can be debated by the representatives of all the people of Canada.

I am very, very disappointed to hear the government House leader—who is supposed to be guiding the business of this House—make the statement he has today.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Hon. members will realize we are now locked into a disagreement over a representation of events that have taken place. If there is any connection with a question of privilege as I have defined it on previous occasions, I have not heard an argument to that effect as yet. There is a disagreement about the interpretation put upon certain statements and events. That is the way it remains.

An hon. Member: He can withdraw.

Mr. Speaker: Statements by ministers. The hon. Solicitor General (Mr. Fox).

Mr. Gillies: Mr. Speaker, on the same question of privilege—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I invited discussion on the question of privilege. I have now indicated that it is essentially a disagreement and does not constitute a question of privilege. I have, perhaps regrettably, made a ruling and I have no opportunity now to re-open the question. The hon. member for Don Valley (Mr. Gillies) seeks the floor on the question of privilege that I have just decided.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. Solicitor General.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Saskatoon-Biggar (Mr. Hnatyshyn) on a point of order.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order which relates directly to the statement to be made by the

Solicitor General. I have the responsibility for responding to this statement which was received by our party at approximately 2.15 p.m. today, and I want to say something about that to the Solicitor General as well as the way in which he deals with this House.

The government House leader talks about taking up the time of the House and the apparent interest in this debate, but then allows the Solicitor General to make a statement on motions that will take up one hour of the time of this important debate. Important as his statement is, it could have been made at a later date. I think the first thing the government House leader should have done was ask that the time taken by this statement on motions be added on tonight. He could make a specific motion rather than sitting there in a cloak of sanctimony. If the statement is to be made, and if we are to give the national unity debate priority the government House leader should rise and ask that whatever time is used for the statement be added to the time for debate.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The Solicitor General.

Mr. Clark: What a spent Canada.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*Translation*]

ROYAL CANADIAN MOUNTED POLICE

ESTABLISHMENT OF COMMITTEE TO EXAMINE UNAUTHORIZED ACTS

Hon. Francis Fox (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, I thought very sincerely that the statement I am about to make would be of interest not only to the House but also to the general public, and I think it is important to proceed with this as soon as possible. Of course, Mr. Speaker, I am going to talk about a subject on which my colleagues are extremely well informed, and I think that the whole thing will require a minimum of time if there is some good will on all sides.

[*English*]

On June 17 last, I informed the House that the government had seriously considered the setting up of a Royal Commission of Inquiry in March, 1976 when, for the first time, the government was informed of the participation of the RCMP in the unlawful entry of the premises occupied by L'Agence de Presse Libre du Quebec, in October 1972. The Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) and the then Solicitor General received at that time repeated and unequivocal assurances from the RCMP that the APLQ incident was exceptional and isolated and consequently there was no need of a commission of inquiry. The government eventually decided, as I previously informed the House, not to establish a commission of inquiry. The government remained firmly committed, however, to re-examining the need for a commission of inquiry after the judicial processes, more particularly the investigation initiated by the

Quebec authorities and the court proceedings that could follow, had run their normal course.

• (1520)

Since making my statement in the House concerning the APLQ incident, allegations have been made that members of the RCMP, and more particularly members of the security service, have, on other occasions, been involved in unlawful actions in the discharge of their duties. The APLQ incident, according to those who made the allegations, was not of an isolated and exceptional character as I had reported in my statement of June 17.

These allegations received our immediate attention. At my request, the deputy solicitor general of Canada and the assistant attorney general, criminal law, personally met with some of the individuals who made these allegations. In addition, I asked the Commissioner of the RCMP to undertake the investigations which were warranted. He later informed me, after having made preliminary inquiries, that some of these allegations might well have some basis in fact. According to the commissioner, it would appear that some members of the RCMP in the discharge of their responsibility to protect national security could well have used methods or could have been involved in actions which were neither authorized not provided for by law. As a result, the commissioner has modified his position and has recommended that the government establish a commission of inquiry into the operations and the policies of the RCMP security service, on a national basis.

[*Translation*]

In the circumstances, Mr. Speaker, and considering these new developments, the government has decided to establish an inquiry commission composed of three members who will be responsible for determining the scope and frequency of inquiry practices and other activities which are not permitted or provided for in the law, involving members of the RCMP, and for examining the policies and procedures regulating RCMP activities in their task, which consists in protecting the country and ensuring its security.

It is necessary, for the good administration of the RCMP, that all the light be shed on charges of unlawfulness that have already been made as well as on all other allegations of the same nature which might follow. That, Mr. Speaker, will be one of the important tasks entrusted to the commission set up by the government. After the light has been shed on these incidents which may be drawn to the attention of the commission, the decisions called for will unfold as they should in each particular case, in close co-operation, if need be, with the responsible authorities. But beyond particular incidents which might be brought before the commission, it is important to think about the lessons to be learned for the future. That is why the government has asked the commission's advice in terms of policies and procedures that govern or should govern RCMP activities in the accomplishment of their task, namely to see to the protection and the security of the country, of necessary mechanisms for implementing these policies and procedures, and finally of the amendments to the legislation

which could be necessary, in keeping with the security requirements of our country.

Even if the commission is particularly requested to inquire into matters related to the security service of the RCMP, the government has also requested to have brought to its attention any incident involving illegal action on the part of RCMP members, outside of security service operations. Regular police operations are more immediately submitted to the control and surveillance of the courts. Nevertheless, the government prefers not to restrict the terms of reference of the commission to the security service, so that eventually it could know about incidents involving unlawful acts that could be drawn to the attention of the commission. Thus, the government will be able to take the necessary steps at the appropriate time.

[*English*]

I cannot emphasize too strongly the importance of the commission whose establishment I have just announced. We must, as I have just mentioned, get to the bottom of those allegations which have been made recently against RCMP members. This process will, I hope, help to clear the air and improve the climate within which our national police force is now working.

In a democratic society such as ours, the policies and procedures which govern the activities of the security service must conform with the rule of law. At the same time, the rule of law must be responsive to the requirements of our national security. The rule of law and the requirements of national security constitute two facets of one unique reality which have never been easy to reconcile even in countries with firm democratic traditions. The recommendations of the commission will, I am confident, assist us in meeting this ever present challenge.

As I said on June 17 last, the rule of law is and must be paramount. It constitutes the vital force of our society without which our basic freedoms run the risk of becoming empty slogans. Clearly, there can be no compromise in this regard; it is upon the rule of law that the integrity and survival of our democratic institutions and our fundamental liberties are based. The recommendations of the commission will help us, I have no doubt, to improve the policies and procedures that govern the activities of the security service, and will help us as well in our search for ways to improve the working of the security service in the vital role assigned to it for the protection of our national security.

I take pleasure in informing the House that Mr. Justice D. C. McDonald of the Supreme Court of Alberta will be chairman of the commission, the other members of which will be Mr. Donald S. Rickard of Toronto, and Mr. Guy Gilbert of Montreal. With the consent of the House I should like to table in both official languages official copies of the terms of reference of the commission.

Mr. Nowlan: You can't get away with that.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

[Mr. Fox.]

Mr. Nowlan: You members opposite should be crying, not clapping.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The minister's request to table a document is made after the tabling of documents has been called and therefore requires the unanimous consent of the House. Does the minister have consent to table those documents?

Mr. Lawrence: Mr. Speaker, with respect to the tabling of the documents—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. It is not a debatable proposition. Either the minister has unanimous consent to table the documents, or he has not. Does the minister have the consent of the House to table the documents?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Lawrence: No.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The documents cannot be tabled at this time.

Mr. Lawrence: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member cannot raise a point of order at this particular moment.

Mr. Lawrence: Mr. Speaker, the point concerns the tabling of the document. I rise on a question of privilege.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. According to the procedure under which we are now operating, the minister may make a statement, which is met with a statement in reply made by the parties. I am prepared to call on spokesmen of the various parties and allow questioning, within some discretion, but at the moment I am not aware that I am able to consider a point of order in respect of any of these proceedings.

Mr. Lawrence: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege, which is this. The Solicitor General (Mr. Fox) mentioned the tabling of certain terms of reference concerning a public inquiry or royal commission. Mr. Speaker, those could just as easily have been read to the House for inclusion in *Hansard*. In this way all people would know the exact terms of reference. I feel my privileges have been abridged by the minister's failure to do this. His action therefore deprives me of the necessary knowledge I must have in order to evaluate properly the statement the minister just made.

Mr. Broadbent: Mr. Speaker, I rise on the same point of order or question of privilege, whichever it may be. If we are to respond seriously to the statement concerning the announcement of the inquiry or establishment of the commission, surely it is relevant that all members should be aware of the terms of reference within which the royal commission will work. I had the opportunity to read them, and they raise certain questions in my mind. I suspect they will raise questions in the minds of others, and are therefore relevant. Members should know them. I appeal through you, Mr. Speaker, to the minister. I

ask him to reconsider what he has done and complete his statement by reading to the House the terms of reference of this royal commission.

An hon. Member: Or include them as an appendix to *Hansard*.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The minister has made his statement. I do not think there is any proceeding whereby the House can instruct or demand the minister to say more or less. There is a period provided for questions to be put by the opposition with regard to statements.

Mr. Lawrence: What are you hiding?

Mr. Ray Hnatyshyn (Saskatoon-Biggar): Mr. Speaker, if I may deal with the incredible—I must term it outrageous—statement the Solicitor General made, let me say that my party, and I am sure the NDP would be agreeable, would concur in any motion the Solicitor General might move to have the terms of reference printed as an appendix to *Hansard* in order that the people of Canada may know precisely the kind of document to which the minister was referring.

● (1530)

Mr. Fox: Mr. Speaker, I, of course, am trying to find a way which would make the terms of reference public. I tried to table them in the House of Commons. If it would be in any way helpful to the hon. member, I would be more than willing to consent, with the agreement of the House, that the matter be printed as an appendix to *Hansard*.

Mr. Clark: Well, we forced that out of them.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. At the moment there is no consent that the documents be tabled at this time. The minister has now indicated that he is prepared to ask that the documents be appended to *Hansard* as if they had been read. Does the House agree?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: There is no agreement.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: Mr. Speaker, I note that the refusal came from the government benches. That will not be lost upon the Canadian public. It was the government benches that refused to have this printed as an appendix to *Hansard*.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I should indicate for the accuracy of the record that the refusal that I heard was not confined to one side of the House.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: I know that Your Honour's hearing is at least equal to mine, and I am not going to comment further.

The fact is that the terms of reference and the statement made by the Solicitor General are in keeping with the tradition that has developed within the government of attempting to avoid dealing with issues until the very last moment. It deals with very important matters raised in this House by members of the opposition. It is part of the tradition that it only deals with these matters after considerable pressure has been exerted by members of the opposition. In this case it has protested for a period of over one year with regard to the line of questioning that has taken place relating to this whole matter.

The government suggested that our questions were not constructive but rather destructive of our police force. However, today we have the Solicitor General standing up and having the audacity to tell this House and the Canadian people that he misled this House and the Canadian people on June 17 with respect to the activities of the RCMP.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Hnatyshyn: When the Solicitor General was appointed to his position we had some hopes for him as a man of ability, a man who with some sense of integrity would deal with his responsibilities as Solicitor General. However, he is now falling into the way in which his colleagues acted during the terms of their administration, waiting until the last moment. They have not let us have statements until the very last moment. They have been involved in a continuous misleading of this House and this country over a period of one year.

I read and listened to the statement of the Solicitor General. I should tell him that I received the statement in only one of the official languages. In future I ask that he take special care that we receive his statements in both official languages. I read and listened to the Solicitor General's remarks. I am incredulous. Not once in his five page statement did the Solicitor General mention the fact that the RCMP reports to a ministry and reports to a minister, the Solicitor General.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Hnatyshyn: Not once did he mention the fact that in theory this government and the present and former Solicitors General have had and should have used ministerial responsibility with respect to the activities of the RCMP when the indiscretions and illegalities were reported to them. Not once did he mention this as an issue of government incompetence and potential wrongdoing.

We have been asked to believe by the solicitor general of the day that the government knew of the RCMP's interest in the raid on APLQ, yet in the formal meeting to discuss the letter accusing the RCMP of involvement in the APLQ break-in, he did not ask whether they were in fact involved.

When a letter was received by the office of the former solicitor general, the answer was that somehow he simply accepted advice. Letters have been tabled in this House stating that advice was received through the office apparatus and that he ignored serious suggestions of illegal acts by the RCMP. That has shown his incompetence to act in that position, by doing nothing with respect to a serious allegation.

The Solicitor General at one time stated that he had no knowledge of RCMP involvement. He subsequently indicated that he knew of the involvement but he did not take the

reasonable rational step of acting on it. This statement that has been made by the Solicitor General is not credible. It seeks to whitewash the government while witchhunting on the RCMP by its terms of reference.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Hnatyshyn: The Solicitor General stated in his remarks today that they have not limited the investigation to the activities of the RCMP with respect to the APLQ but want to look at all RCMP activities and all the illegal activities of the RCMP. He failed very notably to mention the fact that the terms of reference will not be extended to involve the role of the Solicitor General, those who have held that office, and the activities of the RCMP and their degree of competence, incompetence or wrongdoing. That is a glaring omission from these terms of reference.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Hnatyshyn: On the basis of the Solicitor General's approach to this whole matter, we in Canada are running closer and closer to Nixonian politics of stonewalling until they are finally forced to give out.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Hnatyshyn: This may have some bearing on the reason why the Solicitor General has been so anxious to have an election now, before we can uncover more incompetence and more wrongdoing that has taken place.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Hnatyshyn: This is not the kind of inquiry that has been asked for by such responsible groups as the Canadian Bar Association. It is not the kind of inquiry asked for by such distinguished and eminent Canadians as the Hon. Emmett Hall, representing the Civil Liberties Union.

An attempt by the government to whitewash its responsibility with regard to its relationship with the RCMP is an attempt to focus attention on that fine force for which we in this party have tried to preserve respect in this country, unlike the government and the Solicitor General.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Hnatyshyn: We cannot accept this to be a complete judicial inquiry with respect to the matters we have raised in this House, and only because the government has now decided to act under considerable pressure, unless there are included within the terms of reference the following: that the present Minister of Supply and Services (Mr. Goyer) must testify under oath with respect to his involvement in this whole matter.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Hnatyshyn: Second, it must be completely clear in the terms of reference that there will be complete access to the minutes of the cabinet committee on security and intelligence, chaired by the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau).

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Hnatyshyn: Third we believe the commission should have, on a confidential basis if necessary, and I refer to the previous suggestion as to the terms of reference that it could well be on a confidential basis to the commissioners as provided for in an inquiry, access to the files of the Solicitors General, past and present. Also, the terms of reference should provide that the present Solicitor General and the present Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development (Mr. Allmand), the former Solicitor General, testify under oath with respect to the operations of the RCMP.

The terms of reference should make it perfectly clear that it includes a complete investigation of the preparation and distribution of the extra parliamentary opposition list which has been of some prominence in this House. This is the list which is apparently related to the break-in at the Praxis Corporation in Toronto.

● (1540)

We finally suggest, and because we have had such a brief time these are only certain suggestions, and we may raise further suggestions for the benefit of the Solicitor General, that there also be an investigation of the wrongful destruction of RCMP documents alleged to have occurred on June 2 and 2 of this year. Unless these matters are included in the terms of reference we can only come to the conclusion that this inquiry is an attempt to stall any discussion with respect to this matter, an attempt to focus the inquiry exclusively on the RCMP. Certain senior officers of the force have something to answer with respect to its activities—I am not disputing that—but I want to make perfectly clear that the government bears a very substantial responsibility with respect to the incidents that are now raised and which have generated this judicial inquiry.

Since the Commissioner of the RCMP has stated that the illegalities of the RCMP may now be considered to be widespread we must also have the opportunity in this judicial inquiry to look at the climate which existed in government and in which apparently the government either neglected or refused to investigate allegations of wrongful acts committed by the RCMP. That should be an essential part of any inquiry, and it must be included.

I must say, in conclusion, that we feel the Solicitor General should give this undertaking that we shall not be precluded from asking questions or raising inquiries with respect to any illegalities on the part of the RCMP merely because there is now some general, wide-brush investigation in process. I hope the Solicitor General will deal with these matters when they are raised in the House, because we intend to raise them as they come forward in discharge of our responsibility to the people of Canada.

There is one danger which I should like to draw attention to with respect to this inquiry. I have been concerned for a long period with respect to the apprehension that the Prime Minis-

ter and solicitors general have felt with respect to the operation of the RCMP as some sort of threat to government. We in the opposition will be vigilant to ensure that this inquiry does not lead to suggestions being made by the government and actions being taken by which the government will attempt to obtain partisan political control of the RCMP.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Hnatyshyn: This is the kind of complaint one hears in editorial comments about the way in which the government itself regards the RCMP. We are concerned about the interface, about the operation between the force and the Solicitor General, but if the government takes any steps to attempt to use this situation as a vehicle to obtain political control over the RCMP it will be fought to the bitter end by members of our party.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Baldwin: Bring back impeachment!

Mr. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby): Mr. Speaker, I must begin by saying I am just a little confused by the logic of the last point the hon. member made. If I understood the case which was being made, it was that in a democratic state it is absolutely essential for there to be political control.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: Partisan political control.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Broadbent: Anyway, what is of basic importance in this matter is, precisely, political accountability, and I do not hesitate to say that this means political control. Of course if at some point the manner of political control becomes inappropriate then we make, in a free society, political judgments about the government concerned.

Mr. Clark: If we can get the evidence.

Mr. Broadbent: I wish to turn now to the subject of this inquiry. If I may say so, Your Honour did a real service to parliamentary democracy when you made the important ruling which enabled the House to conduct a serious debate on this matter, in the course of which all opposition parties had an opportunity to bring to the country's attention the serious mess we are now in, involving both the RCMP and the government.

It is a compliment to the parliamentary system and other free institutions that the editorial writers and the civil liberties groups, as well as others, should finally force the government to act in setting up an inquiry. However, I regret to say that the terms of reference of this inquiry will raise, in the mind of the public, at least as many serious questions as the inquiry was set up to answer. I, for one, cannot understand why the government has done what it has done in this respect, unless it is stupid or foolish or has something to cover up. I shall try to show what I mean in terms of the logic of my argument. There are some important questions to be raised about the terms of reference of this commission. I want to begin in the following way in terms of the sequence of getting the commission established.

We are now told that the Commissioner of the RCMP advises that RCMP members may have been involved in "activities which were not authorized or provided for by law". Important questions follow from that statement made this afternoon by the Solicitor General (Mr. Fox). The first question which occurs to me is: when did the commissioner learn this? When did he find out that this was the case? We have it on the authority of a number of ministers, including the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) not long ago, that something quite to the contrary was believed by the commissioner. When did he draw it to the minister's attention?

The minister did not tell us this afternoon when the government learned that there was perhaps a pattern of illegal activities on the part of the RCMP. Was it two weeks ago? When was it? I assume it was after the minister's statement in the House on June 17 when he said something to the contrary. Presumably, also, it was after he and the Prime Minister assured us that the Montreal incident of 1972 was an abberation.

On June 22 the Prime Minister assured me in the House that he had been informed that the Montreal incident was, and I quote from *Hansard* for June 22, "an abberation, an incident and an isolated one." That was just a couple of weeks ago. Now it turns out it was not an abberation or an isolated incident but that it was presumably part of a pattern. I repeat: when was the Solicitor General informed about this new situation? In replying to me on June 22 the Prime Minister was answering a question I raised about the allegations made by a former corporal in the RCMP who had alleged, back in 1972, that the kind of illegal activities which the minister today suggested were part of a pattern, did exist back in 1972. And it was on June 22 that the Prime Minister was replying to a question I put to him about the allegation by that corporal, who had made it in 1972 but repeated it just a couple of weeks ago.

Once again, the Prime Minister said—and this is important to the point I shall come to in a minute—that it was an isolated incident. It is clear now that it is not. It is clear, also, that the investigation allegedly undertaken, not in 1972 but in 1976, was a sham. When this matter was raised in the House a year ago, we were assured by the Solicitor General and the minister responsible to the House and to the people of Canada that this matter was investigated. We were assured last year that it was an isolated incident.

● (1550)

Surely some important questions arise. It is clear now, it seems to me, if I understand correctly the minister's statement, that there was a pattern of illegal activities by the RCMP—clearly the government believes that now, or it would not have set up this kind of inquiry—and I would think it is clear that this pattern of activities goes back at least to 1972.

If that is so, we on this side of the House are understandably concerned about the assurance that we were given, not only by

the Solicitor General in the House last year but also by the Prime Minister, that the matter was under investigation, that indeed there was no pattern of wrongdoing at that time. I recall that that is all that was asserted. From my point of view, in terms of political accountability that is all that has to be said at this point.

I suggest another question which has to be answered by this inquiry if it is to be of any use to the people of Canada is this: in 1972 did the then solicitor general have access to all the relevant facts? It is on record—and again I reluctantly bring out the contradictions—that the Minister of Supply and Services (Mr. Goyer) said he was informed back in 1972. It is also on record through the words of the Solicitor General that the then commissioner of the RCMP and another senior official recalled—I forget the precise words but this is the logic and substance of the point—that they thought they normally would have verbally informed the minister. It seems to me that if the inquiry is to be useful it ought not to concentrate just on the RCMP in this instance but that the opportunity should be welcomed, I submit, by the government to clear up the contradictory implications of the statements which were made.

Similarly last year what kind of investigation was undertaken by the government? How much information was provided to the then solicitor general? How much information was provided to the Prime Minister? If, on the one hand, little information was provided to them, if they had just a superficial investigation, then they are politically accountable to this House for misleading the House and the country when they told us there had been a systematic and thorough investigation. That is what political accountability is all about, Mr. Speaker.

If, on the other hand, they were not informed by the RCMP last year, then it is important for us to ascertain the truth since questions are raised about the political accountability of the RCMP to the government. Either way, Mr. Speaker, we must examine the question. Either the government was deceptive and misled the people, or the government was not informed by the RCMP as it ought to have been. However, the terms of reference of this inquiry make it impossible for us to find the answer to that question.

Although in one sense we welcome the inquiry because it will examine some of the basic questions involved, as I said at the outset it will raise more questions than it will settle. What we have on the surface here is the government deciding to restrict narrowly the terms of reference to see whether there is systematic wrongdoing on the part of the RCMP. But the government has entirely left out very important and unresolved questions concerning political accountability on the part of the ministers themselves. Therefore from our point of view this is a very unacceptable inquiry.

As I have said, I take the view that the RCMP must be responsible to the cabinet of the day. In previous assertions in the House the Solicitor General, the Prime Minister, and others agreed with that. But they have also gone further. I am sure that if I checked back in *Hansard* I would find statements made by the Solicitor General and the Prime Minister in which they said that the political accountability point does concern them. If the political accountability point concerns them, why have they left it out of the terms of reference of this inquiry?

The implications are not pleasant, Mr. Speaker. The implications are that the government is either stupid or it has something to cover up.

Some hon. Members: Both.

Mr. Broadbent: Therefore I appeal to the government to reconsider immediately its terms of reference so as to include the very specific item of making it mandatory that this commission look into the political accountability question in general vis-à-vis the RCMP and the government, and specifically the political accountability that existed around the time of the 1972 break-in and that involved in the report back to the House in 1976 when the matter was seriously raised. Clearly, as it stands this commission is unacceptable.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Adrien Lambert (Bellechasse): Mr. Speaker, I shall be brief since there is a debate going on in the House on national unity, but I must say how surprised I am to see that RCMP members are the subject of a royal commission of inquiry. In my childhood I had great admiration for this police force, we used to call it the mounted police, it was more imposing, very impressive for us little boys, and I still admire it. But for the last three weeks, I have been greatly surprised to hear that RCMP members have committed unlawful acts. I appreciate they are human beings. I also appreciate they are under all kinds of pressures, but if we have come to the point where we cannot rely on our police forces to take care of our security, where their investigations are shady, I am wondering where we are all going?

In the beginning we were told that it was merely an illegal break-in on the premises of the APLQ. I do not know when we were told the truth, but at that time we were told: It happened only once; there is nothing wrong with overlooking it, just this once. But now, we are told that it happened in other circumstances. Other circumstances means several times: perhaps twice, perhaps five times, or ten times. Perhaps even 25 times. No one knows. In any event, there are surely victims when illegal raids take place. The law is not being respected, in addition to which the public is not being given the protection it is entitled to. I am absolutely amazed to see that in the minister's statement. It is written that allegations have recently been made to the effect that certain persons, then members of the RCMP, were implicated, in other circumstances, in procedures of inquiry or other acts that are not authorized by law.

There must be some code or other to guide police agents who are not dumbbells. They can read and understand the rules and instructions they are given. So, those people act according to their whims. In any event, Mr. Speaker, the statement says in part: Whereas public support of the RCMP in the discharge of its responsibility to protect the security of

Canada is dependent on trust in the policies and procedures governing its activities. That is true, and it should be so.

Will a royal commission of inquiry really wipe the slate clean and restore public confidence? I certainly hope so. But there again, will it really be able to get to the truth of the matter and clarify the situation while restoring public trust in the RCMP? Be that as it may, if I could do anything to help clear up the matter, I would be eager to cooperate. It is in that frame of mind that I read the statement of the minister today. Further on, it says: And whereas the maintenance of that trust requires that full inquiry be made into the extent and prevalence of investigative practices or other activities involving members of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police that are not authorized or provided for by law.

I am somewhat broken-hearted to see that again the province of Quebec is involved in this. The government of the province of Quebec. I see the Solicitor General (Mr. Fox) who is saying no with his head, but if the newspapers are telling the truth, an investigation will be carried out in the province of Quebec in connection with the break-in at L'Agence de Presse Libre du Québec. Mr. Speaker, a provincial government and a federal government are both looking into the activities of our police forces. And in view of the current political climate, I really wonder if this is not likely to influence those who are in charge of these investigations. If only we could be convinced that they will cooperate for the general public well-being, I would be less concerned then to see that under two governments two inquiries will be held at the same time on the same matter. I understand that the Solicitor General (Mr. Fox) added in his statement that the inquiry commissioners will go farther in that matter.

In conclusion, I hope at least that a very serious inquiry will be made and that it will not result in confrontation with the Quebec Minister of Justice. I hope that Quebec City and Ottawa will try to serve well the interest of justice so that our policemen responsible for the security of Canadians will regain their confidence and the public will be able to cooperate efficiently with these people responsible for the interest and protection of the public. If we fail to do so, doubts will still be in the air, I am afraid. I am not overly impressed but I fear that the new generation has somewhat less respect than we do for our policemen who generally carry out their duties sometimes at the risk of their lives. Anyway, I am afraid about the result of that inquiry. I hope that it will be properly made, that it will give good results and that we reach the goal set.

● (1600)

[*English*]

Mr. McGrath: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. My point of order has to do with the matter which was raised earlier by my colleague. It is appropriate to raise it now in the form of a point of order because we have reached a stage in the proceedings where members, under the provisions of the Standing Orders, are entitled to direct questions to the minister based on his statement.

Royal Canadian Mounted Police

My point of order is this: a few days ago the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Gillespie) attempted to circumvent the Standing Orders by bootlegging what was an oral statement through the provisions of Standing Order 41(2), which provides for the tabling of documents. Today we see the same kind of procedure. Under the provisions of Standing Order 15(3) the Solicitor General (Mr. Fox) rises in his place to make a statement, and the operative part of that statement, namely, the terms of reference, are not read by him. He has to have them tabled. It is a fact that these terms of reference have already been distributed publicly to the press, but they have been denied to members of the House. Consequently I am being denied the opportunity to ask questions.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Of course I shall allow the hon. member to continue, but there is a practical difficulty, as I am sure the hon. member will realize. I should like the hon. member to address himself to the difficulty, and that is, the order of calling of business is the tabling of documents first and statements by ministers second. Under the circumstances, the minister could scarcely table the document before he made the statement, because the document relates only to the statement. There would have been a practical difficulty if the minister had attempted to table documents on terms of reference of a royal commission which he had not announced to the House.

Mr. McGrath: Mr. Speaker, I am afraid you misunderstood me. I was not suggesting that the minister should use Standing Order 41 to table the document. If he is going to make a statement under Standing Order 15(3), he should make the full statement and not try to circumvent the rule by asking the permission of the House to table the operative part of the statement. In effect he has not made a complete statement. The Standing Order makes provision not only for replies by representatives of the other parties, but also makes provision for members to direct questions to the minister, based on his statement. How can I direct questions to the minister, based on a statement setting up an inquiry into the operations of the RCMP, if I do not have before me and I do not know what the terms of reference of the inquiry are?

This is clearly an abuse of the Standing Order. If ministers are to be allowed to abuse Standing Orders in this manner, then I would suggest that by the same token we are going to be denied our rights under the Standing Orders. If Your Honour is not prepared to rule now, then you should take the question under advisement. There was not a great deal in what the minister had to say, apart from the appointment of the commission. The operative part of the minister's statement was not read into the record; it has not been tabled; we do not know what it is; and I suggest the minister should be directed to read that part of his statement into the record.

Mr. Speaker: I do not know if hon. members want to contribute to the point of order or want to ask questions. I will take the point of order under advisement, but in the circumstances I am having great difficulty. The minister could not

table the document previously. Then he made a statement and offered to table the document, and that sequence would have required consent, which was not forthcoming. Then the suggestion is that the Chair is in a position to order the minister to read the statement. I do not know if I have that authority, but in any case I shall take it under advisement.

Mr. Lawrence: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the terms of reference have been handed out to the press gallery in the press kit accompanying the statement of the minister, and were not given to members of this House or the subscribers of *Hansard*, my question to the minister now is: will he please read the terms of reference?

Mr. Fox: Mr. Speaker, if it will be helpful to the House, I must say once again I am astonished by these charges. Since the beginning of this afternoon I have been trying to table the document.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Fox: If the hon. member had allowed me to table it, he would have had a copy by now. In any event, I would be delighted to read the terms of reference. Following my reading of the document, I should request permission to table it. It seems to me that is the only way it will become part of the record for official viewing. My reading of the terms of reference quickly is not going to be particularly helpful to hon. members. But with Your Honour's permission, I would be prepared to read the terms of reference.

● (1610)

An hon. Member: Answer the question.

Mr. Fox: In answer to the question, I shall read the terms of reference. They read as follows:

WHEREAS it has been established that certain persons who were members of the RCMP at the time did, on or about October 7, 1972, take part jointly with persons who were then members of la Sûreté du Québec and la Police de Montréal in the entry of premises located at 3459 St. Hubert Street, Montreal, in the search of those premises for property contained therein, and in the removal of documents from those premises, without lawful authority to do so;

WHEREAS allegations have recently been made that certain persons who were members of the RCMP at the time may have been involved on other occasions in investigative actions or other activities that were not authorized or provided for by law;

[*Translation*]

An hon. Member: The interpretation system does not work.

Mr. Fox: Since the interpretation system does not work, I shall give the rest of the answer to the hon. member opposite in French.

WHEREAS, after having made inquiries into these allegations at the instance of the government, the Commissioner of the RCMP now advises that there are indications that certain persons who were members of the RCMP may indeed have been involved in investigative actions or other activities that were not authorized or provided for by law, and that as a consequence, the Commissioner believes that in the circumstances it would be in the best interests of the RCMP that a Commission of Inquiry be set up to look into the operations and policies of the Security Service on a national basis;

[Mr. Speaker.]

WHEREAS public support of the RCMP in the discharge of its responsibility to protect the security of Canada is dependent on trust in the policies and procedures governing its activities;

[*English*]

AND WHEREAS the maintenance of that trust requires that full inquiry be made into the extent and prevalence of investigative practices or other activities involving members of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police that are not authorized or provided for by law.

THEREFORE, the Committee of the Privy Council, on the recommendation of the Prime Minister, advise that, pursuant to the Inquiries Act, a Commission do issue under the Great Seal of Canada, appointing

Mr. Justice David C. McDonald of Edmonton, Alberta

Mr. Donald S. Rickard of Toronto, Ontario

Mr. Guy Gilbert of Montreal, Quebec to be Commissioners under Part I of the Inquiries Act:

[*Translation*]

(a) to conduct such investigations as in the opinion of the Commissioners are necessary to determine the extent and prevalence of investigative practices or other activities involving members of the RCMP that are not authorized or provided for by law and, in this regard, to inquire into the relevant policies and procedures that govern the activities of the RCMP in the discharge of its responsibility to protect the security of Canada;

[*English*]

Mr. Paproski: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The minister is reading too fast and the interpreters cannot keep up with him.

Mr. Speaker: Yes, it is a difficult situation. The minister is reading very quickly, and of course that poses a great burden on the interpreters. Perhaps the minister could read a little more slowly.

Mr. Fox: The text goes on to read:

(b) to report the facts relating to any investigative action or other activity involving persons who were members of the RCMP that was not authorized or provided for by law as may be established before the Commission, and to advise as to any further action that the Commissioners may deem necessary and desirable in the public interest; and

(c) to advise and make such report as the Commissioners deem necessary and desirable in the interest of Canada, regarding the policies and procedures governing the activities of the RCMP in the discharge of its responsibility to protect the security of Canada, the means to implement such policies and procedures, as well as the adequacy of the laws of Canada as they apply to such policies and procedures, having regard to the needs of the security of Canada.

The Committee further advise that the Commissioners:

1. be authorized to adopt such procedures and methods as the Commissioners may from time to time deem expedient for the proper conduct of the inquiry;

2. be directed that the proceedings of the inquiry be held in camera—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Some hon. Members: Shame.

Mr. Fox: It goes on to read:

—in all matters relating to national security and in all other matters where the Commissioners deem it desirable in the public interest or in the interest of the privacy of individuals involved in specific cases which may be examined:

3. be directed, in making their report, to consider and take all steps necessary to preserve

(a) the secrecy of sources of security information within Canada; and

(b) the security of information provided to Canada in confidence by other nations;

[*Translation*]

4. be authorized to sit at such time and at such places as they may decide from time to time, to have complete access to personnel and information available in the Royal Canadian Mounted Police and to be provided with adequate working accommodation and clerical assistance;

5. be authorized to engage the services of such staff and technical advisers as they deem necessary or advisable and also the services of counsel to aid them and assist in their inquiry at such rates of remuneration and reimbursement as may be approved by the Treasury Board;

6. be directed to follow established security procedures with regard to their staff and technical advisers and the handling of classified information at all stages of the inquiry;

[*English*]

7. be authorized to exercise all the powers conferred upon them by section 11 of the Inquiries Act; and

8. be directed to report to the Governor in Council with all reasonable dispatch and file with the Privy Council Office their papers and records as soon as reasonably may be after the conclusion of the inquiry.

The Committee further advise that, pursuant to section 37 of the Judges Act, His Honour Mr. Justice McDonald be authorized to act as Commissioner for the purposes of the said Commission and that Mr. Justice McDonald be the Chairman of the Commission.

Certified to be a true copy, signed by the Clerk of the Privy Council.

To facilitate the reading of the material by hon. members I would once again request the consent of the House to table the full text of the document in both official languages so that hon. members may examine it at their leisure.

Mr. Joe Clark (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the reading by the Solicitor General (Mr. Fox) of a document which, however, he should have had the courtesy to circulate to all members of the House, as he did to members of the Press Gallery, before coming to the House of Commons.

I should like to ask the Solicitor General whether it is the view and the intention of the government that the terms of reference which he has just read allow the commissioners to require testimony under oath and preferably in public from the former solicitor general, the present Minister of Supply and Services (Mr. Goyer), concerning his precise role as the minister responsible for the RCMP during the period and concerning the events into which the inquiry will inquire.

Mr. Fox: Mr. Speaker, I think that once hon. members have had the opportunity to examine the terms of reference in detail, particularly paragraphs (a), (b), and (c), they will see that the terms of reference are drafted in very broad terms. It will be up to the commission to decide whom they would wish to hear. They could, of course, call the former solicitor general, the present Minister of Supply and Services (Mr. Goyer), and they could call me and my predecessor in office. The terms of reference are designed to permit the commission of inquiry to do so. Whether or not the commission would do it in camera or in public depends on the decision of the commission itself in conformity with its terms of reference and powers.

Mr. Goyer: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege—

An hon. Member: Sit down.

Mr. Clark: Mr. Speaker, the minister claims a question of privilege—perhaps he should speak first.

Mr. Goyer: I have already stated in the House of Commons that never before March, 1976, did I have any knowledge of illegal activities being committed by the RCMP—either prior to or following their occurrence. The Solicitor General (Mr. Fox) stated that the RCMP had given him the assurance that L'Agence de Presse Libre du Québec incident was an isolated incident and, as far as I know, this was correct. It is only today that I learned of alleged involvement of RCMP members in other illegal activities over the years, and I am pleased that a royal commission has been appointed to verify and study these allegations.

I can assure the commission of my fullest co-operation. It is importat to ensure that the police abide by the country's laws and that the RCMP image be respected both within and outside Canada.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I take it that the purpose of that intervention might be in anticipation of a reply to the question raised by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Clark) as to whether or not it would be the intention of the minister to appear before the commission.

Mr. Clark: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I was interested in the continuing soap opera of the Minister of Supply and Services. I note that the terms of reference cited specifically by the Solicitor General allow the commissioners to conduct investigations concerning practices that are not authorized. This is contained in paragraphs (a) and (b), the only two parts of the terms of reference that are relevant here. In view of the fact that what is of interest to us in this House is precisely the steps which might—or might not, to give him the benefit of the doubt—have been taken by the present minister of Supply and Services to evade giving the authorization that a minister normally would have given, it appears to me that there is a possibility that these terms of reference—

● (1620)

Mr. Goyer: Make a charge!

Mr. Clark: The minister should move from soap opera to comic opera. It appears to me that the very careful wording of this particular term of reference relative to authorization would not require the appearance before the inquiry of the Minister of Supply and Services because he claims he did not authorize what should not have happened without his authorization. What I would like to have from the Solicitor General is a categorical undertaking that it is the intention of the Government of Canada to have the Minister of Supply and Services appear before this inquiry in open session, under oath, to explain all aspects and answer all questions relative to the state of his knowledge concerning the activities of the RCMP in any matter being inquired into by the inquiry. May we have that specific undertaking?

Mr. Fox: Mr. Speaker, prior to the hon. gentleman's question I must say I had some difficulty following the language

which was being used. I noticed that at one point the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Clark) referred to an authorization which would normally have been given. It seems clear to me—and during the course of the debate it has always been clear—that in no case would any minister of the Crown want to be in the position of authorizing an illegal act because at that point, of course, he also would be involved in criminal activity. My understanding is that the Minister of Supply and Services (Mr. Goyer) has just promised to extend his fullest co-operation to the commission of inquiry.

According to the terms of reference which have been referred to in the House, it seems to me that the commission of inquiry will have all the authority necessary to inquire into the APLQ affair and to summon the witnesses it thinks are necessary to cast light on the questions surrounding the matter. For me, or for the government at this stage, to tell the commission how it ought to conduct its own inquiry would be improper. I think the terms of reference are clear. The commission has all the authority necessary, and my expectation is that the commission would want to look into the APLQ affair.

Mr. Clark: Mr. Speaker, I am sorry to have to keep pressing this matter. Given the government's obvious interest in clearing up this matter, I wonder if the Solicitor General would give us a clear undertaking now that the government will request that the Minister of Supply and Services be allowed to appear in open session under oath to explain all aspects.

Mr. Goyer: I have done it here, but still you ask questions.

Mr. Clark: Would the Solicitor General please answer that question?

Mr. Fox: Mr. Speaker, I cannot add very much to the previous answers I have given. The commission of inquiry has been set up and has full powers to inquire into all aspects which are brought to its attention. Some aspects will undoubtedly have to do with the APLQ affair. Questions have been raised in the House by various hon. members. They have raised questions of cover-up and other related matters. In the course of its inquiries into those matters I suppose the commission will wish to call on members of the government who have additional information in that regard.

Mr. Broadbent: Mr. Speaker, I too have a question about the terms of reference. I am not a lawyer, and that may or may not be a handicap under the circumstances, but having read the terms of reference with care, I do not reach the conclusion the minister seems to reach, that is, that the royal commission can look into virtually an unlimited range of questions pertaining to allegations of wrongdoing. I think—and I put this in the form of a question to the minister—that there is a rather narrow legal interpretation of terms of reference and, if there is no specific mention of the political accountability point, is it not the case that once the commission begins its work and looks with care at its terms of reference, it may well conclude that, quite apart from what the minister says here today, it is not entitled to get into the political accountability question at all? I ask that in light of the fact that there is not a specific reference instructing the commission to do that.

My question is twofold. Is it not a clear possibility that the commission might read this document and reach that conclusion; second, if it is a possibility, given the minister's own expressed concern about the issue of accountability on many occasions in the House in recent weeks and the alleged concern of the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) about political accountability, why is that not in the terms of reference?

Mr. Fox: Mr. Speaker, I feel that the terms of reference are wide indeed. Section C of the terms of reference states that one of the powers given to the commission is to advise and make such reports as it deems necessary and desirable in the interests of Canada regarding the policies and procedures governing the activities of the RCMP. It can look at the policies and procedures, and this could include procedures regarding reporting to the political level.

Mr. Broadbent: It could.

Mr. Fox: Yes. If the commission believes it is necessary, I suppose it will be examining a number of matters. The terms of reference are extremely wide in the sense that they allow the commission to have a look at all allegations which have been made. I think some of them are clearly unfounded, but perhaps the commission will conclude that some of them have basis in fact. I suppose the commission will have a look at how matters were handled within the force and what relationship there was between the force and the responsible minister. However, as to the over-all question of accountability, if the government is not satisfied with the present state of accountability—and I am not saying we are not—then it would be up to the government to present legislation in the House. We would not want to divest ourselves of our responsibility in that regard.

Mr. Broadbent: Mr. Speaker, I find that answer incredible. Considering that during the period when we were questioning in the House about the 1972 break-in in the first place, to which the minister refers in his opening paragraph in the terms of reference, serious conflicting implications—and I will not put it more strongly than that—emerged with regard to the degree of knowledge of the then solicitor general—and I am not questioning that minister's integrity at the present time at all—and considering that we have conflicting testimony in its implications from then Commissioner Higgitt, another man whose integrity I have no other reason to question, is it not important to have that resolved and to have the political accountability with regard to that specific incident looked into?

Second, is it not important for the commission, given the important principle of ministerial responsibility, to look into the information which was given to the House a year ago, when the Prime Minister and the then solicitor general said that after the 1972 issue was raised in the House it was investigated, there was no pattern established and they received adequate answers? I forget the precise words, but the clear political commitment made in this House by the Prime

Minister and the then solicitor general was that there was an investigation and there was nothing to be concerned about.

Is it not important, in terms of the public knowledge of this event, to know whether there was a cover-up, to use the going word, whether the government of the day was misleading us or whether the RCMP was misleading the government at that time? Surely that is a very basic question that in one sense goes to the root of the whole problem and this whole inquiry, and leaves open the possibility of getting answers rather than making it mandatory.

● (1630)

Mr. Fox: Mr. Speaker, there are a number of instances that have been brought to the attention of the House and a number of instances, as I indicated in my statement, that have been brought to my attention since I made my statement in the House on June 17. It is my firm belief that the terms of reference not only allow the commission of inquiry to look at those cases which have become public but some which are not public at the moment because they have been brought to my personal attention and have been investigated. It would also allow them to look at other possible cases coming up or that they may uncover during the course of their investigation. The powers they have would enable them to look at the APLQ affair from beginning to end to see whether, as the hon. member for Greenwood (Mr. Brewin) suggested, there was a criminal cover-up at any level. That is, of course, one of the things that the commissioners will be looking at during the course of the inquiry.

Perhaps I should read *Hansard* again, but my understanding of the whole matter is that assurances were given to the House, on the basis of information received by the force, that the APLQ affair was an exceptional and isolated incident. Of course I stand by those statements. It is only post-June 17, post the time that I made a statement in the House—

Mr. Broadbent: When did you find out?

Mr. Fox: —that specific allegations were brought to my attention. As I stated here, it is not enough simply to have allegations. I asked the Deputy Solicitor General of Canada and the Assistant Deputy Attorney General, Criminal Law, to interview the people who had made the allegations and to look further into the allegations to see if there was any semblance of fact there. I also requested that the commissioner of the RCMP look into them to see whether on his side there was any basis in fact. It was only when I received reports to the effect that there apparently may be some basis in fact—

Mr. Broadbent: When did you find out?

Mr. Fox: —that this was brought—

Mr. Speaker: A supplementary, the hon. member for Northumberland-Durham (Mr. Lawrence).

Mr. Allen Lawrence (Northumberland-Durham): Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question relates to the very restrictive terms of reference. I can well understand why the minister was ashamed to read them in the House. Having had a hand in drafting terms of reference I can assure the House that they are extremely restrictive.

Based on the logicality of the terms of reference, wherein the inquiry has been called because of certain allegations, the main allegation in this House involves the former solicitor general. This means that inextricably interwoven in this whole matter was the knowledge of serious and, as it turns out, genuine, allegations of police intervention in criminal activities—knowledge which was sent to the minister. In other words, there was ministerial knowledge of serious allegations. That was the basis of most of the allegations that came certainly from this party, within this House. Bearing that in mind, is it not rather strange that there is absolutely no term of reference to permit the commissioners to inquire into the relationship not only of the minister but also of his staff, with the RCMP?

I do not want the minister to make the same error that the hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby (Mr. Broadbent) made when he confused political responsibility with political control. We are talking about political responsibility here. Why was there not a term of reference inquiring into the relationship between the political head and the operational head of the RCMP?

Mr. Fox: Mr. Speaker, I think one of the premises on which the hon. member's question is put is that someone was aware of potential or alleged criminal activity. I think it is quite clear, and my statement bears it out, that as soon as any matter concerning alleged criminal activity was brought to my attention or to the attention of any Solicitor General, the necessary steps were taken to investigate it.

The establishment of the royal commission is a clear indication of the government's stand that the police must act within the limits of the law. Through the top management of the force, the police completely subscribe to that proposition. The whole purpose of the royal commission cannot, by any stretch of the imagination, ever be conceived as a cover-up operation. If it were it would be a poor way of handling the matter. The fact is quite the opposite. The purpose is to give to the commission of inquiry all the latitude and power it needs to look into every allegation, founded or unfounded, whether brought forward in a responsible or irresponsible manner, and to get to the bottom of the matter. Surely that is the purpose of the royal commission.

Mr. Lawrence: I have a final supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Back in 1973 the existing system failed. Serious and genuine allegations of criminal activity were made to the minister, and he bungled it. It may not have been his fault but he bungled it one way or another. The system failed. Under these terms of reference the commissioners cannot inquire into that relationship. I suggest to the minister that is a whitewash term of reference. Why are the commissioners not asked to inquire into that relationship?

Mr. Fox: Mr. Speaker, I think if the hon. member looks at the terms of reference he will find that the commission has full

power to inquire into all matters it wishes. The hon. member conveniently forgets that a number of initiatives have been taken by this government which relate in good part to the problem of accountability raised by the Leader of the New Democratic Party (Mr. Broadbent). I refer to the changes in the Protection of Privacy Act in 1974 concerning both the criminal side of the operations of the RCMP and the security side of the operations of the RCMP.

The hon. member referred to the situation in 1973. Naturally we are all interested in finding out whether some forms of criminal activity were entered into by some police officers—as a former attorney general the hon. member should be well placed to know that with a force of 19,000 people spread across the country it may unfortunately happen that some person committed an act that he ought not to have committed. I do not think that is sufficient reason to say that it is necessarily a pattern of activity. It has raised sufficient concern in our minds, however, that we feel that full light should be shed upon the matter.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Lambert (Bellechasse): Mr. Speaker, since the commission will be committed to scrutinize seriously the various break-in situations, in cases where they would discover that an RCMP officer acted in cooperation with other police forces, either the Montreal Urban Community's or the Sûreté du Québec, would they have under their terms of reference the authority to compel officers of those other police forces to give evidence before them in order to further clarify the case? If so, would such evidence be kept secret or made available to the public?

Mr. Fox: Mr. Speaker, in answer to this, I would say that under the exact terms of reference they are to scrutinize the actions of the police force for which we are responsible federally. The aim is not to inquire into the actions of municipal or provincial police forces. The commission, however, has all the powers of a commission of inquiry, including that of issuing subpoenas, of requiring appearances before the commission and, where Canadian citizens wherever they may be in Canada had information of such a nature as to enlighten them on RCMP operations, clearly the Commission could require them to appear. As far as in camera proceedings are concerned, the commission is instructed by the government that all hearings must be held in camera in matters involving the national security of Canada. In other matters, the commission has discretionary powers to decide whether hearings are to be held in public or, in keeping with the inherent rights of citizens to be protected against allegations unless there is some degree of evidence against them, to decide that those parts of the hearings that could affect the civil rights of Canadian citizens should also be held in camera.

[*English*]

Mr. F. Oberle (Prince George-Peace River): Mr. Speaker, the government takes this matter of national security and intelligence so seriously that the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) chaired the cabinet committee on national security and intelligence. On that committee served the then solicitor general, the then minister of justice, and the then minister of national defence. Since there was interplay between that committee and the RCMP through the Solicitor General my question is this: Does the government intend to have the Prime Minister, who was the chairman of the committee, or the secretary of that committee, testify before the commission under oath on those incidents which will be exposed in the inquiry?

• (1640)

Mr. Fox: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman's question relates, apparently, to some grandiose scheme or plot. He spoke of evidence. I do not think we have seen evidence of the type of grandiose plot he described in his question. It would be up to the commission of inquiry to decide on the conduct of this inquiry and, if it was found in the incidents the hon. member referred to that there was a cover-up, it could ask witnesses to appear. On the other hand, speaking hypothetically, if the commission came to the conclusion there had been no cover-up, and if people were entitled to assume that the investigation the Montreal Urban Community Police had launched would come to a head, I suppose the commission might not pursue the matter further, in the belief there is nothing else to pursue. The province of Quebec instituted a commission of inquiry, which is considering precisely why the inquiry conducted by the Montreal Urban Community Police into the APLQ affair came to an end.

Mr. Oberle: The minister accuses me of introducing another grandiose scheme to the House. Those grandiose schemes, so-called, to which I drew the minister's attention probably led to the setting up of this inquiry. The minister is still hanging on to information he obtained from me, and I intend to give him additional information. Being a layman and not a lawyer, I do not know if certain sections of the Federal Court Act, particularly section 41(2), will apply to the inquiry being launched. I am referring to provisions allowing the minister to sign an affidavit, on the strength of which he can withhold evidence from the court if it is deemed as being injurious to national security, cabinet secrecy, federal-provincial relations, and so on. I ask, will that provision of the Federal Court Act be waived in this particular inquiry?

Mr. Fox: Mr. Speaker, I hate to disappoint the hon. member, but none of his wild accusations or allegations led me to change my stand. After following up by way of investigation the allegations the hon. member made, I was not able to find evidence of criminal conduct or criminal wrongdoing. Be that as it may, the question the hon. member raised a number of times in the House is presently being investigated by the Ontario Police Commission, and I am content to leave it at that for the moment.

To answer the hon. member's specific question, if I were to exercise the rights which parliament confers on me under sections 41 and 42 of the Federal Court Act during the course of the inquiry I am sure the hon. member would hear about it and I would be fully accountable for my actions in that regard, as usual to the House of Commons.

Mr. Oberle: The minister has not said if that particular section will apply to evidence which the commission may request of a minister of the Crown or even the Prime Minister.

If the allegations or information I have made known privately to the Solicitor General are without foundation and have nothing to do with the setting up of the commission inquiry, will he now give me permission, publicly, to divulge that same information to the press, since, according to what he says, it is without foundation?

Mr. Fox: Mr. Speaker, two different considerations are involved.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): One is the truth.

Mr. Oberle: Yes, or no.

Mr. Fox: We are talking about the foundation for the conduct of the inquiry. I hope the hon. member agrees that most of the information he relayed to me related to police forces not under the jurisdiction of the federal government.

Mr. Oberle: It related to the RCMP, your office, and officers in your office. Answer yes or no.

Mr. Fox: Obviously the hon. member feels strongly about the matter. The matter is being examined impartially and independently. Surely the hon. member, a member of the Progressive Conservative party, does not object to the Ontario Attorney General, for whom I have the greatest respect as an attorney general, looking into the matter. As for the other part of the question, I think I answered it fully in my previous response. I would not intend to file any such affidavit, but I would have to consider the matter. I suppose if the commission wants to look into matters which have nothing to do with its terms of reference, I would need to consider the matter.

Mr. Oberle: That is right. You would cover it up.

Mr. Fox: Further, I would seek the advice of the law officers of the Crown on how I should conduct myself in the circumstances and I shall answer in the House of Commons, as usual, for any actions I may take.

Mr. Oberle: I have finished playing ball with you.

Mr. Fox: The Federal Court Act gives me certain powers. And it is not for me to say parliament was wrong in giving me those powers.

Mr. James A. McGrath (St. John's East): Mr. Speaker, my question is supplementary to that asked by the hon. member for Northumberland-Durham (Mr. Lawrence). Let me preface it by saying I have read the terms of reference carefully and they seem narrow and restrictive. Would it not be in the minister's own interest to include in the terms of reference provisions which would allow the commission to inquire into the relationship between the Solicitor General and the RCMP, particularly as it relates to accountability and responsibility? Surely that is germane to this whole question. I ask the minister, in light of the exchanges which have taken place in the House today—and I commend him on his manner of handling himself—if it would not be in his own best interest to have that matter spelled out in the terms of reference, so that the commission can look into that particular relationship and determine if it can be improved?

Mr. Fox: Mr. Speaker, no. I appreciate the hon. member's advice, but from my reading of the terms of reference I cannot share his opinion that they are restrictive. The first part would allow the commission to conduct such investigations as, in the opinion of the commissioners, are necessary. I cannot think of broader language. Part (b) would give the commission power to report facts relating to any investigative action or activity, and so on. That language is also broad in the terms of reference. I could have phrased the terms of reference in such a way as to resrtrict them solely to the APLQ matter, the Praxis affair, or to some of the other matters other hon. members raised. I felt it would be better to hold a more open, wider inquiry. I wanted to let the Canadian public know that this commission has all the powers necessary to look into all the allegations of wrongdoing on the part of the force. I want to re-establish, in that way, the previous excellent reputation of the force, a reputation it still deserves, and will continue to deserve.

Mr. John Gilbert (Broadview): Mr. Speaker, the minister stated that only recently he had obtained information concerning incidents of alleged wrongdoing on the part of RCMP officers. On the basis of that information, apparently, he set up the commission of inquiry. How many incidents of alleged wrongdoing were brought to the minister's attention? More important than that, have any people been suspended as a result of the allegations of illegal action, and have any been charged?

Mr. Fox: Mr. Speaker, between June 17, I believe, and the present, a number of allegations have come forward. Consequently the deputy Solicitor General has had but a short time to examine these allegations. I asked him to do it. I also asked the Commissioner of the RCMP to look into the matter. This has been done as quickly and humanely as possible, in the circumstances. Certain new facts came to light in the past couple of weeks, and it takes a certain length of time to determine if there is any basis to some allegations. I cannot say that we have hard evidence at present as to who committed what acts. We felt that the best way to deal with the matter was to set up an independent commission, which would examine the facts and so avoid the sort of criticism the hon. member's leader levelled at the government concerning the RCMP in-house investigation of 1976.

• (1650)

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I will see the hon. member for a supplementary question, and conclude questioning with the hon. member for Wellington-Grey-Dufferin-Waterloo (Mr. Beatty), the hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Beaudoin), and the hon. member for Moncton (Mr. Jones).

Mr. Gilbert: Will the minister direct his attention to the number of incidents that were referred to him? Is it right to

assume that no persons have been suspended or charged? More important, in light of the information supplied by the hon. member for Central Nova (Mr. MacKay), will the minister take steps with regard to protecting the documents and letters that may be involved with regard to investigation?

Mr. Fox: Yes, Mr. Speaker. A directive has now been issued by the Commissioner of the RCMP to stop any further destruction of documents by the RCMP, even in their normal course of operation in the destruction of documents that have lost their use.

Mr. Perrin Beatty (Wellington-Grey-Dufferin-Waterloo): Mr. Speaker, will the minister indicate whether my understanding of the terms of reference is correct, that the commission of inquiry is specifically directed that the proceedings of the inquiry be held in camera on all matters relating to national security? If that is so, can the minister indicate whether any investigation into the mishandling of this affair by the former solicitor general, the Minister of Supply and Services (Mr. Goyer), conducted by this commission will have to be held in camera in view of the fact that the illegal break-in into L'Agence de Presse Libre du Québec was justified on the grounds of national security? In other words, is it not the case that the terms of reference are so restricted that the inquiry is directed by the government that any investigation of the activities of the former solicitor general with regard to the L'Agence de Presse Libre du Québec affair will have to be held in secret behind closed doors?

Mr. Fox: Mr. Speaker, that is not the reading I have of the terms of reference. The terms of reference are quite clear that if, in the opinion of the commission, there is a matter of national security which is at stake, it has the power and is indeed directed to sit in camera. However, if matters do not relate to national security, matters which I presume are information and national security is not involved, there would be no obligation to sit in camera.

In light of previous experience, for example in crime inquiries in Montreal where numbers of people had allegations made against them and no opportunity to defend themselves, a commission should take that into consideration and make up its mind whether there is a public interest and whether it should be held in camera or open. They should also consider whether individual rights are involved which may be adversely affected if the proceedings are not held in camera.

Mr. Beatty: Mr. Speaker, members on this side of the House will be very interested to see whether that investigation will take place in camera or in open session.

With regard to the terms of reference, may I also ask the minister whether in his opinion they are intended by the government to be broad enough to cover the exchange or correspondence tabled in the House yesterday by the Minister of Supply and services which included a letter from his assistant, Mr. Cameron, dated October 11, 1972, and marked urgent. It asked the RCMP for a recommendation as to what sort of acknowledgement, if any, should be made to the letter of allegation from L'Agence de Presse Libre du Québec, concluding with the final sentence "It is noted that reply has been requested by 11 a.m. on Friday, 13 October, 1972, two days later." , and to determine what the reason was why it took 15 days, including 13 days beyond that deadline, for the RCMP to reply, and determine whether there was any other form of communication by the RCMP and the Solicitor General's office during that period?

Mr. Fox: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member's question may be very interesting from a historical point of view. The facts are as the Minister of Supply and Services has indicated. The letter was discussed at a subsequent meeting with the head of the RCMP. The matter was dealt with at that time in the manner I indicated in my statement and the minister indicated in his. What happened in between does not seem to have very much relevance.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Léonel Beaudoin (Richmond): Mr. Speaker, when the Solicitor General made his statement on the APLQ incident on June 17, 1977, I thought precisely that it was certainly not of an extraordinary or isolated nature. Here is my question: To pursue the matter I had raised at the time with the Solicitor General, in view of the fact that the Quebec government has appointed Mr. Keable to investigate almost the same matter, because it would be wrong to think that this inquiry will be carried on largely outside Quebec, since it will take place essentially in Quebec, I believe, can the minister tell the House whether this royal commission—and I congratulate him for setting it up because it was necessary, in my opinion—will cooperate with Mr. Keable or will they have authority to ask Mr. Keable to appear before them as regards the investigation he has been carrying on? Can he also tell us what results can be expected? If so, does he think this matter might lead us to a constitutional fight.

Mr. Fox: Mr. Speaker, I do not think this matter might lead us to a kind of constitutional fight, as the hon. member has suggested. In my opinion, our position is extremely clear. If it had been an isolated, extraordinary and very specific case, if it were a criminal offence perpetrated within this province, this inquiry would fall under the jurisdiction of the provincial attorney general, who is responsible for the administration and implementation of the Criminal Code within his province, and this is what we have done.

At the present time, other allegations lead us to believe that it was not an unusual nor an isolated event. Therefore, as the government responsible for the federal police force, it seems to me quite normal to set up a commission of inquiry to examine the behaviour of the federal police under the circumstances. However, I do not expect any clash between the two commissions of inquiry and I do not see why the federal commission should call Mr. Keable as a witness. I think that Mr. Keable has very definite terms of reference on four specific questions which have been raised, among others why the inquiry of the Montreal police force came to an end. As for us, there would be other practices, perhaps illegal, which we suspect and we

really want to solve the matter and learn exactly what happened.

[*English*]

Mr. Leonard C. Jones (Moncton): Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask the minister three questions. They will be very brief and he can answer them briefly. Will all the members of the cabinet, the parliamentary secretaries, their predecessors in office, their respective staffs and all relevant documents, be compellable witnesses and compellable documents by subpoena or otherwise? Does this inquiry include certain problems that are taking place in the RCMP in New Brunswick? Will the government pay for counsel and legal fees for the RCMP individually and collectively?

Mr. Fox: Mr. Speaker, with regard to the first question I believe the answer in broad terms will be no. With regard to the second question relating to the RCMP inquiry by the New Brunswick government, once again the answer is no, if I understood the question. On the third question as to whether legal counsel would be provided to members of the force, there is a force policy under which in most cases funds for legal assistance are provided to members of the force in connection with things that may have been done in the pursuit of their duties.

Mr. Jones: Do I understand that the inquiry will not have the right to subpoena members of the cabinet?

Mr. Fox: Mr. Speaker, if it is a legal question the hon. member is asking me, I will have to check. However, I cannot imagine that if any member of the cabinet is asked to supply relevant information to the commission of inquiry, he would not be willing to do so.

* * *

● (1700)

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I have two questions for the government House leader. First, what is the intention of the government with respect to business for tomorrow, Friday, and next week?

Mr. MacEachen: Tomorrow we shall resume the third reading of Bill C-27 followed by C-17, the Air Canada bill, and C-49. Next week I would hope also to deal with the report stage of the amendments to the criminal law.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): The other question I have in mind relates to the debate on national unity which, according to the understanding between all parties, was to occupy two days. By the luck of the draw, there happened to be one long day and one short day. The government saw fit, for a reason which escapes me, to make a statement in the middle of the short day. I am being charitable when I say the reason escapes me; this has happened on other occasions and I think it is a practice which ought to be avoided. That a statement of at least partial capitulation, which some have called a cover-up, should have made in relation to an important matter on a day set aside for a debate on national unity is beyond my comprehension, and the government House leader owes an apology for dealing with the matter in that way.

In addition, he owes us some time. I am not worrying about the time we took up on the question of parliamentary privilege. That is part of the normal parliamentary process and I might add that more could be heard about that matter tomorrow. But as to the statement catapulted in by the minister, I believe the request made by one member of the House to extend the time set aside for the debate so as at least to make up the period lost, about an hour and 45 minutes, ought to be granted by the government House leader, and I would ask him to seek whatever order might be required so that the time could be made up.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. MacEachen: The hon. member says it escapes him why the Solicitor General (Mr. Fox) decided to make a statement today.

An hon. Member: It doesn't escape me.

Mr. MacEachen: It does not escape me, either. The reason is related to the importance of the matter, one which, in the opinion of the Speaker, was of such urgency just a short time ago that the business of the House of Commons was set aside to deal with it. It was the view of the government that just as soon as a decision had been taken to establish a royal commission related to our national security, that decision should be communicated to the House of Commons as quickly as possible.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. MacEachen: That is why the statement was made today. It was because of the gravity of the subject matter, and for no other reason. The hon. member said his question of privilege was part of the parliamentary process. Of course it was. But a statement by a minister is also part of the parliamentary process and was justified on the grounds I have indicated.

The hon. member has suggested that further time might be made available for today's debate on national unity. I am not ready to make or to receive a proposal at the present time because I know the circumstances are not right and that the mood is not right at the moment for securing the kind of concurrence which would be required. However, I would be ready to consult through usual channels to determine whether it would be possible to agree on some extended period. The hon. member for Grenville-Carleton (Mr. Baker) must bear in mind that the proceedings of the House have been taken up with these two matters—important matters—which have engaged the time, interest, and intellect of members of the opposition, for the most part, rather than members of the government.

Order Paper Questions

Mr. Clark: The government House leader has said that the atmosphere in the Chamber is not now conducive to an agreement on an extension of hours. I simply want to say on behalf of my party, and I am sure the spokesmen for the other parties on this side of the House will agree, that we are prepared to support an extension of the time of debate today to allow the agreed time to ensue for a discusion on national unity, and we do not want that decision to be delayed simply because the government House leader is in a state of pique. We are prepared, now, to agree to the extension of sitting time until 8.45 p.m. tonight.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Suggestions are being made by way of a point of order. There is no point of order to be dealt with at the moment.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): I think it would not be unreasonable for us to have discussions among the House leaders while debate goes on this afternoon. We might agree to the suggestion which has just been made by the Leader of the Official Opposition (Mr. Clark). However, I would offer an alternative, perhaps even two options. To sit right through until 8.45 p.m. would be unfair to everyone. Perhaps we might rise at six and sit from 8.p.m. until 10 p.m. Or maybe we could sit until 7 p.m., as now ordered, and then sit for an hour or two on another day. After all, we had the experience the other day of trying to make arrangements on the spur of the moment in this Chamber, and look where that got us.

Mr. Speaker: That is the difficulty in which we find ourselves—we are attempting by way of a point of order to determine whether or not agreement can be reached. It is not a proper vehicle for such a discussion. Some proposal would have to be made to the House for consideration. Obviously, the time is not right.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Lambert (Bellechasse): Mr. Speaker, I must admit that in the course of the afternoon an hon. member on the government side suggested the idea of extending the sitting from six to eight o'clock or from eight to ten o'clock with a break for supper between six and eight o'clock. I answered that yesterday we happened to suggest such an extension for today but he refused. This time, I put some conditions, as was my privilege. They were to tell me about this but I did not hear from them. As far as I am concerned, I stick to the status quo as defined in the motion which has been passed yesterday proposing to sit until seven o'clock tonight.

[*English*]

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, the following questions will be answered today: Nos. 1,521, 1,553, 1,611, 1,784, 1,948, 2,320 and 2,464.

[*Text*]

DEMURRAGE CHARGES

Question No. 1,521—**Mr. Malone:**

What was the demurrage cost of grain ships for the crop year 1975-76 at the Port of (a) Vancouver (b) Thunder Bay (c) Churchill?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): In so far as the Canadian Wheat Board is concerned: The Canadian Wheat Board advises that their records are not kept by individual ports but are broken down only into East Coast and West Coast categories. Demurrage charges for the 1975-76 crop year for West Coast ports, the bulk of which were at Vancouver, were $3,114,919, while those for East Coast ports were $193,812. No demurrage costs were incurred at Thunder Bay and Churchill.

CONSULTING WORK FOR FARM CREDIT CORPORATION—MANITOBA INSTITUTE OF MANAGEMENT

Question No. 1,553—**Mr. MacKay:**

1. Was the Manitoba Institute of Management employed in 1975 and 1976 to do consulting work for the Farm Credit Corporation and, if so (a) were tenders called before the contract was awarded (b) who selected this firm and who decided to award it the contract?

2. Was the Chairman of the Farm Credit Corporation, Mr. Baldur Krustjanson, a director or a member of the Board of Manitoba Institute of Management when the Institute was employed to work for the Corporation?

3. How much has the Farm Credit Corporation paid in total to the Manitoba Institute of Management?

Hon. E. F. Whelan (Minister of Agriculture): Farm Credit Corporation advises: 1. Yes. The Institute assisted the Corporation in the preparation of terms of reference for a management audit program. (a) It was considered inappropriate to put the project out to tender until the terms of reference had been completed. (b) The selection was made by the Chairman and ratified by the Members of the Corporation.

2. Yes.

3. Payments made to the Manitoba Institute of Management Inc. were as follows:

Year	Consultation	Expenses	Total
1975	$30,940	$6,814	$37,754
1976	$33,660	$9,308	$42,968

DYLEX LTD.

Question No. 1,611—**Mr. Jones:**

1. Is Dylex Ltd., 637 Lakeshore Blvd. West, Toronto, Ontario, a federally incorporated company and, if so (a) on what date was it incorporated (b) what are the objects of the company (c) who are the officers and directors (d) who are the shareholders and, in each case (i) how many shares are held (ii) what is his/her address?

2. Is the company Canadian owned and, if not, what percentage is foreign?

3. What is the name and address of any branch, subsidiary or business associated or controlled in any way by Dylex Ltd. and what are the details of all holdings in each case?

4. Has any investigation or inquiry been made by the government into Dylex Ltd. and (a) if not, for what reason (b) if so, what are the details of the findings?

Hon. A. C. Abbott (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): 1. Yes. 1.(a) April 4, 1928. (b) The objects of the corporation are contained in the Letters Patent and are available to the public from the Corporations Branch of the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs (Note: Too lengthy to be contained in an answer). (c) Louis H. Posluns, James F. Kay, Wilfred Posluns, Irving Posluns, Jack Posluns, Samuel F. Kay, David Korn, Arthur Zaldin, Hubert J. Stitt, William Singer, Daniel W. Casey, Lionel Robins, Irving Levine, Harry Rosen, Kenneth Axelrod, George Fine, Henry Zagdanski, Samuel Shainhouse, Sydney Loftus, Schuyler M. Sigel. (d) Information disclosed by the Corporation in Section A of the Annual Return required to be filed under the Corporations and Labour Unions Returns Act reveals that of the total 869,079 issued shares, 145,422 are owned by Oelsak Limited—address: 637 Lakeshore Blvd. W., Toronto M5V 1A5. 117,477 are owned by Nadler Bros. Limited—address: 637 Lakeshore Blvd. W., Toronto M5V 1A5. There is no information on the owners of the other issued shares.

2. Eight hundred sixty-three thousand, seven hundred sixty-five shares are held in Canada while 5,314 are held in the United States.

3. See Table "A".

4. (a) No investigation has been made by the Corporations Branch into the affairs of Dylex Ltd. since no complaints from shareholders have been received. (b) In 1973, Dylex Ltd. (Fairweather Inc.) was convicted under section 36 of the Combines Investigation Act. For a separate case, again of section 36 of the Combines Investigation Act, Dylex Ltd. (Fairweather Inc.) was acquitted in March 1974.

Shares or other Corporations Held by Dylex Limited

	Manner	Date	Place	
Family Fair Inc.	Letters Patent	January 12, 1968	Ontario	100 per cent
Dylex Acceptance Corp. Ltd.	Letters Patent	May 4, 1928	Dominion	100 per cent
Fashion Council Ltd.	Letters Patent	December 24, 1971	Ontario	100 per cent
Fairweather Inc.	Letters Patent	October 6, 1959	Ontario	52.9 per cent
Harry Rosen Men's Wear Ltd.	Letters Patent	October 11, 1956	Ontario	100 per cent
National Knitting Mills ltd.	Letters patent	July 26, 1955	Ontario	100 per cent
Bradford Spinners Ltd.	Letters Patent	December 3, 1964	Ontario	100 per cent
The Young Canadian Clothiers Corp. Ltd.	Letters Patent	April 21, 1970	Dominion	N/R
Canadian Clothiers Corp. Ltd.	Letters Patent	April 13, 1965	Ontario	100 per cent
Jermaines (1948) Ltd.			B.C.	100 per cent
Jermaines (Oakridge) Ltd.			B.C	N/R
Inactive Companies				
Dylex Properties (Eastern) Ltd.	Letters Patent	December 14, 1960	Ontario	
W. H. Leishman & Co. Ltd.	Letters Patent	September 3, 1933	Dominion	
Crown Tailoring Co. Ltd.	Letters Patent	February 24, 1932	Ontario	
W. R. Johnston & Co. Ltd.	Letters Patent	November 21, 1933	Ontario	
Daroff of Canada Ltd.	Letters Patent	May 28, 1965	Dominion	
Sobel, Newman & Kutner Ltd.	Letters Patent	February 5, 1965	Ontario	

CIDA CONTRACTS AND CANADIAN POPULATION

February 23, 1977

Question No. 1,784—**Mr. McKenzie:**

1. How many Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA) consulting and construction contracts were awarded in (a) 1974 (b) 1975 (c) 1976 to (i) British Columbia (ii) Alberta (iii) Saskatchewan (iv) Manitoba (v) Ontario (vi) Quebec (vii) the Atlantic provinces (viii) other?

2. What percentage of the total number of CIDA consulting and construction contracts in (a) 1974 (b) 1975 (c) 1976 were awarded to (i) British Columbia (ii) Alberta (iii) Saskatchewan (iv) Manitoba (v) Ontario (vi) Quebec (vii) the Atlantic provinces (viii) other?

3. What percentage of the total Canadian population in (a) 1974 (b) 1975 (c) 1976 lived in (i) British Columbia (ii) Alberta (iii) Saskatchewan (iv) Manitoba (v) Ontario (vi) Quebec (vii) the Atlantic provinces?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): In so far as the Canadian International Development Agency is concerned: The answer to parts 1 and 2 of this question will be found in the following table.

Consulting and Construction Contracts

	1974		1975		1976	
	Number	Per cent	Number	Per cent	Number	Per cent
British Columbia	14	12.3	14	12.3	10	8.1
Alberta	7	6.1	4	3.5	7	5.6
Saskatchewan	2	1.7	2	1.8	2	1.6
Manitoba	6	5.3	—	—	3	2.4
Ontario	34	29.8	53	46.4	34	27.4
Quebec	45	39.5	35	30.7	57	46.0
Atlantic Provinces	5	4.4	4	3.5	9	7.3
Other	1	0.9	2	1.8	2	1.6
	114	100.0	114	100.0	124	100.0

In so far as Statistics Canada is concerned: 3. The percentage of the total Canadian population in 1974, 1975 and 1976 in British Columbia, Alberta, Saskatchewan, Manitoba, Ontario, Quebec and the Atlantic provinces is provided on the following chart.

Order Paper Questions

Percentage Distribution of Canadian Population for 1974, 1975 and 1976[a]

	1974	1975	1976
British Columbia	10.7%	10.8%	10.8%
Alberta	7.6	7.7	7.9
Saskatchewan	4.0	4.0	4.0
Manitoba	4.5	4.5	4.4
Ontario	36.1	36.1	36.1
Quebec	27.3	27.1	27.0
Atlantic Provinces	9.5	9.5	9.5
Territories	0.3	0.3	0.3
Canada	100.0	100.0	100.0
(Total population, in thousands)	(22,446)	(22,800)	(23,110)

[a] Post-censal population estimates produced by using 1971 census counts as the base. All these figures will be revised based on final counts from 1976 Census.

PARTIES HELD IN CONJUNCTION WITH THE PROCLAMATION OF NEW CITIZENSHIP ACT

Question No. 1,948—**Mr. Epp:**

1. What is the projected cost to the taxpayer for parties held or to be held in Vancouver, Kelowna, Prince George, Edmonton, Calgary, Regina, Saskatoon, Winnipeg, Oshawa, St. Catharines, Peterborough, London, Windsor, Sudbury, Thunder Bay, Waterloo, Barrie, Hamilton, Saint John, Halifax, Moncton and Charlottetown in conjunction with the proclamation of the new Citizenship Act?

2. What is the projected cost to the taxpayer for the liquor to be served at each of the parties?

Hon. John Roberts (Secretary of State): Costs incurred for receptions held as part of the information programme on the occasion of the Proclamation of the New Citizenship Act: 1. Vancouver, $4,052.85; Kelowna, $1,007.57; Prince George, $1,089.20; Edmonton, $1,516.00; Calgary, $1,890.20; Regina, $1,531.00; Saskatoon, $1,996.00; Winnipeg, $2,310.32; Oshawa, $1,611.64; St-Catharines, $1,775.73; Peterborough, $1,898.00; London, $2,500.38; Windsor, $1,704.12; Sudbury, $1,685.21; Thunder Bay, $1,211.40; Waterloo, $1,524.05; Barrie, $1,485.50; Hamilton, $1,794.57; Saint John, $2,535.45; Halifax, $1,852.58; Moncton, $1,691.13; Charlottetown, $1,910.45. Sub-total, $40,573.35.

2. Vancouver, $1,506.30; Kelowna, $152.35; Prince George, $263.20; Edmonton, $360.00; Calgary, $628.45; Regina, $474.50; Saskatoon, $930.00; Winnipeg, $763.02; Oshawa, $663.64; St-Catharines, $509.80; Peterborough, —; London, $1,189.00; Windsor, $791.12; Sudbury, $754.25; Thunder Bay, $543.40; Waterloo, $545.71; Barrie, $382.50; Hamilton, $711.50; Saint John, $1,405.15; Halifax, $1,152.17; Moncton, $847.50; Charlottetown, $845.15. Sub-total, $15,418.71.

TELECOMMUNICATIONS—COSTS OF EQUIPMENT AND SERVICES

Question No. 2,320—**Mr. O'Sullivan:**

1. With reference to the answer to Question No. 1,943, which stated in part, that the total cost included in the 1975-76 Estimates of the Department of Manpower and Immigration for telephone and other related communications equipment rentals was $4,412,836, what was the cost (a) incurred by (i) the Atlantic Provinces (ii) Quebec (iii) Ontario (iv) the Western Provinces (v) Yukon (vi) NWT (b) for (i) telephone equipment (ii) teletype equipment (iii) radio and other mobile communications devices rental (including any paging equipment) (iv) payments for actual communications services and rental of time on communications lines?

[Mr. Goodale.]

2. With reference to the answer to Question No. 1,943, which stated in part, that the total estimated cost included in the 1976-77 Estimates of the Department of Manpower and Immigration for telephone and other related communications equipment rentals was forecast as $4,153,189, what was the cost (a) incurred by (i) the Atlantic Provinces (ii) Quebec (iii) Ontario (iv) the Western Provinces (v) Yukon (vi) NWT (b) for (i) telephone equipment (ii) teletype equipment (iii) radio and other mobile communications equipment rentals (including any paging equipment) (iv) payments for actual communications services and rental of time on communications lines?

Hon. Bud Cullen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): 1. (a)(i) Atlantic Provinces, $426,078; (ii) Quebec, $1,104,-829; (iii) Ontario, $1,823,503; (iv) Western, $1,034,457; (v) Yukon, $11,276; (vi) N.W.T., $12,693. (b) Atlantic: (i) $314,-912; (ii) $1,693; (iii) Nil; (iv) $109,473; (b) Quebec: (i) $858,404; (ii) $39,216; (iii) Nil; (iv) $207,209; (b) Ontario: (i) $1,484,820; (ii) $83,493; (iii) Nil; (iv) $255,190; (b) Western: (i) $642,981; (ii) $27; (iii) Nil; (iv) $391,449; (b) Yukon: (i) $5,698; (ii) Nil; (iii) Nil; (iv) $5,578; (b) North West Territories: (i) $8,008; (ii) Nil; (iii) Nil; (iv) $4,685.

2. (a)(i) Atlantic Provinces, $395,071; (ii) Quebec, $1,045,-935; (iii) Ontario, $1,741,349; (iv) Western, $943,245; (v) Yukon, $11,504; (vi) North West Territories, $16,085; (b) Atlantic: (i) $318,406; (ii) Nil; (iii) Nil; (iv) $76,665; (b) Quebec: (i) $821,185; (ii) $59,354; (iii) Nil; (iv) $165,396; (b) Ontario: (i) $1,448,961; (ii) $107,079; (iii) Nil; (iv) $185,309; (b) Western: (i) $682,167; (ii) Nil; (iii) Nil; (iv) $261,078; (b) Yukon: (i) $5,643; (ii) Nil; (iii) Nil; (iv) $5,861; (b) North West Territories: (i) $9,341; (ii) Nil; (iii) Nil; (iv) $6,744.

CBC—SUITS FOR OLYMPICS

Question No. 2,464—**Mr. Beatty:**

1. Did CBC have a number of employees measured for special suits to be used during the Olympics and, if so, how many?

2. Were any suits subsequently purchased and (a) if so (i) how many (ii) at what cost (b) if not, for what reason?

Hon. John Roberts (Secretary of State): I am informed by the CBC as follows: 1. No employees were measured for special suits. Certain items of clothing were supplied but were to the nearest stock size.

2. No. Separate items were purchased. (a)(i) Sufficient quantities were ordered for the more than 2,000 Olympics personnel under the control of CBC as host broadcaster as well as for personnel involved in CBC domestic coverage. The clothing purchased served as a uniform and readily identifiable appearance for these personnel. (ii) 198 melon jackets at $63.40 each, 16 blue jackets at $63.40 each, 1,997 "common image" windbreakers at $26.17 each, 16 melon pants or skirts at $30.80 each, and 4,046 blue pants or skirts at $25 each. (b) Not applicable.

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker: Shall the remaining questions be allowed to stand?

Mr. McCleave: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order involving all members of the House and arising out of the answers just given to us by the Parliamentary Secretary to the

President of the Privy Council (Mr. Goodale). Looking at today's order paper I find there are at least 24 questions of a vintage more than a year old. Some of them were placed as early as November 3, 1975, on the order paper of another session.

● (1710)

I simply want to say that it is not acceptable to have 24 questions standing in the name of one person, which happens to be the hon. member for Leeds, (Mr. Cossitt) remaining unanswered. There is more than inability to answer at work here; there is vindictiveness at work, and I for one am not prepared to be a member of a free assembly which allows the government to show spite, malice, and deliberate indifference toward any of the members of this assembly.

I am not going to go through all of them because we should get back to the national unity debate, but question No. 31 in the name of the hon. member for Leeds is almost a classic illustration of the problem he is up against. Let me read just part of it:

With reference to the answer to question No. 3,573 of the first session of the 30th parliament, asking details on government business awarded to Urbanetics Limited which stated: "See answer to parliamentary question No. 3,359" of the first session of the 30th parliament, for what reason does the government consider this possible since question No. 3,359 of the first session of the 30th parliament has not been answered?

I think that is contempt of an almost unbelievable degree. I just want to tell the parliamentary secretary this, that some of those questions are going to be answered, and they are going to be answered starting tomorrow, or I will use the technique or moving the adjournment of the House on every possible occasion on behalf of the hon. member for Leeds until the government comes to its senses and revokes this revolting habit simply because it does not like the fact that a member has moved from one side of this political principality to the other and has changed from being a Liberal to being a Conservative.

In any event, I have made my indignation known and I am going to use every technique I can against the parliamentary secretary and the stonewalling of the government.

Mr. Goodale: Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend from Halifax-East Hants and I have had an opportunity to work rather closely with one another—at least, I had thought that was the case—in our work on one particular standing committee of this House, as well as in the House itself, and I am amazed and disappointed at what he has just said, particularly with regard to his imputing of motives to me and to the government in the process of answering questions which appear on the order paper. What he has just said is not only untrue, but I think unfair, and leaves a wrong impression with all members of the House and certainly with those who watch the proceedings of the House. I must take strong exception to the tone and the tenor of what he said, because it is simply untrue.

I have indicated on other occasions when dealing with a similar point of order that it is our objective to endeavour to answer all of the questions which appear on the order paper before the end of this session. I indicated to hon. members that in recent days some members had placed rather extensive lists of questions on the order paper which had the effect of delaying the process of answering questions simply because of the new bulk of questions appearing on the order paper.

Nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, we do intend to respond to all of the questions before the end of this session. We will do our level best to do that, and I can inform the House that with respect to some of the questions to which the hon. gentleman referred in his remarks just now I think I will be in a position to provide answers within the next couple of days. But I can assure him that the suspicions that he has expressed with respect to motives are absolutely without foundation.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Shall the remaining questions be allowed to stand?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

* * *

MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, I ask that all the notices of motions for papers be allowed to stand for today.

Mr. Speaker: Is that agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

[*English*]

CONFEDERATION

DEBATE ON NATIONAL UNITY

The House resumed, from Tuesday, July 5, consideration of the motion of Mr. Trudeau:

That members of this House dedicate themselves anew to the continuing unity of Canada as a free and independent country organized on the basis of a federal form of government with two official languages and a diversity of cultures.

And on the amendment of Mr. Clark (p. 7321).

Mr. Leonard C. Jones (Moncton): Mr. Speaker, last night at 11 o'clock when we adjourned I had just quoted a paragraph from the document which had been tabled in this House some weeks ago called "A National Understanding". Perhaps that should be re-entitled "A National Misunderstanding". The paragraph I had read reads, in part, as follows:

In any event, the federal government asserts that it is incompatible with the unity of Canada that Canadian citizens should be able, when they move from province to province, to send their children to schools where they are taught in their own language.

What this paragraph means, Mr. Speaker, I have no idea. But what it says is that it is not beneficial to national unity for a parent to be able to place a child in school of his or her own language when moving from province to province. Surely the language in that document must be in error, because the statement goes on to say that facilities should be provided—we might conclude in the French language—for those transferring from the province of Quebec to any other province.

Already this has conflicted with the previous statement on incompatibility with national unity. The paragraph goes on to say that facilities will continue to be provided in the province of Quebec for those transferring into that province. How can English language facilities be continued in the province of Quebec when Bill 1 states that people coming into the province must be educated in the French language? In the next paragraph of this statement the government agrees with the policy that Bill 1 promotes, that immigrants into the province of Quebec must be educated in the French langugage regardless of their origin, or even their wishes. The government feels this must be the case if the province is to remain predominantly a French language province.

The government also states in the same paragraph that the same choice must be available to immigrants to other provinces. It would seem to me that there is no choice for immigrants in the province of Quebec.

We have allowed Quebec to have a double standard for too long now. It is time we realized that we cannot continue to live as a nation with ghettos of English and ghettos of French. We must become Canadians. And that goes for Quebec too; they must become Canadians if they are to remain in Confederation.

In closing, may I say that the Quebec story is a sad one indeed. It leaves all of us, in the maritime provinces particularly, in a peculiar situation. My suggestion is that the Quebec problem, the national unity problem, be taken out of the political arena. It is time that members of parliament, each and every one of us, realized that we do not sit here as party members but as the representatives of the people of Canada. It is time that the government turned to the realities of the situation at hand and stopped making a bit of a mockery of disunity. It is time it stopped making our disunity a popularity issue.

It is perhaps true that if a non-partisan committee comprising members of parliament, Senators, MLA's and elected officials of all kinds met on a tripartite basis in all parts of the country, and non-partisan regional committees were set up across the country, we just might make some headway. But as it now stands the politicians are inflating the emotions of all concerned persons, so that soon a viable solution may not be possible due to emotion upheaval.

If unity is to be achieved, equality must be the law. It must be the rule. We must have equality of race, religion, creed, of province and region. Politicians alone cannot begin to mend the problems of the state. The people of this country must also be consulted. Unlike other members here, I suppose I have to say why I do not agree entirely with forcing the province of Quebec to stay in Confederation, or in unity. Unity can be accomplished only if all parties are willing. There must be a *consensus ad idem* before we can reach any kind of agreement. Likewise, for reconciliation there must be some consensus.

• (1720)

Unity can only be attained if all Canadians become true Canadians. Unity and the repairing of a state can be fulfilled only if we all take the time to work together toward a common goal. The best place to start uniting this country is with a common goal of work for all. Some refer to this as full employment. I suggest we can have something approaching full employment. In seeking truth and happiness, we will find unity and harmony in our country, and in seeking unity and harmony among our peoples we will find a better nation, one which is strong and free.

I find it difficult to bring myself to support a motion which alleges and states continuing unity. There has not been national unity but a great deal of disunity, and economic problems which have been caused as a result of improper implementation of programs, hastily and ill-conceived by the federal government, and by some of the provincial governments as well.

National unity cannot be achieved in debate by politicians, but like love and brotherhood can be only achieved by people working together with God's will and counsel. As to linguistics, which is only part of the national unity question—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Order. I regret to inform the hon. member his allotted time has expired.

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Halifax): Mr. Speaker, yesterday, my leader made a tremendous speech. I did not fully realize what a shattering day it was for the government until the two foxes in the government today concocted this method of trying to capture the media.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Stanfield: The second fox being my old friend, the government House leader.

I enter this debate today with a feeling of great sadness. It is almost exactly ten years ago that I, as the premier of Nova Scotia, decided to enter federal politics. I thought I might be able to do something to strengthen our country, and in particular to improve the understanding between French-speaking and English-speaking Canadians, and also to improve economic opportunities in the Atlantic provinces. It makes me sad to view the sorry state today of the economy of those provinces, but it moves me almost to tears to see our country economically hobbled and menaced by threatened disintegration.

I wish to speak to this House very bluntly, and I should like to be heard, even though some members may not like what I say. What I say will be said very deliberately. I do not wish to add to the difficulties of our country, but we must be frank with one another and with Canadians. Disunity today is not entirely the fault of the government, but the government ought

to set the tone and should give leadership. I say that it is not just the government's fault, because some individuals and groups outside the government and outside the Liberal party have pushed concepts of this country which are clearly divisive.

The right hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker) has expressed concern about the rise of provincialism. Certainly excessive provincialism is divisive, but there are concepts and goals which transcend provincial or regional lines and which are even more dangerous to Canadian unity because they are divisive, even if they are put forward in the name of national unity. Thus, our present crisis is not just the fault of our present government.

This government has too often engaged in confrontation and polarization, rather than reconciliation. We saw these tactics employed to set the east against the west back in 1973 and 1974 in connection with oil, for the purpose of trying to secure votes in an election, leaving wounds in the west that will be many years in healing. The present emergency relates to the province of Quebec. Admittedly one cannot reconcile to federalism those who are fully committed to separatism; but did this government have to polarize opinion in Quebec between federalism and separatism? You either accepted the Trudeau concept of federalism or you were stigmatized.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Stanfield: This federal government made no effort to reconcile Quebec nationalists who were federalists but were also concerned by the heavy hand of Ottawa in areas they consider vital to the future of their province—language and culture. Whether or not this hard line was maintained by the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) and his colleagues, this was maintained tragically through an underestimate of the strength of Quebec nationalism. It was not very long ago that the Prime Minister said separatism in the province of Quebec was dead. Whether or not this was a result of a tragic mistake in judgment is speculation. What is beyond speculation is that the Trudeau government helped to polarize opinion in the province of Quebec.

I am very unhappy that the Prime Minister chose to risk the future of our country on a shoot-out between himself and René Lévesque. In all honesty and fairness I have to say that Mike Pearson would never have done it. The lesson in this for the future is not that we should now try to conciliate Mr. Lévesque or members of his government—dedicated separatists—but that we should create confidence in the minds and hearts of Quebecers who are not separatists but yet do not buy the Trudeau orthodoxy.

The ministers of the government are reported to be urging an early election on the basis that this would settle things down. My attitude toward the next election is a little different from theirs. I will not be running again. My professional interests will not be involved. A federal election will prove nothing as far as the future of Quebec is concerned. Because of traditions in that province, the Liberals will probably win a substantial majority of the seats. This will in no way indicate that Premier Lévesque could not win a substantial majority for the provincial government when the chooses to go to the people. We could conceivably go on for some time with federal Liberals and the Parti Québécois each doing well in the province of Quebec, with our country churning in a continuous turmoil. Perhaps the government and its supporters are happy with such a prospect. Obviously they are happy with the way things are going. One can observe this daily in this Chamber. Politically they were in a bad situation before the election of the Lévesque government. If the Lévesque government had not been elected, this government would have to invent it. They have tried to wring every last ounce of political benefit from crisis, and apparently will continue to do so while pretending not to.

• (1730)

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Stanfield: But our problems of unity, the future of this nation, surely are, or should be, beyond partisan rivalry. The future of our country is at stake. The country was created by co-operation between politicians who had been bitter opponents but recognized that only through co-operation and joint effort could everything be prevented from going down the drain.

One of the alarming aspects of the present danger is that the government sees this crisis as a political benefactor. The Prime Minister has not even called in the provincial premiers; he has not even consulted or invited other federal party leaders for private discussions. No doubt his supporters will point to the Pepin-Robarts commission as a non-partisan response to this crisis. I do not object to that commission, indeed I wish it well, but our problems will be solved, if they are solved at all, as the Prime Minister himself has said, by the elected representatives of the people. The commission may be helpful, but it is far short of an indication that the Government of Canada is putting the interests of the country ahead of its own partisan electoral interests.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Stanfield: There is one area in which we have had bi-partisanship or, more accurately, multi-partisanship, that is, bilingualism. We have had multi-partisanship toward institutional bilingualism not because the government sought it but because the leadership in the opposition parties supported institutional bilingualism. I supported it because I considered it to be in the national interest, as well, frankly, as in the long term interests of my own party, but it was and is an unpopular policy in a large portion of this country, in the west, through much of Ontario and through much of the Atlantic provinces. In my own province of Nova Scotia public opinion was heavily opposed to that policy as it was perceived by the people.

Those of us who supported and continue to support bilingualism do not expect any medals, but it was not easy for many members of my party to vote for a measure that their constituents thoroughly disapproved of as they perceived it. It was particularly difficult for members from the west, for reasons that the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Murta) indicated very

clearly last evening. It was difficult for many members, but who was it who tried to induce as many members as possible to vote against the Official Languages Act? Who was it who arranged by stealth to have the necessary number of members call for a recorded vote in order to put the greatest possible constituency pressure on members? Who was it? It was the hon. member for Crowfoot (Mr. Horner).

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Stanfield: And that is only part of the story. To find Canadians whose conception of Canada differs more from the Prime Minister's than that of the hon. member for Crowfoot you would have to look pretty hard.

Yesterday the Prime Minister emphasized the need for accommodations. A few weeks before his government launched its charter on language rights, about which the minister will probably be speaking in a few minutes, the Prime Minister made a deal with the hon. member for Crowfoot. Is this what the Prime Minister means by accommodation? The Prime Minister has betrayed those who supported him at no small cost to themselves in putting in place and trying to gain acceptance for the central theme of his conception of Canada.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Stanfield: I do not know of any act of comparable cynicism committed by any prime minister of this country. Machiavelli would be proud of him. What hypocrisy! But the cynicism and the hypocrisy of the Prime Minister do not weaken in any way my support, nor the support of my leader, which is more important, for language equality in Canada. Bilingualism is generous in spirit and essentially necessary to our country.

Miss Bégin: That is not what Joe said yesterday.

Mr. Stanfield: That is exactly what Joe said yesterday.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Grafftey: And you know it, Monique.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Stanfield: Do not get too excited over there; there is more to come. Be patient.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Order, please. The hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Stanfield) has the floor. Will he please address the Chair?

Mr. Stanfield: I say that a policy of bilingualim is essential to the country.

A policy of quasi-unilingualism—English across the country with French permitted in Quebec and perhaps around the national capital—would not work, quite apart from any concept of justice in the country. It would be resented, of course, by the Francophones. Needless to say, unilingual French in any part of the country would be resented by the Anglophones.

Having said that, one must recognize and state—as the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Clark) did yesterday and we would be wise to recognize it—that bilingualism does have its divisive aspects. For the English speaking minority in Quebec and for the French speaking minority in other provinces, bilingualism has a very strong positive appeal if it carries conviction—I do not know how much conviction the government's appeal carries today. It is their best assurance of something like equality of language.

An hon. Member: You sound bitter.

Mr. Stanfield: I am bitter because of the mess in which I find my country to be.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Grafftey: He sacked you; aren't you bitter?

Mr. Stanfield: I only have a few minutes left.

I believe that institutional bilingualism is necessary in Canada, and I think that should be reasonably clear by now. But it is folly to believe that bilingualism by itself or in itself will unify this country. I believe that millions of Canadians, including a good many in Quebec, accept it grudgingly at best. It would be of no service to Canada to pretend otherwise. I believe that Canadians should be encouraged to learn both French and English. I believe we should make that far easier than we have in the past.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Stanfield: I would like to see both English speaking and French speaking minorities in Canada able to go to school, to be taught, in their own language.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Stanfield: Minority language rights are a worthy goal for Canada and for Canadians, but language rights—and it is equally important to be realistic—if we can achieve them, and I hope we can, will not unite us. Language differences will continue to cause tension.

I hope that we in Canada can overcome the feelings of intolerence and insecurity that are so often associated with language differences, but if we are wise we will not try to build national unity on language differences. I think that this is a fundamental error of the Prime Minister. Language differences are a cause of stress and strain, not cohesion. Certainly they are too a source of enrichment, but why pretend they are a source of unity? Certainly the language of English and French speaking minorities should be respected, both in terms of decency and for the future of our country, but we will have a far better chance of achieving unity if we recognize the stress and strain and look elsewhere for our national cohesion.

● (1740)

I disagree with those who oppose bilingualism, and I will continue as long as I live to fight people who oppose bilingual-

ism in Canada. We are a bilingual country, and recognition of this truth is essential to our survival as a country, but bilingualism will not by itself unite Canada. The government tragically under-estimated the difficulty of persuading Canadians across the country to accept bilingualism, and now the government seems, unfortunately, to be making bilingualism the heart of its program of national unity.

Mr. Sharp: Who said that?

Mr. Stanfield: I listened to the Prime Minister yesterday. I read the charter and listened to the Secretary of State (Mr. Roberts). I distinguish between the government's political strategy and its unification strategy. Its political strategy, outside Quebec, is very simple; it is Rene Levesque. The Prime Minister and the Minister without Portfolio will not be running in Alberta on language policy. They will be running against Rene Levesque; that is very simple. The government's unification policy seems to be bilingualism. Admittedly, it throws in some other things like regional equality and equality of opportunities, but with the regional disparity and the unemployment we have today nobody takes the government very seriously in those areas.

The government seems to be putting all its marbles on bilingualism, and that is not good enough. Canada is English-speaking and French-speaking, but it is much more. We must accept Canada's duality, and cheerfully, but we must accentuate the "much more", not by having a phony war on poverty, a phony quest for a just society, or a phony war against controls one time and a phony crusade for controls another time, and not by cynical deals which compromise the government's principles and its integrity. Let us start with a little simple honesty. We need goals which are both realistic and challenging, goals which recognize our right to differ and which recognize our right to be different but goals that sublimate our differences. That is our challenge. And I thank the House for listening to me.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. John Roberts (Secretary of State): Mr. Speaker, I have followed the debate so far with great interest and some dismay. There have been many moving, eloquent, and challenging speeches. I am going to confine my remarks to the speeches made by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Clark) and by the hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby (Mr. Broadbent), even though there have been other speeches which deserve response. I am going to do that because, to my surprise, the debate has revelaed much greater divergences among the party leaders as to the approaches which should be taken in relation to this major issue of national unity than I thought was the case before the debate began.

It is clear that we are now embarked as a society on the process of a fundamental re-examination of our governmental structures. I am going to give some warnings and state some reservations, not about undertaking that process but about some of the dangers in that process.

At the outset I want to associate myself with the comments made by the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) yesterday when he said that he, and indeed the Liberal party, do not stand for the status quo. Far from it; on several occasions we have indicated that we are committed to considering, together with the people of Canada, the possibility of basic changes in the direction of the country, in our federal institutions and in our constitution. I support that.

I hope that the comments I make will not be interpreted as an indication that that open approach is undesirable, but I want to express hesitations I have about the expectations which may be aroused in that process. The first reservation has to do with the idea of decentralization, which has become "a buzz word" or a magic wand, described by many people as an approach which will almost automatically resolve the difficulties which are facing our Confederation.

The Leader of the Opposition yesterday made himself the exponent of the view that decentralization of jurisdiction and administration is the proper response to the problems we now face. I think the hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby gave the proper reply to that suggestion. In Canada we already have one of the most decentralized federations in the world, and in the last 15 years it has become much more so. Yet it is hard to say that in the process of decentralization we have abated the forces which have a tendency to divide this country. It is difficult to believe that further moves in this direction will automatically result in a resolution of the tensions within our society and that they will keep it together.

It is interesting to reflect on the analysis Mr. Parizeau, the minister of finance of Quebec, made when describing what led him to become a separatist. Mr. Parizeau said that the basis for his decision was his belief that Canada has already become so decentralized by way of giving powers to the provinces that it will be unable to maintain itself effectively as a single society and as a single economy, and that therefore he had to go whole hog and embrace the separatism philosophy in order to use the state to achieve desirable public goals. I believe he is wrong, but I think the reasoning which led him to adopt his decision—decentralization of federal powers having gone too far—is something which should be a warning to those who believe that the resolution of our problems could be found axiomatically in a further decentralization of federal power. That is not to say that we should not discuss decentralization. We should look at powers in terms of functional needs and decide which are most appropriate to which level of government. However, it would be a tragic mistake to believe that decentralization itself is a magic wand which will resolve our problems.

I believe that the same is true of constitutional change. There are those who embrace the idea of almost any kind of constitutional change as a means of resolving our difficulties. The fact is that twice in the past 15 years we have embraced constitutional change. We have tried that direction.

Yesterday the Leader of the Opposition objected to the federal government's "buying into" provincial areas of jurisdiction. He must know that at the Victoria Conference the

federal government suggested that the federal spending power be limited. Twice in the past 15 years we have not succeeded in finding a solution through constitutional negotiations. If we have not been able to succeed in 15 years of negotiations with provincial governments, which at least accepted the idea of the maintenance of Canada as one country, what basis for optimism do we have that we can successfully undertake negotiations now when we have as one important factor on the other side, the government of Quebec, which refuses even to accept the idea of the maintenance of Canada as a fundamental basis for negotiation? In the words of my namesake and friend—sometimes it is confusing—the hon. John Robarts, "it takes two to make a deal," two to negotiate, and unless we have at least the common understanding that we are seeking to preserve some entity called Canada, negotiations cannot possibly lead to a successful resolution.

Mr. Paproski: You don't want to negotiate.

Mr. Malone: You can't negotiate with a gun.

Mr. Roberts: It is certainly worth discussing different approaches or different views at the provincial level or with the people of Canada. Perhaps we can agree on precise grounds for negotiation, but negotiations should not be undertaken simply for their own sake. They should be undertaken when there are reasonably optimistic grounds to think that those negotiations could lead to success.

It would be a tragedy if these buzz words or magic wands, as I have called them, were taken for complete reality; it would be a tragedy if they persuade us that if we simply undertake constitutional negotiations, or a re-thinking of powers, or a different management of economic policy, our problems would be resolved. That would lead us away from the main question which confronts us; it would be a tragedy to believe we can escape confronting the present "moment of truth".

● (1750)

As the Prime Minister said yesterday, we have, as a society and as a country, arrived at the moment of truth. It is not, as the Leader of the New Democratic Party said, a moment of truth in which the Prime Minister claims that Quebecers must decide between being Quebecers and Canadians. That is a complete distortion of the moment of truth. The question that Quebecers face is whether they wish to be Quebecers within Canada or Quebecers without Canada.

There is a moment of truth, too, for English-speaking Canadians, which calls upon them to decide what kind of Canada they wish to create, what idea of the country they have for the future.

It is not simply a question of leadership. Yesterday the Leader of the New Democratic Party asked why have we abandoned leaderhip in the province of Quebec? Why let René Lévesque take the action? Why have we not been saying that French should be the language of work in the province of Quebec? Why have we not been doing the same things to indicate our support for strengthening the Francophone culture and language in Quebec? Mr. Speaker, where has the hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby been? We have been saying those things. The Prime Minister has been saying them. He showed leadership in Quebec before he entered this House. He showed it as Prime Minister in the speech he gave in Quebec City after the election of November 15, and in the speech he gave to the United States Congress. Do hon. members opposite think the Prime Minister has not provided leadership, that the public does not see that leadership in view of the place we stand in the opinion polls of this country? As a Ukrainian friend of mine used to say, "It is a nonsense."

Mr. Hnatyshyn: I do not think you have any Ukrainian friends.

Mr. Roberts: Mr. Speaker, I have a Ukrainian friend sitting right beside the hon. member.

Mr. Paproski: Not if you keep on like that.

Mr. Roberts: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the jibes of hon. members. Seriously, however, I think we have arrived at the point where there is a fundamental divergence of opinion between political parties, and I think that is important.

The question is: what is our idea of this country we are trying to build? I said earlier that I approached the debate with some sense of dismay. A large part of that stems from the remarks made yesterday by the Leader of the Opposition. I would have thought that those remarks might be the result of some imprecision or carelessness of language in debate, but he restated them quite clearly last night on television.

His remarks, reported at page 7319 of *Hansard*, reveal an idea of this country at variance with the idea of Canada that we, as a government, hold for our country. It is clear that he regards bilingualism, or official languages, not as something which unites this country but as something which divides it; not as something that is valuable and to be welcomed, but something that is grudging—

An hon. Member: That is true.

Mr. Roberts: The hon. member says that is true. I hope it is not, and I trust that I am not misstating the comments of the Leader of the Opposition. He regards it not as something which draws us together but something which drives us apart. He feels that unity in our country is despite bilingualism, and is not based upon it.

That is a fundamental divergence from the approach we take on this side of the House. We do not regard two official languages as something to be accepted grudgingly. We do not believe it is divisive. The Leader of the Opposition said that two official languages, by definition, divide us. I suppose you could say the fact that there are two sexes, by definition, does not unite. Yet in fact those divisions are the basis of solidly uniting a family unit. So it is with two official languages. It is our view that the existence of two official languages is a keystone to our society—not one that we are reluctant about, not one that is regrettable or a source of division but some-

thing that we welcome and embrace. It is at the heart of our idea of Canada.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Roberts: There are, of course, many other elements of national unity and we have talked about them in this debate. I am not suggesting that bilingualism is the sole pillar of unity in this country. It is essential to the fabric of this country and to the survival of this country that Canadians accept it as a strand that is to be welcomed and appreciated, not something to be scathingly diminished as the Leader of the Opposition did yesterday. He reminds me of a man who stumbles over opportunity, picks himself up, dusts himself off, and races away from that opportunity. Two official languages give opportunity to this country and instead of slighting it we should support it, welcome it, and make it the idea of the country we are trying to build for ourselves, our children, and our children's children.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Roberts: If the hon. gentleman wishes to maintain that idea of Canada he expressed in debate yesterday, it illustrates the fundamental division between this side of the House and that side,—a division on which at one stage the people of this country will have to pronounce.

I should like to refer to the consequent comments of the hon. gentleman. Speaking of the situation in Quebec, as reported at page 7320 of *Hansard* he said:

> If they have doubts about the future of their language and their culture within the boundaries of their province, they do know that their National Assembly, which represents a population more than 80 percent French-speaking, will always be much more conscious and more capable to act to preserve the French language and culture than any other legislature, including the parliament of Canada.

That is also a fundamental divergence from the position taken on this side of the House. It is our argument to French-speaking Quebecers that the maintenance of Canada, of a federation, which contains two official languages, is a better and safer means of protecting the language and culture about which they care than if Quebec separated and became isolated from the other contingent parts of Canada.

It is an overriding objective of our policy to ensure that there is a context for the survival and flourishing of the French language within the province of Quebec and outside it. That is an essential preoccupation of this government, and we do not believe it can be safely left to a provincial government alone.

I want to say to the hon. gentleman that the argument he presented is the argument the separatists presented in the province of Quebec—that the legislature of Quebec and the government of Quebec are a better safeguard for what they care about than the maintenance of the federal system. If the hon. gentleman believes that—I hope he does not, but that is what he said—that, too, is something upon which the country will soon have to pronounce. I say that seriously because—and I think also of the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Stanfield)—it seems to me that the Conservative party has now brought forward an idea of Canada in their approach to official languages and what they wish this country to be, that I for one cannot possibly accept. I think that is of fundamental importance.

I do not want to conclude without referring to the speech of the Leader of the New Democratic Party. The major part of his speech was interesting but I do not have time to discuss it all. I want to refer to his closing remarks, however, because there too I find a rejection of the idea of Canada that we are trying to build on this side of the House—a clear rejection which I think is of extraordinary importance. In the last paragraph of his speech, reported at page 7325 of *Hansard*, he said:

> What I think is really required in our country, more than anything else, is a leadership which says to the people of Quebec and to ordinary Canadians outside the province that there are, in fact, two great cultures. I say that to the Prime Minister who tries to pretend that somehow it is simply a multicultural society. It is multicultural, but he knows as well as I do that there is a predominant Francophone culture established as a society in the province of Quebec, and there is the English community outside of it.

I say to him that his idea of Canada which is that there is one country, two languages and two cultures, is fundamentally in opposition to the idea this government has developed. What we stand for is one country, two languages, and a plurality of cultures.

● (1800)

Mr. Paproski: At election time.

Mr. Roberts: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. gentleman wants to fight an election on that issue I, for one, am prepared to enter the lists; and because of my personal friendship with the hon. member I should like to see him return after the election, but there would not be many beside him on the benches opposite.

Mr. Paproski: I meant you only talk about other cultures at election time.

Mr. Roberts: I say to the hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby—I am sorry he is not here, but I am sure the party's former leader will convey my words to him—that he should be precise and know what those words of his mean. I hope he is not saying he espouses a bicultural country. Our diversity of cultural heritages is not something to be fobbed off, but something to be supported, something which should thrive, for it is an essential, integral part of what we are trying to build.

An hon. Member: Only at election time.

Mr. Roberts: Let me also say, because I do not have much more time, that the situation of—

[*Translation*]

. . . Francophones outside Quebec and that minority is very important. That is the core of the policy we are following. That is not something to publish or use during partisan debates. We are really concerned about creating a situation whereby these groups will be able to preserve their culture so that it may survive and flourish outside and inside Quebec as well.

National Unity

[*English*]

We have a marvellous opportunity in this country. People outside this country look in wonder and amazement at a country which has so much in human and physical resources, and a long tradition in history and culture, but which is at the point of trying to decide whether it can continue as one country, whether it can survive. In one sense I suspect the election of November 15 was useful, for it made us much more conscious of what it is we are proud of in this country and what we are trying to create. We are reflecting in the present debate on this idea of one country. That idea of our country for us is one of two languages, two languages at the heart of that country, as a keystone for what we are doing. They should not be accepted as an unfortunate necessity and a temporary phenomenon, but as something as the heart of two countries—one country and two languages—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Paproski: Two countries, that is right. You said it, John.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Order, please.

Mr. Roberts: I did not mean that. I corrected myself immediately. We have one country, at the heart of which are two languages but many cultures.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Order, please. The hon. member's time has expired.

Mr. Malone: So, you believe in two countries.

Mr. Roberts: We believe in one country in which there are two languages and many cultures—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Order, please.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Adrien Lambert (Bellechasse): Mr. Speaker, that is for me a serious duty to take part in the debate on the motion put forward by the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau), which reads as follows:

> That members of this House dedicate themselves anew to the continuing unity of Canada as a free and independent country organized on the basis of a federal form of government with two official languages and a diversity of cultures.

Mr. Speaker, in a few words, that motion sums up the whole history of our country, Canada, which was founded on the recognition of equal rights for two official languages, French and English, and of various cultures. The constitutional debate did not arise overnight, it is not likely to end tomorrow; however, during the last few years, a certain consciousness appeared and expressed itself in a real constitutional activity. This debate on Canadian harmony, by its nature, will show the need for Canadians like me to conceive a new constitution in order to replace the existing one which is essentially a deal reached between two nations that founded our country.

Since 1760, Canada has experienced many constitutional changes. The first regular constitution, born of the British system, was the royal proclamation of October 7, 1763, effective August 10, 1764. It is at that time that New France was officially named the province of Quebec, but its territory was broken up later and King George III submitted the people to English law and abolished French law. In 1774, the Statute of Quebec recognized the French fact and re-established the French civil law, but the province was administered by London. Still the Statute of Quebec may be considered as the great charter of Canadian freedoms. Therefore, it is important that Canadians of 1977 be aware of the detailed events which have developed and which constitute the history of our country.

This constitution of 1774 raised the dissatisfaction of the English element, just as in 1977 there are some who challenge the reality of equal rights for the French-speaking and English-speaking people even if the number of citizens of either language is not equal. No wonder then that in 1977 many Canadians of either tongue want a new constitution, which would be better suited to the present time, because for the last 300 years our country has had several forms of constitution, but that did not check its growth and the fact that it has become an important nation whose reputation is well known at the international level.

In 1791, the new constitution had the effect of dividing the province of Quebec in two distinct governments, one for Higher Canada now known as the province of Ontario and the other, Lower Canada, that became the province of Quebec. Thus, this new constitution recognized the political existence by giving the colony a separatist constitution set up under the model of the British constitution of that time, and this constitution created the first legislative assembly. That was the beginning of our constitutional struggles.

In 1837, Canada was the scene of the patriots' uprising, which resulted in the Union Act of 1840. Later on, the delegates of both Upper and Lower Canada, together with those from New Brunswick and Nova Soctia, took part in a conference in London which began in December 1866, and it is during this conference that a new constitution was adopted and received royal assent on July 1, 1867, a document which is known as the British North America Act. Then was born the federal government as we know it today. That is why we have every reason to say that the federal government was born from the will of the provinces and that it must still be subjected to the provinces and not become their master.

During the debate which took place before the adoption of the final constitution, two opposite approaches of the Canadian state had collided. Some, with Macdonald, were in favour of a single state in what they called at the time the legislative union of the provinces. Others, with Cartier and the French-Canadian delegates, were seeking a federal system which left a wide margin for self-government by the provinces. That formula was finally adopted, and it was recognized that French

Canadians would never have agreed to join Confederation if it had not guaranteed the legal existence of the French element in Canada. Thus, section 92(13) confirmed the existence of separate civil law in Quebec, and section 94 gave the federal Parliament authority to make provision for the uniformity of all laws in Ontario, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia all the while it being forbidden to change the Civil Code of Quebec adopted in 1866. That is why we can say with reason that Quebec is not a province like the others. Which does not mean that it is in any way worse than the others for all that. No, Quebec is not a province like the others, and the Fathers of Confederation were the first to say so. It was confirmed by the constitutional act of 1867 and it has been thus for 110 years. One Prime Minister of Canada alone spoke one unfortunate phrase, and he lived to regret it because it gave rise to much controversy in Quebec. Indeed, the right hon. Louis St. Laurent one day said that Quebec was a province like the others, which does not reflect the truth of the matter.

In 1977, the constitution no longer meets adequately the needs of either Anglophones or Francophones. More than ever before throughout Canada, there is talk of the need for a new constitution if Canadian unity is to be preserved. The problem does not exist only since the November 15 elections; it is not only since then that Quebecers in particular are not satisfied with the interpretation and application of the constitution by the federal government. Under Mr. Duplessis' government, Quebec fought against the centralization of the governments in Ottawa, and Mr. Duplessis insisted on their giving the provinces more autonomy. Remember the alliance between Mr. Duplessis and Premier Hepburn of Ontario to check the centralization of the then Liberal government. The struggle continued under Mr. Jean Lesage, the Quebec premier. He was the one who first used the expression "State of Quebec". Daniel Johnson went one step further and spoke of equality or independence. His reasoning was very logical. Bertrand, who succeeded him, continued in the same vein. Robert Bourassa, the Liberal premier of Quebec, even while Ottawa had a Liberal Prime Minister, could not get along with it where the constitution was concerned. Since 1867, the federal government has centralized the power and allowed French Canadians to be the victims of many injustices.

An English Canadian, named Gordon Robertson, recalled some of these injustices when speaking before the graduates of Dalhousie University in May 1977, and I quote:

> His thesis is clear: "For more than a century, both at the provincial level, except for Quebec, and at the national level, our history is the denial of the very principle of the coexistence on an equal footing—or even simply of the coexistence—of both cultural communities."
>
> Here are the facts:

He recalls a few facts, and I quote:

> In 1885, Louis Riel was hanged because he attempted to defend the interest of French-speaking Metis in the west.
>
> In 1890, Manitoba failed completely to consider the rights of the French language and made English the sole language in its legislative assembly, in its statutes and in its courts.

Of course, such measures are unacceptable, whether they originate from French or English-speaking people. What is right, is right! What is wrong is wrong! One has to recognize it. I continue that quotation:

> In 1891, the clauses of the law regarding the French language were repealed in the Northwest Territories.
>
> In 1905, the newly formed provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan denied any rights to the French language on their soil.
>
> In 1913, Ontario passed regulation 17 which forbade the teaching of French in its schools.

And Mr. Robertson ended by the following remark which I quote:

> Sweeping aside as an illusion the argument regarding the standard of living used by so many Liberals, Mr. Robertson predicts that lest the Anglophones start doing away with their pettiness, their lack of understanding and their hostility "the French Canadians will sooner or later rather take the chance of impoverishment in order to recover their dignity. A proud people cannot be bought".

● (1810)

If such were the comments of a Francophone, one could say that they came from someone who likes beefing, and does it all the time. But these were the comments made by an Anglophone who observed the situation, who knows that everything derives from history and simply intends to warn us against the situation we are presently experiencing in Canada. What is the use of talking about national unity when one knows full well that the federal government finds it to its advantage to keep the opinion of the provinces divided in order to keep running the show. This difference of opinion has been evident for quite some time. We find division everywhere. The provinces still feel dissatisfied after every conference. No one can or wants to agree. It has now been 50 years since the federal government and the provinces have been talking about patriating the constitution, but we have never succeeded in putting forth a formula for an amendment on which everybody could agree.

So long as we will not decide to deal seriously and in depth with a revision of the power sharing formula, it will be useless to expect to get a new constitution. We cannot expect to unify a country while there still are serious regional disparities and thousands of workers unemployed. Mr. Speaker, I will take the liberty to quote a few sentences which were pronounced in Toronto last March 21 by the Chairman of Royal Bank of Canada who said:

> . . . the problem of Canadian unity which confronts us today (and which may very well destroy our country if we do not settle it) has its origin in the type of federal system which we have adopted.

And he added:

> . . . it is not the time to replaster but rather to rebuild, a task which is inevitably linked to the constitutional reform, . . . and in the review of our constitution we would be better off to study a system which would ensure better consultation mechanisms between the provinces and the federal government . . . as the series of federal-provincial conferences which we have had so far seem to have turned into avenues of confrontation, contestation and political publicity.

Incidentally, we have had 27 federal-provincial conferences on that subject since 1963 but we have not moved one single step forward.

We were told a few weeks ago that personalities would tour the country lecturing on national unity. I would invite them to visit our constituencies and address our former textile, cloth-

ing, furniture or shoe industry workers. Let them speak at leisure to them. They will be listened to with such attention, but let them also listen afterwards. Those workers will repeat what they are telling us. The federal government is not discharging its responsibilities, it is letting in imports to compete with our own production, workers are laid off and plants are closing down.

They will tell them for instance that in January 1977, 68 per cent of the Canadian shoe market was occupied by imports. So let us stop dreaming in colour and let us tackle the real causes. Canadian harmony is a very laudable goal to everyone, but under the current constitution, it is sheer utopia. As long as our provinces do not have enough revenues to cope with their responsibilities to the people, there can be no Canadian harmony.

I had an opportunity to follow through as an observer one fiscal federal-provincial conference. Provinces were requiring a larger part of the fiscal basis, but the federal government refused to transfer any more tax revenues because it did not have enough for itself. So the conference ended without solving the problem. In January 1966, at a federal-provincial conference of welfare ministers in Ottawa, Quebec requested no less than the transfer of family allowances, old age security pensions and manpower centres.

At the 1968 federal-provincial conference, Premier Daniel Johnson stated: "The government of Quebec insists on regaining full responsibility for social security for two main reasons. First, the coexistence of two governments in that area hinders efficient social security planning, allows for contradictory programs and leads to administrative duplication and waste. Then because social security measures on the whole affect the nation fundamentally as a society."

The most serious and sound suggestions that were made yesterday by my colleague, the hon. member for Shefford (Mr. Rondeau), should serve as a basis for the drawing up of a new constitution. For my part, I would recommend that the provinces equip themselves with a mechanism having the authority required to call a real summit meeting which would be attended by representatives from all the provinces, the federal government, community organizations, social and cultural organizations, industry, business and finance. Then, the provinces could meet again to draw up a new constitution incorporating the suggestions and recommendations made at the previous meeting. Such a new constitution should spell out as clearly as possible the actual role of the federal and provincial governments. I am convinced that this procedure would afford greater satisfaction and would generate a genuine harmony in this country.

In 1970 a joint committee of the Senate and the House of Commons was set up to look into the whole constitutional problem. It submitted a report on March 16, 1972, and each and everyone of us as well as the government would find it profitable to take a second look at it and draw our inspiration from it because the report does contain rather commendable suggestions. However, Mr. Speaker, if we really go to the bottom of things, we will find that the main cause of the lack of understanding between the provinces and the federal government is mainly and above all of a monetary nature.

As long as the federal government will engage in loansharking with the provinces, which means that they have to pay back $5.00 for each dollar they borrowed, it will not be possible to live in harmony. It is not right that a government should lend money to another government for profit; it should be first and foremost to provide services for the people.

If the legislative, executive and judicial branches of any sovereign government are the powers that be there is another source of power which supersedes governments themselves. This super power which does not proceed from any constitution and which is exercised under no specific conditions or requirements is the monetary power. As monetary matters come under federal jurisdiction, if the federal government were to fulfill all its responsibilities in this area by making this financial system available to governments and to the people, it would largely contribute to the settlement of the constitutional problem.

● (1820)

[*English*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Order. I regret to interrupt the hon. member but the time allotted to him has expired.

Mr. Maurice A. Dionne (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, I am somewhat dismayed at the bitterness of the attack by the opposition on the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau). One would be forgiven for concluding that members opposite wanted this debate as an occasion on which to attack and seek to destroy the Prime Minister. That attack will not work. I will not deal with the specific statements which have been made because my hon. friend, the Secretary of State (Mr. Roberts), has dealt with them very effectively.

There was one charge made in the House this afternoon which I believe should not go unanswered. I refer to the attack upon the hon. member for Crowfoot (Mr. Horner) by the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Stanfield). I would point out, Mr. Speaker, that on May 27, 1969, in the vote on Bill C-120, "an Act respecting the Status of the Official Languages of Canada," there were 17 members of the Conservative party who voted against that bill, and that at that time the party opposite was led by the hon. member for Halifax. Ten of those members who voted against Bill C-120 are still members of the Conservative caucus today.

Some hon. Members: Oh!

Mr. Dionne (Northumberland-Miramichi): Mr. Speaker, none of us has ever made any personal attack on members over there for the way they voted on any bill.

I am participating in this debate today in order to express some thoughts on the question of national unity from the point of view of a representative from New Brunswick, to try to state what Confederation means to us. First, it means a guarantee of our provincial identity. New Brunswickers, and indeed all

Canadians with roots in Atlantic Canada, are a strong-willed people, fuelled by a quiet pride in their cultural heritage and regional distinctiveness. We cherish a unique heritage upon which our province has been built. It is a three-fold heritage. There is the Acadian heritage, the loyalist heritage, and the Irish heritage. From these backgrounds our province derives a flavour which we cherish and defend, and it is in the defence of this provincial identity that we have consistently rejected a wider maritime union. It is also the reason we embrace Confederation, for we are confident that this Confederation with nine other provinces guarantees our right to be different and singular; it guarantees our distinct regional identity.

Second, it means a firm commitment to social reform. Throughout Confederation, Canada has built a concern for the needs and well-being of all its people and has grown strong on the basis of four commitments from the federal government, commitments which are shared by every provincial government in this country, or, at least, by every provincial government save one. They are: to do everything possible to avoid another great depression; to establish a system of social security and other support programs which will minimize the privations of family rearing, of old age, of unemployment, of sickness, and of crop failure; to create a society of greater opportunity culturally, linguistically, economically, and educationally; and to strengthen the federation of Canada and the economy of each region by a fair distribution of the wealth of our country in order that all our people will be able to maintain a basic standard of living—the standard to which they have become accustomed through good fortune, good government, and good personal and collective effort.

Confederation is based on a willingness to share a political process of cooling and reconciliation, of working out regional differences through sensible compromise rather than through senseless confrontation and violence.

What would separation by the province of Quebec mean to us, Mr. Speaker? It would mean the loss of the idea of the rich provinces helping the poor. It would create a new era of provincial selfishness and isolation. It would mean the loss of a large number of regional-development-minded members of parliament from Quebec, and thus a weaker voice for economic development in the less wealthy areas of our country. In addition we would lose our relatively easy and inexpensive access to central Canadian markets with a resulting rise in the cost of our food, clothing, and manufactured goods. Restricted accessibility to central Canadian markets would also hinder the sale of our processed foods and of our pulp and paper exports.

● (1830)

Another result is that subsidies for imported oil would probably be discontinued, resulting in increased annual energy costs of approximately $450 for every man, woman and child in the Atlantic region. This would result not only in higher fuel bills for home heating and travel but, even worse, a much slower rate of industrial development where such development is most urgently needed. Coupled with the loss of federal aid, even in part, the result would be a severe economic crisis. In such a crisis we would probably be forced into a union with all the Atlantic provinces, or into becoming part of the state of Maine. Our provincial heritage and identity would thus be subject to the melting pot of maritime union or of American homogeneity.

So how should we look upon Quebec, Mr. Speaker? Separatist tendencies are not a new phenomenon, nor are they restricted to Quebec. Indeed, in New Brunswick our legislature was clamouring for separation from Canada even before the ink had dried on the British North America Act. Separatist tendencies do rear their ugly heads in various regions throughout Canada but are held in check by the belief of each region that its existence and identity are secure.

This sense of security does not exist to the same extent in the province of Quebec. As a predominantly rural society, Quebec probably could remain isolated and develop independently; but with the change to an industrialized society which began after the war and became greatly accelerated during the sixties, Quebec has been forced to defend its identity against the larger North American English society which dominates business and industry.

Thus, Quebec needs new guarantees for the continued existence of its Quebecois culture. Support for Confederation by Quebecers must be based on the ability of the federal government and the Canadian people adequately to guarantee their continuation. We need, on the one hand, a constitutional revision and, on the other, a new tolerance by all Canadians. We must show the people of Quebec that we will guarantee their identity, and we must give them concrete proof by our actions. If we cannot convince them of our sincerity they will be forced into the arms of the racism now being advocated by René Lévesque.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to turn my attention for a moment to the Acadians. Aside from the indigenous people of Canada, probably no other single group of Canadians has made such a valiant effort to preserve and protect their linguistic and cultural heritage. The fact that the Acadians were able to survive, to reconstruct their lives and to maintain a distinct way of life following the expulsion and dispersion in 1755, is indeed a great tribute to the tenacity and devotion of these people.

It is only in the last generation that a real effort is being made to bring the Acadians into the mainstream of New Brunswick life. The greatest impetus to that drive came from that great Acadian premier of New Brunswick, Senator Louis J. Robichaud. But the separation of Quebec would be very detrimental to Acadians. It would mean the removal of the largest group with the greatest possible interest in bilingualism and the development and enhancement of French Canadian culture. Without the Quebec bulwark, these values would fade. As Bill 1 has made plain, an independent Quebec would offer no such protection to minorities and none to Acadians. Even joining Quebec would mean the loss of the Acadian identity.

There are those, of course, who would advocate a separate Acadian state. Such a state is simply not economically viable.

That part of New Brunswick which is home to the largest group of Acadians is in a state of economic distress and requires continued federal help. Although the idea of a separate Acadian state might make a few purists happy, it would cause a lot of hungry bellies among the workers. Furthermore, there is no guarantee that the rest of New Brunswick would react peacefully to such a proposal. Acadians need a Quebec in Confederation.

Therefore, what can we all do? We can create the national will to maintain Confederation. We must show the separatists that we want Condederation and that we are willing to fight for it. We must create a new social contract by which the rights of every minority and every group are amply protected—a social contract embodying a new constitutional arrangement; a social contract embodying the willingness of each Canadian to respect unselfishly the rights and needs of each other and of each region of our great country; a social contract embodying the goal of social and economic equality for all Canadians; and for us in New Brunswick, a social contract in which we work for the right of Acadians to work, to live, to receive justice, in their own language, and to ensure that they receive a fair share of provincial wealth and opportunities.

In conclusion let us return to the fundamental ideals on which this nation has grown and prospered—the commitment to provincial self-identity and the commitment to social reform. Let us get our youth involved in promoting and protecting these ideals. There is a great reservoir of strength in our youth. René Lévesque has offered Quebecers an equitable society but a racist society. Let us offer Quebec and all of Canada an equitable society and a just one. If we fail to make this fragile Canadian experiment work, we are unworthy of the trust our forefathers have placed in our hands. We are unworthy of the place we have proclaimed for ourselves in the world. We are unworthy of our nation. The future is in our hands. Let us not fail to bear the torch.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

* * *

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I should like to report to the House that we have had some consultations, and in order to provide additional time for this debate tomorrow we have agreed to devote the period from four o'clock until six o'clock to it. I should like to go further and say that I will call it as the first item under government business. If we get to government orders before four o'clock, we would have until six o'clock for the debate; but I should suggest that because we do not know what may intervene tomorrow—there may be a repetition of what happened today—and if we do not get to government orders until 4.15 o'clock or later, I would suggest we sit for at least two hours from that moment, even if it is beyond six o'clock. I want to assure the House that there will be no unhappy moments that we can avoid in any event.

[Mr. Dionne (Northumberland-Miramichi).]

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I want to say that the minister is notably generous on his birthday. In the spirit of that generosity I should like to wish him a happy birthday and say that we concur in the proposal.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, we did have a very pleasant meeting at which we came to this agreement, and we are happy to concur in it.

I join with my hon. friend in extending to the President of the Privy Council (Mr. MacEachen) best wishes on his birthday. I do not wish him many returns of what he has been through on this particular day. However, I do hope his fortieth, forty-first and all his other birthdays, now that he is past the age of 39, will be happy ones.

● (1840)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Caouette (Villeneuve): Mr. Speaker, I am glad to have this opportunity to join with my two colleagues in this discussion, and I might add it is precisely with this kind of debate that we will finally reach a consensus and above all bring about unity among all the parties represented in this House. I should also like to join my two colleagues, in wishing a happy birthday to the President of the Privy Council (Mr. MacEachen). Many happy returns.

[*English*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Is it agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): It is so ordered.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, perhaps one point should have been made clear, that is, that there will be no private members' hour tomorrow afternoon.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Is it agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

* * *

CONFEDERATION

DEBATE ON NATIONAL UNITY

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Trudeau:

That members of this House dedicate themselves anew to the continuing unity of Canada as a free and independent country organized on the basis of a federal form of government with two official languages and a diversity of cultures.

And on the amendment of Mr. Clark (p. 7321)

Mr. Douglas Roche (Edmonton-Strathcona): Mr. Speaker, it is very significant that the Secretary of State (Mr. Roberts) who finished his speech a few moments ago did not attempt to refute the serious charge made in the preceding speech by the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Stanfield) that the Prime

Minister's (Mr. Trudeau) actions on the language issue have been an incomparable act of cynicism, more so than that of any prime minister in the history of our country.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Roche: The hon. member for Halifax told the truth and it cannot be denied.

Yesterday my leader made a magnificent speech on national unity which showed why this country would be so much better united if he were the prime minister.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Roche: Time is short. Alberta wants action, not oratory, on national unity, so I will take only one minute to make four points.

First, Alberta is committed to Confederation. The outflow of dollars from Alberta to Ottawa has averaged $172 per person per year. Our contribution to the well-being of Canada, through staging in oil and gas increases, will soon be measured in the billions of dollars.

Second, Alberta believes that the Prime Minister is blackmailing the Canadian people by insisting once again that languages are at the heart of the national unity problem. Rather, national unity demands a redispersal of power and economic advantage based on the principle of stronger rights for all provinces. We will not accept language problems in Quebec as an excuse for not dealing with Alberta's economic problems.

Third, Alberta supports linguistic fairness, but the application of the Official Languages Act has divided Canadians, and that is why the act should be re-examined. Bill 1 in Quebec, if passed, should be sent to the Supreme Court. Minority rights in every province should be strengthened, including more services for ethnic Canadians.

Fourth, Alberta wants a new national economic policy that recognizes western Canada not only as a region of primary producers but as a major manufacturing complex. We want new transportation and tariff policies that will accelerate development of secondary industry and secure greater markets for Alberta petrochemical and manufacturing exports.

A renegotiated Confederation demands not a public relations task force but fundamental economic and social changes. A stronger Alberta is good for a unified Canada.

Let us stop this lament for a nation and get on with an all party parliamentary committee to draw blueprints for the rebuilding of Canada.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Donald W. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): Mr. Speaker, never has my country been more deeply divided than it is today, more deeply at odds with itself, inside itself. It has been threatened before, but it is deeply divided today. It is threatened today, not because of the government which was elected in Quebec on November 15 last, but because of the policies of this government, its confrontational stances and its rigid centralism. These things had much to do with the separatist vote in the province of Quebec last November. That vote prompted uneasy stirrings, moreover, elsewhere in this land, to which I shall come.

Today in this House we witnessed two events which indicated to me that the policies of the government will continue unchanged and that the government has learned no lessons from the past. Even in the face of the unity crisis the government is concerned only with its perpetuation in office.

The first of these incidents was a statement on motions on a matter which has been before this House for, I would say, four or five months. It was brought to the attention of this House by members of the party which I have the honour to represent. After almost five years of dead silence this statement came in the midst of this debate which, despite what the government House leader said, was not brought on by his initiative but by the initiative of hon. members on this side of the House. We had that interruption because of the outstanding speech made yesterday by the Leader of Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition (Mr. Clark), which captured the imagination of the press. As the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Stanfield) said, one of the "foxes" tried to get into the act today to draw attention away from yesterday's speech. That was the first indication that the government had one interest and one interest alone, namely, its perpetuation in power.

The second incident took place when the government House leader misled the House and was not required to withdraw his remarks. I came into this House with an innate Canadianism, which I hope all of us in this House have. I have studied Canadian history, political philosophy, and political science. I served in the defence of my country when it was threatened. I proudly represented my country abroad, but only up to a point, until I ceased to represent my country abroad. I came into this House thinking that with that background I could represent my constituency well in this forum and believing I could make some contribution to my country. But what do I find? I find this kind of jiggery-pokery, this nonsense of choosing this time in the midst of an important debate to draw attention away from a good speech, for a political end.

While the hon. member for Halifax was speaking, an hon. member opposite had the downright effrontery to say that the hon. member was feeling bitter. Of course he retaliated quickly. The hon. member for Halifax said he was feeling bitter because of the mess this country is in, and I am feeling bitter because of that too. It is very sad that, considering my record in defence of my country and in representing my country, I have cause to be bitter.

● (1850)

I am glad we had no part in drafting the resolution under debate altough I think we had a hand in bringing about the debate. The resolution begins:

> That members of this House dedicate themselves anew to the continuing unity of Canada . . .

Mr. Speaker, I stand here proudly. I defy anyone to require me to dedicate myself anew to the unity of Canada. I have been working for the unity of Canada all my life.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): Surely there is somebody on that side of the House with enough command of the English language to produce something meaningful for us to debate. In the middle of the remarks made by the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) yesterday he had the effrontery to come up with the notion that what we need at this stage is a task force. That is what required us to call for a proper forum in which these matters could be discussed. There has been a down-playing of this parliamentary forum as the proper place in which these matters should be discussed.

I would draw to your attention, Mr. Speaker, that Australia is facing this same problem. Their constitution is not working well and they have established an Australian constitutional convention. An article published in "The Parliamentarian" in April this year, written by the Attorney General of the Commonwealth of Australia, sums up the purposes of the convention. The last paragraph reads:

> The solutions to basic constitutional problems must be political solutions acceptable to the people at large and the open discussion of constitutional issues by politicians from all the major political parties and representing all the regions of the country should contribute much to the removal of difficulties which have bedevilled constitutional reform and Commonwealth state relations in the past.

Just by changing a few expressions in that paragraph we have the justification for the commission recommended in the amendment to this resolution.

I should like to make some more comments but I am not going to stand in the way of others who wish to speak. I urge the government to reconsider its notion of a task force, and to assign to those to whom it belongs the problem of looking into the matters which have brought us to our sorry state—matters which have caused bitterness in many minds because of the confrontations the government has brought forward. I cede the floor, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Gus MacFarlane (Hamilton Mountain): Mr. Speaker, usually it is a great honour and privilege to join in any debate in this House, but at this moment in the history of our country it is very important to say something in a positive way about the unity of the country. I am not going to try to assert any particular reason or right that I might have.

Born of Scottish parents who emigrated to this country, to live in Verdun, Quebec, I, with my family, associated with one of the great founding races of this country. Mr. Speaker, my parents chose to live here; they were not born in this country, although I was fortunate enough to be born here. My parents, of Scottish heritage, decided they wanted to live in this country and bring up their family here. In those early days I remember hardly any discussions, in that province or city, concerning the division of the country, although there was bigotry and unfairness. But it was not directed just at the French or English; it was directed at the Jew, at the so-called hunky, at the black, and at others. I grew up at a time when such bigotry and unfairness were rampant.

Because of my experiences and because of my background, I am not willing to listen to those who say that our different cultures, the cultures of the English and French, our two great founding races, and the cultures of other ethnic groups, are divisive. I am not willing to admit that the acceptance of such diversity of cultures brings about divisiveness in Canadians.

May I call it seven o'clock, Mr. Speaker?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Order, please. It being seven o'clock p.m., pursuant to orders made on Thursday, June 30 and Tuesday, July 5, 1977, this House stands adjourned until tomorrow morning at eleven o'clock.

At 7 p.m. the House adjourned, without question put, pursuant to Special Order.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Thursday, July 7, 1977

The House met at 11 a.m.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

EMPLOYMENT AND IMMIGRATION REORGANIZATION ACT

MEASURE TO ESTABLISH DEPARTMENT OF EMPLOYMENT AND IMMIGRATION, ETC.

The House resumed consideration, from Tuesday, July 5, of the motion of Mr. Cullen that Bill C-27, to establish a Department of Employment and Immigration, the Canada Employment and Immigration Commission and the Canada Employment and Immigration Advisory Council, to amend the Unemployment Insurance Act, 1971, and to amend certain other statutes in consequence thereof, be read the third time and do pass; and the amendment thereto of Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre).

Mr. John Rodriguez (Nickel Belt): Mr. Speaker, when I was on my feet on Tuesday of this week, speaking on the amendment of the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles), to refer the whole question of the qualifying period back to the Standing Committee on Manpower and Immigration, that is, the work period required for people with minor attachment to the labour force to make them eligible for unemployment insurance, I mentioned the fact that after the committee had completed its deliberations I had written to all the premiers and major trade unions across the country. I thought that was the right thing to do for any member of the House who wanted to make some constructive suggestions on any bill at any stage.

When I was speaking last Tuesday, I read into the record the first letter I received, which was from the Premier of New Brunswick, Mr. Richard Hatfield, who, I believe, is a Conservative premier. He wrote a very honest letter, part of which I read into the record. I also read from the brief his views with respect to the report stage of the bill and committee hearings on it. I pointed out that Mr. Hatfield was concerned about the fact that there seems to be no meaningful consultation among the federal and provincial governments with respect to legislation. Mr. Hatfield pointed out that Bill C-27 and the superimposition of 54 regions with respect to unemployment insurance reflected this very dramatically.

The whole point he made was that the government always responds in an ad hoc way to criticism of legislation. The premier was particularly critical of the fact that while the government recognized regionality in the amendment brought in by the minister whereby in three years a qualifying period of 14 weeks will be required before a person will be able to obtain insurance benefits, the opposite seemed to be true, and the premier said that amendment was unacceptable to his province and to his government. He raised the question as to whether the government expects regional disparities to disappear overnight in three years' time. Surely, if the argument for disparity exists now as a result of the inaction of the government, it will exist in three years' time. So why should the government propose the elimination of regionality? I admit that I do not share Mr. Hatfield's political ideology or philosophy, but I certainly appreciate his honesty and the manner in which he responded to an opposition member from this corner of the House. He was co-operative and informed me of the kind of thinking that is going on within his government.

• (1110)

In the committee the United Auto Workers very clearly outlined labour's response to Bill C-27. The message that came through loud and clear from the UAW was that this is not the time for the government to be tampering with the Unemployment Insurance Act, and that the government ought to be going about the business of stimulating the economy and introducing policies which will create employment opportunities. The government should not be blaming victims for their own predicament at this time. The UAW made a very moving appeal in its brief. The brief said, "We want jobs. We want employment opportunities". In a very emotional way, the UAW made the argument that the right to work is as basic to Canadians as the right to education, free speech or organization. I think this government has far too long used the unemployed and unemployment in its fight against inflation. The government has used the unemployed as scapegoats in its effort to remain in power. That is what this debate is about. The government thinks it can get off the horns of this dilemma easily, but I hope the people of Canada will focus on what is taking place in this House.

I hope the people of Canada will realize that unemployment does more to disunite the country that it does to unite it. For the last two days there have been many pious speeches and there has been much rhetoric about loving each other. It has been said that the way to solve our problems is to love each other. Suddenly we are going to have a national love-in, and that is supposed to cure the problem of disunity. The youth of Quebec are experiencing 16 per cent unemployment, while the national youth unemployment rate is 13.8 per cent. That is a great disincentive to unity. When one part of the country has a high youth unemployment rate, that is certainly a disrupting influence and is a cause for disunity.

If the government really wants to put the boots to the separatists, it has to show the young people of this country that there is something to be gained from participating in federalism. Young people should be able to get jobs because of the initiatives of the central government. They should be assured that the central government is strong enough to direct the economy and to satisfy their aspirations and hopes in terms of employment opportunities. The government should be able to satisfy their dreams about material gain. Let us not forget that that is a very strong incentive these days. Hon. members opposite talk about incentive and about giving corporations incentive. When are they going to start talking about giving incentive to young, unemployed people and to the unemployed generally? Unemployed people want jobs so they can earn money to buy things that television tells them they are not complete without. The government should be providing jobs, not fiddling with the Unemployment Insurance Act and trying to tighten up when we are experiencing high unemployment.

In addition, last Tuesday I was discussing some of the serious problems within the country and hoping the government might zero in on those problems. One of our problems is that our country has developed a hinterland economy. I referred to Japanese-Canadian trade relations as a microcosm of the problem that faces Canada. I believe that problem was the reason for the visit of the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) to Japan some months ago. The problem is that 96 per cent of our exports to Japan are raw materials, while 95 per cent of our imports from Japan are finished products, primarily automotive products, cameras and electronic equipment. We have locked ourselves into the position of being producers of raw materials. Our people are hewers of wood and drawers of water. That is as it always has been. We mine raw materials and ship them out either in a semi-processed state or in a raw state. That is the experience in the area from which I come. We export raw materials and we export jobs along with them. We have no infrastructure for research and development. That is all found in the parent company countries. It is not found in Canada.

I am not the only one who is saying this. I am not an economist, and certainly not a corporate elitist, but it is interesting that as every day goes by we have more ammunition. We can pick up any paper or document, whether it be a Manpower publication or a private sector publication, and in those papers and documents we have ample ammunition for this debate on the question of employment in Canada. I would like to refer to an article which appeared in the Toronto *Star* of Monday, July 4, 1977. The article is headed "Lack of science means fewer jobs". This editorial quotes the chairman of the Science Council of Canada as saying:

> Council Chairman Josef Kates says the impetus must come from governments, which account for 40 per cent of Canada's collective spending. And the main thrust must come from Ottawa, because the problem is national.

He was talking about the development of an industrial strategy to develop strong Canadian capabilities in science and technology; in other words, research and development. The article continues:

> The areas in which Canadian know-how is weak, he says, touch every individual: housing, energy, natural resources extraction, communications and electrical transmission. Other areas, such as Arctic and oil sands technology, are ones in which Canadians should excel—and benefit from—but have been left to foreigners to develop and exploit.
>
> The rewards for asserting what Kates calls "technological sovereignty" are many. "The economy will be strengthened, employment will be generated. We will have the capability to solve our own problems and adjust to change and we will strengthen the sense of Canada as a nation."
>
> By failing to accept the challenge, Canada instead has a weak economy, high unemployment and a heavy reliance on outsiders to solve our problems and make our decisions.
>
> Kates echoes the sentiments: "A selective 'buy-Canada' attitude should be reflected in policy formulation to ensure the long-term well-being of firms deemed essential to support technological sovereignty. Most industrialized countries have in place policies which favour indigenous companies over foreign firms."
>
> There is more at risk than the loss of Canadian scientists, managers, entrepreneurs and other essential economic movers to the United States and elsewhere.
>
> What's really at stake is the ability of Canadians to arrange their own economic affairs—and, by extension, their own political and cultural affairs—in a way that's best suited to Canadians rather than as an adaptation of somebody else's brain power.

That was the chairman of the Science Council of Canada speaking on the whole question of the need to develop Canadian technology, research and development. That is the very basis for creating an economy which will expand and provide jobs for the many gifted and talented young people our school systems are producing but who presently stay unemployed. Indeed, they cannot even find the necessary eight weeks of employment to qualify for unemployment insurance benefits. Our amendment proposes that clauses 29 and 30, dealing with the qualifying period, should be referred back to the committee. We said this was a very serious step, moving from the eight-week minor attachment period to a regional rate that ranged from 10 to 14 weeks, depending on the unemployment rate in the 54 regions of Canada. We criticized this step because of the bureaucracy that will be needed. Members of parliament deal with unemployment problems every day and well know how complicated is the act. We can envisage the nightmare when 54 regions are superimposed on the act and the people who administer it have to sort out what the rate is on any given day and consider who has moved into the area, what their last address was, and so on.

● (1120)

Everything is blamed on the computer these days, not on the bureaucrats who put the information into the computer. Just as unemployment is the scapegoat for the inadequacies of this government, so is the computer the "fall guy', for the bureacrats. Even moving to the regional rate, going from the minimum 10 weeks to 14 weeks, depending on the rate of unemployment in a region, will place hardship on many of the unemployed who cannot find eight weeks's work, much less ten.

This matter was brought to our attention by L'Association des Travailleurs de Rivière du Loup who sent a brief to the Standing Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration in which they pointed out that it is not easy for many people to

find work for those extra weeks. In fact, 9,205 people are registered with the local Manpower centre at Rivière du Loup, out of a potential labour force of 33,000. This means 30 per cent of the labour force is actively seeking work. The figures do not include those registered in Manpower training programs or those receiving social welfare assistance, even if they are able to work. They are a minority. Job opportunities in the community are very limited and people cannot even find eight weeks' work, much less the ten weeks that is being proposed.

The question of the importance of work has been discussed in this debate. Some would have us believe that people do not want to work today, that they are work-shy or are not interested in working. I disagree with this view. There has been talk of loss of the work ethic, but I do not believe this has happened at all. It is a fact, however, that the government does not have the ability, the foresight or the will to do things with the economy that would put people to work, so it finds all sorts of excuses for its lack of ability. To reinforce this, I should like to quote from a paper entitled "Jobs and poverty: a report on Canada's working poor", published in June, 1977, where the following passage appears:

Work means more to most people than simply making money. Above and beyond the income it produces, and the things money can buy, work brings self-respect and personal satisfaction and defines a person's position in his community and the wider society. Where and how we work strongly influences most aspects of our lives, from friendships we maintain and places we live, to the way we raise and educate our children. Along with the family, work is a core institution which provides order and meaning to our daily lives.

We see that for many people who are unemployed, and for the poor, work is a very important pastime because it gives them dignity and a sense of belonging in the community. I want to comment, now, on why the government felt it had to tamper with the qualifying period. The minister and his bureaucrats all said it was a disincentive to work.

Mr. Alexander: You said all that before.

Mr. Rodriguez: Mr. Speaker, when we were in committee—

Mr. Hogan: You never seem to get the message.

Mr. Rodriguez: We will give it to you now.

Mr. Alexander: Oh, sit down.

Mr. Rodriguez: The Canadian Labour Congress appeared before the committee and presented a brief. A rather interesting exchange took place between the hon. member for Hamilton West (Mr. Alexander) and Mr. Chafe who represented the congress.

Mr. Alexander: Don't be selective; read it all.

Mr. Rodriguez: I want to quote from the passage which related to the qualifying period, as follows:

MR. ALEXANDER: It has been brought to our attention that as a result of studies, whether or not we are talking about the comprehensive review, the eight-week eligibility period or qualifying period, as the case may be, was a disincentive. It has been pointed out that those who were working were really taking advantage of the act because they could have worked longer but in certain instances they did not, and the commission or the minister, as the case may be, found as well that when the benefits ran out, as a result of being involved with an eight-week eligibility period, it was not too long thereafter that these persons were able to acquire employment. Have you any reply to those, I believe, correct statements made by the minister.

The hon. member for Hamilton West thinks the eight-week minor attachment period is a disincentive to work, but he did not produce any facts to support that view. Mr. Chafe gave him what I consider an appropriate answer when he said:

MR. CHAFE: Well, Mr. Alexander, if I might deal first of all with the popular phrase "disincentives to work", in our view, having looked at most of the material that has been produced in this respect, that the studies we refer to, which were done largely by economists and people in the academic field, are not at all positive about that. In fact, there have been glaring inconsistencies in some of the studies done. One of them, in particular, was done on the basic premise that all unemployment is voluntary in the first place and he went from there to try to reach a conclusion that the new Unemployment Insurance Act of 1971 had a disincentive effect that would increase, I believe, the average unemployment rate by 1.5 per cent. To be quite blunt about it we think these studies that were done in that respect are far removed from reality, that the people who are doing them are largely doing it on a theoretical basis and that they know nothing about the realities of "joblessness".

There have been other indications of similar activity on the periphery of unemployment insurance and nobody, in our estimation, yet, has presented any kind of concrete proof whatsoever that the minor-attachment claimants, under the present act, are the perpetrators of all of the so-called difficulties that seem to be attributed to the operation of the Unemployment Insurance Act. It is a matter of record, with the Unemployment Insurance Commission, that the minor attachment claimants in the system are a minority of the claimants.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Order, please. I regret to interrupt the hon. member, but his allotted time has expired. He may continue with the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Rodriguez: Who said no?

An hon. Member: Everybody said no.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Order, please. The hon. member for Hamilton West (Mr. Alexander) on a point of order.

Mr. Alexander: Mr. Speaker, in light of the fact that the hon. member did not know who said no, and so that there will be no mistake on the record, it was I, the hon. member for Hamilton West, who said "No" to the hon. member for Nickel Belt (Mr. Rodriguez).

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Rodriguez: You should be ashamed of yourself.

● (1130)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Charles-Eugène Dionne (Kamouraska): Mr. Speaker, the amendment which is now being discussed reads as follows:

That the motion be amended by deleting all the words after the word "That", and by substituting therefor the following words:

"Bill C-27 be not now read a third time, but that it be referred back to the Standing Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration for the purpose of reconsidering clause 29 and 30 thereof."

Realizing now that clauses 29 and 30 should be reviewed and amended, I consider this amendment should be supported and I will briefly state why it should be done.

To require that a claimant should have worked at least 12 weeks to be entitled to unemployment benefits is to lay a direct charge against the unemployed, leading us to believe that they are responsible for their own predicament. This new clause to the legislation proposed by the government directly affects the poorer workers since most workers who qualify with a minimum number of insurable weeks of employment are the following: the older workers, the less educated who keep their jobs for a shorter period, because available jobs are often for a short period. Students who do not wish to pursue their education and who, as a first experience, choose to work in the summer, find themselves unqualified for benefits due to this new provision, and so do the workers who pick fruit, vegetables or tobacco in various provinces of Canada.

This provision does not take any account of modern requirements in terms of personnel hiring in private, public or near public enterprises. More and more frequently, a business will need skilled workers for a short period of time. These skilled workers are generally hired for a specific type of work of short duration. The bill under consideration provides an increase from eight to twelve weeks of insurable employment to qualify for benefits. The government and its supporters want to make us believe that the majority of unemployed who qualify with a minimum of eight weeks of insurable employment are chronic unemployed.

It is obvious that with the provisions of this bill and many others, the government intends to make a viable enterprise with an insurance that eliminates factors involving the greatest insurance risks. A social legislation, such as the one which deals with unemployment insurance, should not be administered with the same standards which apply to private enterprise, especially when workers are footing the bill.

Over the first few years after its adoption, the Unemployment Insurance Act was in line with the economic requirements of the period. In spite of occasional tensions, the economy started to recover strongly in the post war period, and over the first few years of operation, the unemployment insurance scheme came out with a surplus. Through its 1971 amendments to the Unemployment Insurance Act, the government has considerably strayed from the basic principles of a truly social legislation, the purpose of which was mainly to redistribute incomes. By setting the eligibility minimum requirements at eight weeks of insurable employment, without taking either regions or type of employment into consideration, the government should have foreseen that the workers of richer areas would pay for workers of not so rich areas where the rate of unemployment is very high, due to seasonal unemployment. Over the past couple of years, however, the government has been compelled to supplement heavily the unemployment insurance fund. As a matter of fact, a high rate of employment and a dramatic reduction in the number of available jobs have considerably increased the deficit of the unemployment insurance fund.

[Mr. Dionne (Kamouraska).]

Seasonal unemployment in some areas of Quebec such as the Lower St. Lawrence and the Gaspe peninsula rose slightly because of the lack of significant investments which could have reduced the unemployment rate by creating new jobs. Each winter, we experience a period of chronic unemployment and there are practically no jobs available for workers. In spite of this fact, the Unemployment Insurance Commission keeps disqualifying claimants who are not actively seeking jobs. This is nonsense, but unfortunately such are the results of this inadequate legislation.

This situation further deteriorated to the extent that in February 1977, there were 932,000 unemployed, according to Statistics Canada, an unemployment rate of 9.1 per cent which is a precedent in Canada since Statistics Canada started to compile data. Unemployment has so increased, both in scope and frequency that it has now become impossible to consider it as a risk in terms of an insurance. The unemployment problem is no longer a probability, but a cyclic and permanent reality. With this in mind, the whole philosophy that prevailed when the unemployment insurance plan was set up should be reconsidered and brought in line with the 1977 new conditions of a recessionary economy.

In adopting Bill C-69 in December, 1975, the government excluded claimants 65 years of age or over and repealed the section dealing with increased rate for breadwinners. Bill C-27 follows the same path in that it aims at disqualifying claimants who have worked 8 to 11 weeks while reducing the benefit period for all categories of workers. The objective of this bill is to save about $275 million, so that all claims can be paid out of the Unemployment Insurance fund without direct government intervention.

However, it is easy to understand that the real cause for unemployment is not the excessively large number of unemployed people who are entitled to benefits, but rather an oversupply of workers in an ailing economy. A jobless worker should not be considered as a lazy man but rather as a victim of present economic fluctuations. So, we must reorganize that sad system, that topsy-turvydom, and enable everyone who is willing to earn a living honourably to offer his services to employers capable of giving them jobs. There are so many things to be done in Canada! Generally, Bill C-27, even amended, clearly represents a step backwards as compared with the present act. Instead of improving it, every decision being taken is such as to make things tougher for the unemployed. That legislation comes at the wrong time since all government studies foresee an increase in unemployment.

Just about all the studies made by civil servants, at top and lower echelons, forecast higher rates of unemployment in coming months and years. So, in view of that, the Minister of Manpower and Immigration (Mr. Cullen), advised by officials of the government, decided to amend the Unemployment Insurance Act and cancel the right of thousands of people to unemployment insurance benefits. To my mind, that is the wrong approach. Allow me to point out, in passing,—yes, I do want to point it out—that doing away with the rule on four consecutive weeks without benefits susceptible of interrupting

the period does improve slightly the present system. That may be the only improvement in the bill, because, as I stressed to the House, it took two years of work, a team of civil servants and another minister to understand at last that this article terminating a benefit period after a four-week non-qualifying period should be modified. Then it was realized that this would adversely affect workers who seek employment or who could accept a job to such an extent that several people in my area called me when they could get a job without knowing how long it would last. I advised them to stop during the third week or else the civil servants of the Unemployment Insurance Commission would terminate their benefit period. The act is so silly that we were sometimes forced to make suggestions so that people would not be deprived of income, not knowing for sure whether they could work three, four or five weeks at a time, when the unemployment rate is high. This qualifying requirement from 10 to 14 weeks of employment is an improvement in comparison with the initial legislation. It is nonetheless a definite step backwards in comparison with the present system which provides for a universal qualifying period of eight weeks of insurable employment.

• (1140)

Precise details will have to be incorporated into the final draft of the legislation such as entitlement conditions of a worker going from a low to a high unemployment area. I remember asking this question at the Standing Committee on Manpower and Immigration and the senior official of the department took a lot of time to answer me. He made quite a phraseology. He spoke for 15 minutes and could not tell what would happen to an unemployed man who would leave Gaspésie with a certain amount of weeks to see his friends or his parents in Toronto and he could not tell whether that man would have a chance to find himself a job. But once there, he is still unemployed. Would he still be eligible for unemployment benefits? Therefore, given the circumstances, it is absolutely essential that this piece of legislation be clarified so that it may be implemented.

What seems particularly alarming in this new way of assessing entitlement to unemployment benefits is the relative nature of statistics. By raising the entitlement conditions, the government eliminates many unemployed, which artificially reduces the unemployment rate, but I insist on the fact that it is only an artificial reduction. The result of this measure will be a longer qualifying period, which will make entitlement to benefits more difficult for people out of work who are not on the Manpower centres records.

A lot of people as well as various groups concerned with this legislative measure have addressed a number of briefs to the Standing Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration, for example groups of lawyers from the legal assistance services in the area of Sherbrooke, Montreal and particularly in the lower St. Lawrence area, from Rivière-du-Loup to the Gaspe peninsula. These people are constantly dealing with problems arising from this unduly complex legislation. Every Monday morning, at the commission's offices in Cabano and Rivière-du-Loup, I meet lawyers from the legal assistance offices in Cabano and Rivière-du-Loup who are there to defend unemployed people caught in a bind, and there are dozens of cases like that regularly. Why? Because we have a legislation which hardly applies at all. Agreed, the Unemployment Insurance Commission has paid out millions of dollars to unemployed people those last few years, there is no question about that, but why? Because there are thousands of unemployed people in Canada. But that is not a reason good enough to try and change the legislation to get rid of part of them, since they will still remain unemployed and have to resort to social assistance because they will have no other source of income. That is not the best way to run the affairs of the country in the interests of the workers in Canada. Most of them are willing to work and try to earn their living honourably. We must provide them with the chance to do so.

I would like to quote from the conclusion of a brief which has been prepared by representatives of the legal commission in my region. It says that finally, the unemployment insurance legislation was at the outset based on the principles of an insurance against a risk, namely the temporary and occasionnal loss of one's job. With the development of the scheme, and more particularly with the extension brought about in the legislation in 1971, the government has changed it into a social legislation for redistributing the income of workers favoured with full employment to workers living in high unemployment areas.

We find it unacceptable that the government decide to change the current system by reducing the coverage at a time when the number of claims has risen dramatically among workers. The government should have considered increasing revenues rather than reducing benefits. Further, a true economy-priming policy would have reduced the number of claimants and boosted revenues. Keeping this in mind, and despite a few minor improvements such as extended right of appeal, and even with the amendments brought forward by the minister on April 26 last, Bill C-27 is a step backward. There may have been abuses, but the proposed remedy is out of proportion. It affects mainly those workers who have the largest exposure to unemployment, those in high unemployment areas.

I have in my files hundreds of cases of all kinds. This morning I dictated no fewer than ten letters, all pertaining to unemployment problems.

They originate in a UIC office in my area, either Rivière-du-Loup or Lévis, and then go to the arbitration board and the Federal Court, always because of a badly drafted law. How can we then feel inclined to support such a legislation, when we know it will make things more difficult for the unemployed? We cannot. If I could cast 100 votes against it, I would.

Recently, the National Council of Welfare put out a brief concerning employment and poverty. I would like to quote from the last page of the brief, to give an idea of the interest taken by those people who follow the situation all over Canada. They know the problems. It is their job to take the public's opinion, to make surveys and try to make practical

suggestions to the government. Here is the last sentence of their brief:

In Canada, 60 per cent of the poor are working, without being able to earn a decent living.

One can see that in addition, working conditions are difficult.

In a society which distributes a large part of its wealth on the basis of work, the plight of low-wage earners is shocking and unjustifiable. The latter have been deceived by work ethics and deprived of minimum fringe benefits and working conditions which most Canadians now consider as a right.

The kind of legislation now before us is not likely to improve the lot of those people. As long as they have the opportunity to work, their wages are not even adequate and they cannot draw unemployment insurance benefits whenever they are unemployed. It must be kept in mind that since their wages are not very high, the rate of their benefits are not either.

In the Montreal *La Presse* of Tuesday June 14, an article dealing with the brief I have just quoted reads as follows:

In a society which distributes a large part of its wealth on the basis of work, the council added, the plight of the poor is both terrible and inexcusable.

To meet the problems of low income people, the very first thing to do would be to develop a plan under which they would at least be garanteed an income at the poverty line. This is the very first step to take.

It is unfortunate that a real guaranteed income program, a real legislation which would ensure a guaranteed income to everybody, has not been brought forward in Parliament. We have heard about it for ten years and even more, and the Minister of National Health and Welfare, (Mr. Lalonde) has occasionally put forward specific proposals which he intends to implement. This is a step in the right direction, but it is far from being a real legislation on guaranteed income which should be enforced in a country such as ours, which likes to distribute its wealth around the world—and I have no objection to it, I am quite willing to help those who face difficulties. But we, Canadians, should be clever enough to provide all Canadians with a standard of living that will enable them to look forward to the future with enough assurance.

● (1150)

[*English*]

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

Some hon. Members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): The question is on the amendment in the name of the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles). All those in favour of the amendment will please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): All those against will please say nay.

Some hon. Members: Nay.

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

[Mr. Dionne (Kamouraska).]

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Call in the members.

The House divided on the motion (Mr. Knowles, Winnipeg North Centre) which was negatived on the following division:

● (1200)

(*Division No. 72*)

YEAS

Messrs.

Beaudoin
Blackburn
Brewin
Broadbent
Caouette (Villeneuve)
Caouette (Témiscamingue)
Dionne (Kamouraska)
Gilbert
Hogan
Jones
Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre)
Laprise
Leggatt
Muir
Orlikow
Peters
Rodriguez
Rondeau
Symes—19.

NAYS

Messrs.

Alexander
Andras (Port Arthur)
Andres (Lincoln)
Appolloni (Mrs.)
Baker (Gander-Twillingate)
Baker (Grenville-Carleton)
Baldwin
Beatty
Bégin (Miss)
Blais
Blaker
Blouin
Boulanger
Breau
Brisco
Buchanan
Bussières
Caccia
Cadieu
Cafik
Campagnolo (Mrs.)
Chrétien
Clark (Rocky Mountain)
Clermont
Coates
Crosbie
Cullen
Cyr
Danson
Darling
Daudlin
Dawson
De Bané
Dick
Douglas (Bruce-Grey)
Drury
Duclos
Dupont
Dupras
Ellis
Elzinga
Epp
Fairweather
Faulkner
Fleming
Fox
Francis
Friesen
Gauthier (Ottawa-Vanier)
Gendron
Gillespie
Goodale
Goyer
Graffftey
Gray
Guay (St. Boniface)
Guay (Lévis)
Haidasz
Halliday
Harquail
Herbert
Hnatyshyn
Hopkins
Huntington
Isabelle
Jamieson
Jelinek
Johnston
Joyal
Kaplan
Kempling
Knowles (Norfolk-Haldimand)
Lajoie
Lalonde
Lamontagne
Landers
Lang
Langlois
Lapointe
La Salle
Lavoie
Lawrence
Leblanc (Laurier)
LeBlanc (Westmorland-Kent)
Lefebvre
Loiselle (Chambly)
MacDonald (Cardigan)
Macdonald (Rosedale)
MacDonald (Miss) (Kingston and the Islands)
MacEachen
MacFarlane
Martin
Mazankowski
McCain
McCleave
McIsaac
McKenzie
McRae
Milne
Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich)
Munro (Hamilton East)
Neil
Nicholson (Miss)
O'Connell
Olivier
Paproski
Parent
Patterson
Pearsall
Pelletier
Philbrook
Pigott (Mrs.)
Pinard
Portelance
Poulin
Railton
Ritchie
Roberts
Robinson
Roche
Rooney
Rynard
Sauvé (Mrs.)
Savard
Scott
Sharp
Skoreyko
Smith (Saint-Jean)
Stanfield
Stevens
Stollery
Tessier
Towers
Trudel
Turner
Watson
Whiteway
Whittaker
Wise
Wood
Yanakis—141.

● (1220)

Mr. Speaker: I declare the amendment lost.

The question, therefore, is on the main motion. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Mr. Arnold Peters (Timiskaming): Mr. Speaker, we have returned now to the debate on third reading of the bill after what I think is an unfortunate lack of appreciation by hon. members of the advantages of the amendment moved by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles). It is my hope, coming as I do from a depressed area in Canada, that further changes will be made to the bill.

It is odd that one can call part of Ontario a depressed area, because most people think the province has no problems. Nevertheless, in northern Ontario, in particular, unemployment insurance is very important to sections of the population which the government does not wish to support, namely, the class of people who are attached to the labour force in a limited way, not because that is their wish but because of the area in which they live. This is true, of course, of other areas of Canada. I was pleased to see that one or two members recognized their responsibility with regard to those areas and did something about it to bring about changes. To be fair to them, other hon. members may have no problem in this regard. It is probably a fact that many people with short-term attachment to the labour force are to be found in a large area of Canada, but not in a large number of ridings; therefore, the matter is of small concern to some.

We have contended during the debate on this bill that one part of it is excellent and another part deserves further study. That is the part to which we are very much opposed. It does not warrant our support. I am referring to the section of the act which would merge the Unemployment Insurance Commission and the Manpower job placement officers of the Department of Manpower and Immigration. It is bad enough that many hon. members are not interested in the unemployment rate in Canada, but at least they could sit here quietly. I would appreciate it if they would leave, go on holiday, or do whatever they want.

Mr. Baldwin: Where could we get better entertainment than this?

Mr. Peters: I would appreciate it if they took themselves off somewhere else, because I intend to speak until one o'clock and also later today on this section of the act. Also, I intend to move an amendment, after which there will be a vote, and another vote after that. So if these members are just waiting around here for something to happen, it will not happen and they might as well go for lunch. I certainly would encourage them to do so.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Order, please. There appear to be a lot of conversations. I suggest that hon. members wishing to carry on conversations go behind the curtains, into the lobby.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Peters: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate your assistance. As the hon. member for Moncton (Mr. Jones) suggests, I will start over again. I may do just that, Mr. Speaker, and again and again. Nobody will be able to detect whether or not this is in order, with all the hubbub that is going on.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Peters: I was opposed in the first place to separating the unemployment section of the department from the employment section or job placement agency. Unlike the Conservatives, I am not too happy with the job placement agency in Canada—and that goes back to the time when I was a young lad looking for my first job. In those days one had to buy a job. Since I was too poor to buy a job, I had to get it another way, although it really was not very different. Seeing that everybody is so interested in what I have to say, and it is such a pleasant afternoon, I will be pleased to tell the House about it. When I went to look for a job, the logical place in northern Ontario to do so was in the mining industry. I accompanied my father to Timiskaming and I went to the job placement agency. In those days the job placement agency was a private company run by a one-armed bandit.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Peters: That was literally the case. You had to pay, because that was how they operated. The government did not assist you in finding employment in those days. You made your payment. I do not know exactly what it was, but I gave him quite a story. I told him that I had come out of the bush—I had been working in the bush before Christmas, and this was around February—that I had been staying in a hotel and had a big bill to pay, that I owed the restaurant for meals and was pretty hard up. I said to him that I would certainly appreciate his help. He was kind enough to send me to one of the smaller mines, the last mine on the back road where the drifters went. Prior to that I had been to another mine. I knew the brother of the superintendent at that mine fairly well. I went to the bunkhouse and was interviewed, and I left without a job because the price of the job was a bottle of Black and White scotch every payday. I understand the superintendent collected that from almost everyone he hired. He lived for many years, and he died of an ailment of the liver. However, it took many years and many employees before that happened. I am sure other hon. members remember the depression and could tell similar stories about how jobs were obtained. Some of their stories might be better than mine. I was an employer before I started to work in the mines.

● (1230)

Mr. Trudel: Now it comes out.

Mr. Rodriguez: Free enterprise capitalist.

Mr. Peters: I was an employer in a very small way. My father worked for the government. He was away most of the time and left a younger brother and me to run the farm. We had to hire people to help on the farm. I heard some fairly good sob stories which probably were true. Those stories

indicated to me the indignation of looking for employment under those kinds of circumstances. I was very pleased when in 1940 the national employment service was established and the government started to assist in providing employment.

Mr. Jones: They established a new bureaucracy.

Mr. Peters: I am not sure whether that was the reason it was established. That is when we started getting unemployment insurance numbers which became substitutes for names. That service later developed in to our social security system. Numbers were more important than names. A name could be given and a file could not be found; but if a number was given, it could be found. A bureaucracy developed, and that was part of the problem. There were two sections of the national employment service. In one section people lined up and asked the agent if there were any jobs. It really did not matter very much in those days what the job was. If the agent had a job for digging ditches, you were supposed to take it. If you did not want the job, you were not able to draw benefits because the agent would not give you a slip to go over to the other section to get your benefits. If the agent did not have a job for you, he gave you a slip and you went to the unemployment insurance section.

At that section there was a card of about six inches by eight inches. The card indicated all your payments and how much they were, and on the reverse side there was a record of withdrawals. When you made a withdrawal, that amount was taken off, and your balance was so much. You knew when you were running out. You knew all the factors, and you knew how much you had been paid. You could talk to the girl at the desk. She had all that information, and you could argue and discuss the point. You could appeal decisions, or you could accept them. It was not a bad system. I would be prepared to go back to that system.

For some mucky-mucks that system meant line-ups—and if there is one thing people in Canada hate, it is a line-up. Every day in my office I do not have a line-up of people but I have a line-up of unemployment insurance problems. People can no longer line up and ask about unemployment insurance. They just wait and wait. They get in touch with their member of parliament, with their northern affairs officer or with the Unemployment Insurance Commission. Those are unsatisfactory line-ups. They are 100 per cent more demoralizing than asking a girl to get your card to see whether you are entitled to any benefits. In days gone by, if you were entitled to benefits the girl at the counter handed the benefits over the counter in cash. You did not have to pay a premium at the local grocery store to have your cheque cashed. You did not have to pay a charge to cash your cheque at the local beer parlour or wherever you may have taken it. You got your money, and that was that. You were entitled to it, and you knew you were entitled to it. You knew how much you were entitled to, how much you paid in, what your balance was, and how long you could continue collecting.

Mr. Rodriguez: There were no computers.

[Mr. Peters.]

Mr. Peters: There were no computers and no civil servants in the gallery. They did not exist. They did not have to exist. There were only a few, and they were very competent. As the years went by, the bureaucracy got bigger, but the people in that bureaucracy became less competent to handle individual problems. It is not that the commission does not have some very competent people, because it has—but who is appointed to deal with my claim, my question, or my request for information? I telephone the unemployment insurance office because I live 150 miles away from it. I phone the district office and ask about my claim. Who do I ask? I ask a young girl who was picked up off the street two or three days before and who does not know which office she is working for. She does not have the faintest idea about benefits or anything else, because she was the last one hired. Her superiors have not had time to talk to her. However, she answers the telephone and says, "I don't know" and hangs up. I ask for her name, and she says she does not have to give her name. She thinks I am asking for a date. Her mother told her not to make that kind of date, and the commission has not yet told her what to do. That is exactly what happens. We no longer have a situation where you can walk into the national employment office and be offered a job or not. In days gone by, if you were not offered a job you made a request for benefits. You either received benefits there and then, or you didn't. This happened every week when you turned up at the office. Nowadays, people appear only to make their presentations once a month to Canada Manpower so that they meet the requirements and are not taken off the rolls. They may be looking for jobs, but in my area looking for a job is a stupid thing to do. In my riding there are little towns of 200 people 50 and 75 miles from nowhere.

Mr. Baldwin: What about their voting habits?

Mr. Rodriguez: Some vote Conservative.

Mr. Peters: Sometimes many people visit those little communities and some people work there, but in the winter season there are no jobs. The people know there are no jobs in those little communities. The tourist camps are closed, the restaurants are closed—everything in the community is closed, so people have obviously left.

● (1240)

We could discuss some of the other things that affect small communities. Maybe it is only because the minister does not know about small communities that he made some of these changes. But Sarnia is not such a large city that he could not look at the surrounding area. Surely he could drive to Oil Springs, Petrolia, Dresden, or some of the communities that have the same problems as those in my area. The last time I was in Oil City there was a dance hall and a motel. My cousin ran both of them, but he was pretty well living on the pogey. Maybe the minister should go out and look at that community. Petrolia is not much better off. Dresden is a nice little tourist town in the summertime, but in winter I think they must just sit around the fire and talk about the days when it was the end of the underground railway for runaway slaves from the

United States. Maybe the minister has never been there. I am sure that if he had, some of the rules made for unemployment insurance benefits would make no more sense to him than they do to me.

It has been decided that over a three-year period these two departments should come back together again. The people in my area are asking who is going to be bumped, red-circled, downgraded. Are the staffs to be integrated? Maybe one section should be eliminated.

Mr. Rodriguez: Which one?

Mr. Peters: I do not want to say that, because it is "damned if you do" and "damned if you don't." Maybe we could just lay everybody off and start again, hiring the good ones and leaving the bad ones out. I have a list of bad ones, if anybody wants it. I would start pretty high up the ladder, because every time I phone either the Manpower office or the unemployment insurance office, they are off on a coffee break. It is called a business meeting, but it lasts from Monday morning until late Friday afternoon.

When an individual wishes to deal with a government agency, we have a situation much like the saying that not only must justice be done but it must be seen to be done. If the minister were to take a survey of how many people in the country are satisfied with the operation of the unemployment insurance scheme and Manpower, I think unemployment insurance would come out on top. There are two Manpower offices in my area. One could have been eliminated a long time ago because most people do not even know it is there. In combining the operations of these two departments, the minister has not been very fair with the staffs in letting them know who will be redundant, and so on. I am asked questions about this quite often; but of course I do not have the information.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that this wedding has taken place. I was violently opposed to the divorce. In my opinion, the split did not make any sense and I am pleased that the minister has suggested combining the agencies. The operation of the unemployment insurance fund should be viewed in a light different light from the operation of other departments of government. Money contributed by the individual and the employer, with some from the government for administration costs, is entrusted to the UIC. These moneys are handled rather loosely. I think we have an obligation to handle them better.

I have always had a good relationship with the top management of the Unemployment Insurance Commission, Mr. Speaker, because I am interested in what they are doing. I know some of the practical difficulties that can arise from legislation and many times modifications and changes have been as a result of my suggestions. I am sure this is also true in respect of other members. We are directly involved in the business of the commission and are obviously in a position to assist. I think it is safe to say that over the last ten years at least three or four hours each day have been devoted by one member of my staff to unemployment insurance problems. If that is true for other members as well, it means that approximately 150 people, in effect, work for the Unemployment Insurance Commission at no expense to the commission.

● (1250)

It is apparent, Mr. Speaker, that the new legislation will make the collection of unemployment insurance a complicated process. Under the previous act a man knew exactly where he stood. Under this act, a claimant will go for benefits and will confront a situation like this, "Mr. Jones, you are not entitled to any money because you have used all your benefits, you have not worked long enough, or your contributions were not large enough", and so on. Or, if the worst comes to the worst, the claimant will be called to apply again, or will be told he can appeal his case or submit a new application, and so on. He will return to square one.

Mr. Speaker, the old system was not so complicated, and I suggest members of parliament are out of their cotton-picking minds when they make this process so complicated. Under the old system, you were not accused of not looking for work. The UIC people did not say to you, "Do you have transportation?" These factors entered into the question and were given their due weight. You were interviewed, and at the interview it was determined whether you were eligible for UIC benefits. If you were eligible, you were given a slip which you took to the benefits section and collected benefits. The process was relatively simple. Now it is to be a puzzle.

What is more, you came face to face with the employees of UIC, and if they did not treat you politely you could threaten them with a poke in the nose. Occasionally some of them got a poke in the nose because people got mad. It seems to me that we are now complicating this process beyond all reason and without justification. Or perhaps the government wants to create more employment for unemployment insurance, Manpower and Immigration civil servants. Perhaps it wants to expand the civil service and can justify the expansion only by making this bill more complicated.

The minister has not thought through the ramifications of certain variables included in the bill. The minister comes from an area where times have been good. The government Crown corporation, Polymer, prospered. It was located in Sarnia where jobs were plentiful. Polymer was a good Crown corporation.

Mr. Rodriguez: But Polysar is in deep trouble.

Mr. Peters: I grant you that. Nevertheless, Polymer was good for Sarnia. It employed many people at high wages. Perhaps there was little unemployment in the minister's area. Let me ask him this question: Will a small pocket of unemployment in an area otherwise prosperous affect the over-all unemployment rate of the region? I suppose the bright young executives the government likes to hire would feed such questions into the computer. If you ask it the right questions, the computer can answer in seconds. On the other hand, if things go wrong the computer could take weeks or even months to answer.

Say a plant goes bankrupt in a small town and lays off its entire work force. You could have a pocket of high unemployment in an area otherwise prosperous. Would the computer take this pocket of unemployment into account? Would that affect the over-all standing of the region? Would regional unemployment benefit levels be affected? What would happen if unemployment in Oil Springs and Petrolia were high, but at low levels in Sarnia? Would the high level of employment in Sarnia affect the eligibility of people in Oil Springs and Petrolia for extended benefits? Will the standing of the general region be affected? There may not be much unemployment in Sarnia; I do not know; I have not been there for some time. I can ask relatives about conditions in the area; I have many relatives there.

An hon. Member: In the hotel?

Mr. Peters: No, the hotel burned down some time ago. That relative retired. He went to Sudbury.

Mr. Rodriguez: Another capitalist.

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Peters: Mr. Speaker, I was talking about what would happen if unemployment in Oil Springs, say, were high at a time when unemployment in Sarnia was low. I think I have made my point. I suppose the government would feed the problem into the computer. I am concerned about the people of Kirkland Lake who face major problems. About 1,000 have been laid off in the area, one of the largest gold mines having closed. Their lumber industry is hurt, and other resource-based industries are badly hit. It seems to me we should make conditions easier in these areas.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Order, please. It being one o'clock, I do now leave the chair until two o'clock.

At one o'clock the House took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 2 p.m.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

ROYAL CANADIAN MOUNTED POLICE

PROPOSED ADDITION TO TERMS OF REFERENCE OF COMMISSION OF INQUIRY—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Joe Clark (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a matter of urgent and pressing necessity under the provisions of Standing Order 43. The terms of reference for the inquiry into the RCMP are silent in the one area which has been of great concern to the House of Commons and to the public—the question of the quality of the political responsibility for the RCMP exercised by past Ministers, and the implications of that responsibility or lack of it for the constitutionally essential doctrine of ministerial responsibility.

I would therefore move, seconded by the hon. member for Wellington-Grey-Dufferin-Waterloo (Mr. Beatty):

That in the opinion of this House the terms of reference for the Royal Commission into the operations of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, established under the Inquiries Act, should be amended by

(1) adding after the last "whereas" clause the following: "and Whereas it is essential that this inquiry demonstrate that proper ministerial accountability for the Royal Canadian Mounted Police has been exercised in the past, and that proper procedures exist for exercising full ministerial responsibility at present and in the future;" and

(2) by adding at the end the "Therefore" clause after paragraph (c) the following paragraph:

"(d) to investigate and report on the manner in which Solicitors General have exercised their constitutional obligation to supervise fully the activities of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police and report thereon to the Parliament of Canada."

Mr. Speaker: Under the terms of Standing Order 43 unanimous consent is required before such a motion can be presented. Is there such consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

PROPOSED CHANGE IN TERMS OF REFERENCE OF COMMISSION OF INQUIRY—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby): Mr. Speaker, I expect the same fate will befall my proposal.

Considering that the Parliamentary Secretary to the Solicitor General (Mr. Lee) told the House on June 15, 1976 that an investigation into the RCMP break-in in the fall of 1972 had been completed, presumably to the satisfaction of the government, and considering there is conflicting testimony as to the degree of knowledge possessed by the then solicitor general in 1972 pertaining to this break-in, and considering that the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) indicated in the House on June 20 and June 22 of this year that he was concerned about the political accountability aspect of RCMP activities, and, finally, in order to avoid the implication that the Royal Commission announced yesterday will have as its sole purpose the making of a scapegoat of the RCMP, I ask leave to move, seconded by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles):

That this House instruct the government to change the terms of reference of the Royal Commission to include an additional clause (d) to read:

(d) To investigate and report on the adequacy of accountability procedures designed to ensure effective authority over the RCMP by the elected government of the day.

Mr. Speaker: Such a motion requires the unanimous consent of the House under the terms of Standing Order 43. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

[*Translation*]

INDUSTRY

MEASURES TO PREVENT CLOSING OF SHOE MANUFACTURERS—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Léonel Beaudoin (Richmond): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the provisions of Standing Order 43, I ask for the unanimous consent of the House to move a motion requesting immediate action as regards the shoe industry in Canada.

Considering that the Anti-dumping Tribunal which is now examining the situation of this industry in Canada agreed to present an interim report next week on a specific category of shoes and considering the urgency for all shoe manufacturers to know the specific steps that will be taken by the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce in this very important sector and considering finally that the complete report of the tribunal will be tabled next fall only, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Villeneuve (Mr. Caouette):

That the House urge the ministers responsible for the importation of shoes, namely the Minister of Finance (Mr. Macdonald) and the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce (Mr. Chrétien), to ask the Anti-dumping Tribunal to give next week a general idea of government measures to prevent the closing of our Canadian plants.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The House has heard the motion of the hon. member. Pursuant to the provisions of Standing Order 43, this motion requires the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

* * *

● (1410)

[*English*]

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

SUGGESTED REFERENCE TO COMMITTEE OF INTERNATIONAL JOINT COMMISSION REPORT ON GARRISON DIVERSION—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Dean Whiteway (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, I rise under the provisions of Standing Order 43 on a matter of urgent and pressing necessity. In view of the fact that the International Joint Commission is expected to table its final report on the Garrison diversion project this month, and in light of the serious ramifications of this report for Canadian wildlife and waterways, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Perth-Wilmot (Mr. Jarvis):

That this House direct the soon-to-be released final report to the Standing Committee on Fisheries and Forestry for examination and review so that members of this parliament and the people of this country might be assured that Canada's interests in general and Manitoba's interests in particular have been protected.

Mr. Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 43, presentation of such a motion for debate can be done only with the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

* * *

GOVERNMENT ADMINISTRATION

SUGGESTION PROPER METHOD OF MINISTERIAL ACCOUNTABILITY BE DEVELOPED—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): Mr. Speaker, I have a motion under Standing Order 43 which I am sure is sufficiently moderate to command the support of hon. members opposite. The urgent and pressing circumstances arise from the facts leading to the appointment of the commission of inquiry into the RCMP. These revelations, the last of a number of cases affecting government departments, expose the myth of ministerial responsibility and establish that many ministers have been either duped or kept in ignorance or were deliberately deceiving parliament and the people. Therefore, I move:

That this House demands that the government develop a method of true accountability to parliament and the people, and in particular should immediately provide an appendix to the green paper on public access to government documents which would eliminate the mockery of ministerial responsibility as a reason for rejecting a review process when governments refuse to disclose information.

Mr. Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 43, presentation of such a motion requires the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

* * *

ANTI-INFLATION BOARD

CONDEMNATION OF EXPENDITURE ON TAKING POLLS—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North): Mr. Speaker, I rise under the provisions of Standing Order 43 on a matter of urgent and pressing necessity. In view of the eight page ad placed by the Anti-Inflation Board in the latest issue of *Saturday Night* and the unnecessary expenditure of $15,000 for government propaganda, and in view of the fact that this propaganda includes a poll on issues supposedly related to inflation, I move:

That this House condemns the unnecessary propaganda expenditures by the government of Canada and its continuing reliance on formulating federal policies by taking polls.

Mr. Speaker: Presentation of such a motion for debate requires the unanimous consent of the House, pursuant to Standing Order 43. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

Oral Questions

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[*English*]

ROYAL CANADIAN MOUNTED POLICE

PROPOSED EXPANSION OF TERMS OF REFERENCE OF COMMISSION OF INQUIRY TO INCLUDE MINISTERIAL RESPONSIBILITY

Mr. Joe Clark (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I had intended to direct a question to the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources, but two minutes ago we received notice that he will make a statement on motions. Therefore, I will direct my question to the Solicitor General. The terms of reference of the judicial commission of inquiry into the RCMP are narrow, restrictive and inadequate. Therefore, I should like to ask the Solicitor General if he would undertake to expand the mandate of the MacDonald Commission to formally require a complete investigation of ministerial actions and ministerial responsibilities with respect to the interface between the national government and our national police force?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Francis Fox (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, I thank the Leader of the Opposition for his question. Of course, more will be needed than merely stating the terms of reference. In fact, the mandate entrusted by this government to the commission of inquiry is extremely broad. One need but read it, and perhaps in some cases reread it, to see that the commission of inquiry is really authorized to look into all allegations of illegal and criminal activities, and pursue them from one link to the other all the way down the line, provided of course there is a line. I have absolutely no intention, at this stage, Mr. Speaker, of broadening a mandate that is quite wide enough to allow the commission to receive, study and understand all the allegations which may be made, far-fetched, founded as they may be, against the RCMP.

[*English*]

Mr. Clark: Mr. Speaker, the minister well knows that the only people who think those terms of reference are large enough to adequately look into the question of ministerial responsibility are himself, his partisans and other people who might have something to protect. What is surprising to us is that the Prime Minister of this government, in the House on May 24—

An hon. Member: He is the Prime Minister of this country.

Mr. Clark: I did not know that the government wanted to renounce him so quickly, but even if they do not the country will as soon as an opportunity arises. Since the Prime Minister on May 24 stated in the House that in respect of activities of the RCMP "the principle of ministerial responsibility applies", and since the Solicitor General has also himself stated that under the Official Secrets Act he is required to "approve in a certain number of cases the operations of the RCMP security service", I should like to ask the Solicitor General why the government will admit ministerial responsibility in theory yet deny a specific mandate to inquire as to how it was exercised in this particular case.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Fox: Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition is referring to the Official Secrets Act. Some powers are given to me by that act. It goes without saying, Mr. Speaker, that the Official Secrets Act speaks for itself. I have no comments to make on that. The powers are explicit. Everyone is aware of them. With regard to ministerial responsibility, Mr. Speaker, I feel it is completely obvious, simply in the light of my statement yesterday as well as previous statements in the House, that on this side of the House, not only do we accept but we have been, for some time now, living up to the principle of ministerial responsibility.

[*English*]

NUMBER OF ILLEGAL ACTIONS IN WHICH FORCE INVOLVED, PERIOD OF TIME COVERED AND MINISTERIAL KNOWLEDGE OF THEM

Mr. Joe Clark (Leader of the Opposition): What is clear, Mr. Speaker, is that if these ministers can find any way at all to evade responsibility and to blame their public servants, they will do it. In his statement to the House yesterday the Solicitor General stated that he had been informed by the commissioner of the RCMP that some members of the RCMP, to quote the minister, "in the dispatch of their responsibility to protect national security could well have used methods or could have been involved in actions which were neither authorized nor provided for by law". With respect to this important admission by the commissioner, I should like to ask the Solicitor General how many illegal actions the RCMP have been involved in, over what period of time have they occurred, and to what degree did any minister have any knowledge of any aspect of investigations which involved illegal activities.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Francis Fox (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, I have indeed much difficulty understanding the question the Leader of the Opposition is asking. Nearly every day over the past month or month and a half, the Leader of the Opposition and his colleagues have moved motion after motion under Standing Order 43, seeking an impartial inquiry. As a matter of fact, when I made my statement in the House on June 17 last, I was told that the word of the Solicitor General of Canada was not enough, that an impartial inquiry was needed. Opposition members wanted an impartial and independent inquiry, well, they have it now, and it should provide all the answers the Leader of the Opposition has been seeking.

[*English*]

Mr. Clark: A final supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. The minister protests with all the vigour we have become accustomed to in place of answers to questions. What I asked him related to the information he received from the commissioner, and in particular I wanted to know whether any minister had any knowledge of any aspect of any investigation which involved illegal actions, and whether that is now known

to the Solicitor General of Canada. If it is, would he advise the House of Commons that there were cases of this kind, and would he advise the House of Commons how many illegal actions the RCMP is believed by their commissioner to have been involved in, over what period of time they have occurred and under what ministers they have occurred?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Fox: Mr. Speaker, as you and hon. members know, until June 17 last we took the position that the incident was of an extraordinary nature, an isolated case, indeed a very unusual one.

Since then we have learned, as I indicated in my statement in the House yesterday, that we had good reason to believe that there were perhaps other cases where the RCMP resorted to illegal practices, which I think fully justifies the establishment of a commission of inquiry.

The commission of inquiry will have to cast the light entirely and completely on the allegations, Mr. Speaker, but so far there is no indication that any minister of the Crown is involved in any way in the facts alleged.

● (1420)

[*English*]

PROPOSED INQUIRY BY COMMITTEE INTO DEGREE OF MINISTERIAL RESPONSIBILITY FOR FORCE

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): I have a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Having in mind the slippery nature of the answers given—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Baldwin: —and having in mind that the contents of the minister's statement made yesterday completely sweep away and destroy the basis on which the government's case has been rested in the last month on this issue, I should like to ask the minister, on this question of ministerial responsibility which, if I understand anything, means responsibility to the House—

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Baldwin: —if the government will not yield to the reasonable suggestion of the leader of our party to have an inquiry into this question of responsibility and let a committee of the House find out to what extent, if at all, the members of the government have been deceiving parliament.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Baldwin: While there is a rule in the House by which we accept what is said in the House, there are many people outside the House who are skeptical about the rule, are not bound by it, and do not feel the same way about it as we are compelled to feel here.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Francis Fox (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, of course if the hon. member wants to talk of slippery slope, I would remind him that not long ago the opposition accused us of having a police state within the government and of setting up a list of enemies, according to their own words. Conversely, they say there is no political control over the RCMP at present. There is indeed a slippery slope, but in my opinion within the opposition itself. As for ministerial responsibility, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that the commission of inquiry has all the necessary powers to establish whether or not there were criminal activities and consequently to find out if there has been any cover-up or some other doubtful activities.

Mr. Speaker, the best way to discuss those allegations is not to submit them to a parliamentary committee, with all due respect we should have for these institutions—and I profess a lot of respect for them—because that kind of procedure might give rise to sectarian attitudes. Mr. Speaker, I think that the reputation of the RCMP should be discussed outside the polical arena and it deserves to be judged in a fair and independent way as we proposed to the House yesterday.

[*English*]

INQUIRY WHETHER ASSURANCE RECEIVED FROM COMMISSIONER ILLEGAL ACTIVITIES TERMINATED

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): In light of the fact that the Solicitor General has withdrawn previous statements that the APLQ break-in was an isolated and unique incident, could he inform the House if he has received an iron-clad assurance from the commissioner of the RCMP that all illegal activities have now been terminated?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Francis Fox (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, it is quite clear that the instructions given to the RCMP are to carry out their activities within strictly legal boundaries and if ever there were cases where such instructions were not followed, the commissioner and the government would assume their responsibilities, as we indicated once again very specifically and clearly yesterday when, with the consent of the RCMP commissioner and on his advice, we undertook an inquiry on the entire issue.

[*English*]

SUGGESTION INQUIRY INTO MINISTERIAL ACCOUNTABILITY FOR ILLEGAL ACTIVITIES OF FORCE BE MANDATORY

Mr. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby): I have a question for the Solicitor General. The minister knows that members on this side of the House have demanded a full inquiry from the outset, not one simply into the RCMP, so he should not try to buy us off with the claim that the government has done what we have requested.

Considering that on June 8 of last year the then solicitor general said that the government had started an investigation into the break-in in the fall of 1972 immediately it was brought to its attention, and considering that a few weeks later we had a report back to the House from the parliamentary secretary that that investigation had been completed, presumably to the satisfaction of the government, and, to cite one other instance involving political accountability, considering

the conflicting testimony that we have coming from the Minister of Supply and Services pertaining to the time when he was solicitor general compared with what former commissioner Higgitt has said, and concerning the degree of knowledge that the then solicitor general had about the break-in, I would like to ask the present Solicitor General if he will not make it a mandatory requirement that the political accountability aspect of this case be investigated instead of, as he well knows, leaving open the possible occurrence of such an investigation.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Francis Fox (Solicitor General): Because, Mr. Speaker, we have set up—once again, unfortunately, it seems that I have to repeat myself—we have set up an independent commission of inquiry presided over by a justice of the Supreme Court of Alberta who has been directed to go thoroughly over the matter. Of course, this commission of inquiry will want to examine the allegations. I am not going to tell it how to proceed. The commission of inquiry will consider the allegations and if it decides that there was some illegal action, it will no doubt want to examine the matter thoroughly to determine exactly whether or not there was some covering up. I hope that those comments answer the question of the hon. member.

[*English*]

Mr. Broadbent: Mr. Speaker, as a lawyer surely the minister knows that is soporific nonsense.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Broadbent: He has just said to the House that it is possible that the inquiry will look into this. He has not said it is mandatory, and surely that is what we have a right to expect.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Broadbent: Would the minister tell the House why he would object to including a clause—if he is really sincere that he believes the commission should, which is what he wants us to believe, look into all aspects of the question—indicating that one of the requirements of the commission is to investigate and report on the adequacy of accountability procedures in order to ensure effective authority over the RCMP by the elected government of the day? I ask that question in light of the minister's own expressed views about alleged concern and those of his own Prime Minister.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Fox: Mr. Speaker, as far as I am concerned, it is inconceivable that the commission would refuse to examine the case mentioned by the hon. member. I understand that, on his side of the House, the hon. member thinks there are some hesitations, and sees some problems with respect to the RCMP's accountability to the government. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that this question could also be studied by the commission if it wants to make recommendations under clause C of the terms of reference.

[Mr. Broadbent.]

On our part, Mr. Speaker, as government and Solicitor General, if we find we have not enough control or there is a lack of accountability from the RCMP towards the Solicitor General, we will introduce the necessary amendments and fill our role as a government. Then, we do not need the Leader of the Opposition or any other organization to remind us what we have to do. We are prepared to hear suggestions from any circle, provided these suggestions are rational and logical, but we intend to carry out our responsibilities in that area and in others as well.

[*English*]

Mr. Broadbent: Mr. Speaker, with all respect, in the last answer the minister said it was possible that the inquiry would look into these things. The answer he just gave is that it is inconceivable that it will not. The minister cannot have it both ways. Either it is possible or it is inconceivable that the commission will not do otherwise. In a private conversation the minister and I had in the House yesterday—and in a sense I hesitate to bring it up—the minister indicated to me the words he used in one answer, namely, that it is possible under clause C of the terms of reference that the commission would look into such matters. If the minister believes it is only possible and if he wants to maintain—as he is doing, on the other hand—that it is important that the commission look into these questions, then why in God's name does the minister not make it mandatory by putting it into the terms of reference?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Fox: Mr. Speaker, perhaps the hon. member has not grasped what I was meaning. In my opinion, it is inconceivable that the commission of inquiry would not look into the APLQ matter. That matter is mentioned in the first clause of the commission's terms of reference. As for matters of procedure, accountability and suggestion of authority over the RCMP by the Solicitor General, it is precisely under clause C that the commission could decide to make recommendations about it. It is highly possible, despite what the opposition member thinks, that the commission would find that the control mechanisms with the changes we will propose in September are perfectly sufficient for this period of 1977.

* * *

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

INQUIRY AS TO SEARCH FOR CANADIAN JOURNALIST MISSING IN UGANDA

Mr. Léonel Beaudoin (Richmond): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Acting Prime Minister.

In view of the fact that the President of Uganda, Marshall Idi Amin Dada represents a menace for the world on account of his cruelty, because according to one of his former ministers, he put to death more than 100,000 of his fellow countrymen; that a Canadian newspaperman is reported missing in Uganda and this country has not given any satisfactory explanation about his disappearance; can the Acting Prime Minister inform the House whether there is any news about this missing Canadian, whether active search is being conducted by responsible people? Where does the matter stand?

• (1430)

[*English*]

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Acting Prime Minister): Yes, Mr. Speaker. I can advise the hon. member that the Canadian representative in Nairobi has been, I believe, several times in Uganda raising this question with the officials of the government. Up to the present time, to my available knowledge, it has not been possible to locate the journalist in question. There is, as I understand it, some doubt as to whether he continues to be in Uganda. Certainly, we are doing everything possible to locate him and to lend whatever support we can in his discovery.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Beaudoin: Mr. Speaker, can the Acting Prime Minister tell us whether this newspaper man has been identified or is identifiable and whether he stayed in Uganda; also whether any Canadian government official knows of his whereabouts, and with his passport, to what country did he go?

[*English*]

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Speaker, the identity of the journalist is certainly known to the Canadian authorities. However, it has not been possible to get from the Ugandan authorities information as to his whereabouts and as to whether he is still in Uganda. That is the latest information which I had a day or so ago. The Secretary of State for External Affairs is not in the House at the moment, but I will be happy to follow up this inquiry to ensure that the most recent information is made available to avoid any misunderstanding or misapprehension, certainly to avoid any fear that may be caused as to his whereabouts.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Armand Caouette (Villeneuve): Mr. Speaker, a supplementary for the same minister.

Since we seem to have a lot of difficulty to find out where this reporter is now, could the minister tell the House whether it is his intention to break off all relations with Uganda to force this government to give us an answer without delay?

[*English*]

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member should bear in mind that there are a number of Canadians in Uganda, as I recollect. Therefore, it might not be in the best interests of the safety of those Canadians to take the action he recommends, which might be appealing at other times.

* * *

FARM CREDIT CORPORATION

INDICTMENT OF MANAGEMENT IN AUDIT BY SIBALD GROUP—GOVERNMENT ACTION

Mr. Perrin Beatty (Wellington-Grey-Dufferin-Waterloo): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Agriculture, I will direct my question to his parliamentary secretary. In view of the findings of a private management audit of the Farm Credit Corporation completed by the Sibbald Group earlier this year, findings that were scathing in their description of poor morale throughout the corporation and noted lack of direction from the top, including the following comments:

> The problem of management was voiced during virtually every staff interview at almost all levels of the corporation . . .
>
> The number of references to management problems during the interviews was too great to ignore. There are complaints about lack of credibility, lack of confidence in leadership, lack of communication and mystery regarding corporate objectives at almost all levels of the corporation—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Does the hon. member have a question?

Mr. Beatty: Yes, Mr. Speaker. There are a couple of other scathing quotations I could put on the record, but I will let them pass. What action is being taken by the Minister of Agriculture in response to this serious indictment of senior management within this corporation?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Irénée Pelletier (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, all these allegations have proved to be false, after an investigation was made regarding this corporation.

[*English*]

Mr. Beatty: Is the parliamentary secretary telling this House that the internal management audit commissioned by and conducted on the Farm Credit Corporation, which made those findings I referred to and others, is being examined and found to be false? If so, will the parliamentary secretary tell the House whether the charges made in the consultant's report have been investigated? There have been several instances of cases where employees of the Farm Credit Corporation were enrolled in expensive French language training courses and then sent to areas of the country where no one speaks French, thus losing their ability to speak the language, and serious cases of moonlighting among the staff of the Farm Credit Corporation, including moonlighting on government time. Is the parliamentary secretary denying that?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Pelletier: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member has precise cases in mind, he should tell the House about them. The minister has examined these various reports on several occasions and he did not find anything contrary to the duties of the chairman of the commission.

[*English*]

Mr. Beatty: Ten o'clock, Mr. Speaker.

* * *

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

UGANDA—INFORMATION ON STATUS OF JOURNALIST GERALD UTTING

Mr. Douglas Roche (Edmonton-Strathcona): Mr. Speaker, my question is supplementary to questions asked by the Social

Credit. It is directed to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. A few moments ago the Acting Prime Minister provided some information to the House concerning the present status of Mr. Gerald Utting, a Toronto *Star* reporter. Can the minister provide a little more information about the present status of Mr. Utting? I ask this question against the delicate background of two events in the past two days, first, a conversation that took place between the minister's officials and the Uganda High Commissioner to Canada, and second, the announcement by U.N. Secretary General Kurt Waldheim that President Idi Amin has agreed to allow a United Nations team to investigate human rights in Uganda.

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member will appreciate, as I think he used the word, the delicacy of my answer. I was advised just a few moments ago that further discussions took place this morning here in Ottawa between the High Commissioner and officials of my department. Certain steps are presently being taken. I can only conclude from the information provided to me that the prospects look hopeful in getting some firm information on the whereabouts and condition of Mr. Utting in the very near future. In other words, direct contact has been made with Uganda regarding this matter.

CANADIAN ROLE IN MAINTAINING HUMAN RIGHTS—REQUEST FOR REPORT ON PREPARATIONS FOR MEETING ON HELSINKI AGREEMENT

Mr. Douglas Roche (Edmonton-Strathcona): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the answer of the minister. Since human rights have become a major theme in world diplomacy in the past few months, what role does Canada intend playing not only in the specific Uganda situation but in other troubled areas such as Ethiopia and Chile, which are of concern to the United Nations also? Also, in what way will the minister report to the House Canada's preparations for the Helsinki meeting that will be examining violations of human rights in the Soviet bloc?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, on the developments yesterday with regard to President Amin's willingness to accept the United Nations investigatory team, this is of course, although presumably indirectly, in response to a motion moved by Canada at the Geneva meeting some time ago. In that case, what is now being agreed to by Mr. Amin appears to be consistent with what we have been seeking. Whether Canada will have a direct membership on the team which goes to Uganda is not clear at the moment. Presumably, the parties concerned will be consulting as to the make-up and nature of the team and the conditions under which they will go to Uganda.

On other matters relating to non-signatory countries to the Helsinki agreement, there are no new initiatives planned with regard to, for example, Ethiopia and Chile other than a repetition in whatever forums are available. The United Nations and the Canadian position, as the hon. member knows, is very strongly opposed both to human rights violations in Uganda and indeed to the whole unhappy situation in Ethiopia which goes beyond human rights into a number of other areas which are regrettable from our point of view.

• (1440)

As to the Belgrade conference, if I may conclude the answer to a "tripartite" question, I have had consultations in Belgrade with the head of the Canadian delegation. The meetings will very likely continue until the end of this month and it is not clear at the moment what kind of agenda will be devised. I will be glad to consult with members of the foreign affairs committee as to the best means of informing members, and whatever means they decide will be perfectly all right with me.

* * *

TRANSPORT

CUTBACK IN RAIL PASSENGER SERVICE IN NOVA SCOTIA—INQUIRY AS TO OPPOSITION BY PREMIER REGAN

Mr. Robert Muir (Cape Breton-The Sydneys): Mr. Speaker, my question for the Minister of Transport relates to a memorandum he circulated, dated May 25. He indicated in the memorandum, and in a copy of a telex enclosed, that he and the four Atlantic premiers had agreed in principle, among other things, to a cutback in rail services in the provinces concerned. Since Premier Regan a few days ago told a committee from Sydney Academy that he was not only surprised but shocked at the minister's memorandum, and promised to make his feelings known to the minister, may I ask if Premier Regan has been in touch with the minister, to indicate his strong opposition to any possible rail passenger cutback in Nova Scotia; if so, when did such a message from Premier Regan arrive?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I received a telegram from Premier Regan but am not sure of the exact date. It seems to me I got it within the last several days. In it he indicated a view about rail passenger service in Nova Scotia different from that contained in earlier agreements between ourselves. Naturally, I shall pursue the matter. The telegram had specific reference to one rail service.

RAIL PASSENGER SERVICE BETWEEN SYDNEY AND TRURO—SUPPORT OF ATLANTIC PREMIERS FOR RECOMMENDATION TO TRANSPORT COMMISSION

Mr. Robert Muir (Cape Breton-The Sydneys): Mr. Speaker, may I try on another question for size? Has the minister, through his officials or representatives of the department, submitted a recommendation to the Canadian Transport Commission concerning the abandonment of CN passenger rail service between Sydney and Truro? Did such a recommendation contain the names of the Atlantic premiers, including that of Premier Regan?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, as the House knows from past exchanges, and the announce-

ment to which the hon. member referred, the five governments agreed to put before the CTC a study and examination of rail passenger service and the economies of the alternatives available. That study was placed before the CTC for its consideration.

* * *

[*Translation*]

CANADIAN PACIFIC

PROPOSED ABANDONMENT OF HULL TO MANIWAKI SERVICE—GOVERNMENT ACTION

Mr. Thomas H. Lefebvre (Pontiac): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Transport about the request of CP Rail, which has announced recently that it would like to abandon service between Hull and Maniwaki.

[*English*]

Is the minister aware of this CP rail project and the negative results it would have on the Gatineau Valley, if allowed? Also, would he delegate a personal representative to the meeting, scheduled for next Tuesday, so that those interested in preventing the closure will obtain all the information they need to make their protest effective at the public hearings which will be held?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I will be glad to do so. I should say immediately that, unfortunately, the legislation under which we operate makes it necessary for applications for abandonment to be made in order that the CTC may consider if granting a subsidy to continue the service is the proper course of action. Even if the railway hopes to get a subsidy to continue the service, it has no alternative except to apply for abandonment. This question has been of great concern in areas where such procedure has been followed and I look forward to the opportunity of changing the wording of the statute, so that the seeking of assistance and support may be an alternative to the application for abandonment. Certainly, this has been of concern in the west, as well, in connection with branch lines.

* * *

ROYAL CANADIAN MOUNTED POLICE

POSSIBILITY MR. GOYER WILL TESTIFY BEFORE COMMISSION OF INQUIRY

Mr. Stuart Leggatt (New Westminster): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Solicitor General. Yesterday the former Solicitor General, the present Minister of Supply and Services, assured the House that he would fully co-operate with the MacDonald commission. Can the Solicitor General say if the previous Solicitor General informed him of his willingness to testify in public concerning the conflict between former Commissioner Higgitt and himself relating to the events of November 7. Former Commissioner Higgitt's words were, "I would be surprised if he was not informed," whereas the former Solicitor General assures the House he was not informed. That is our information. There is an apparent conflict which I am sure the former Solicitor General and the present Solicitor General wish to resolve in public. The hon. member for Peace River suggested the Canadian public wants to be satisfied on the issue. Can the Solicitor General say if that evidence will be heard in public, if the commission inquires into that specific event?

Hon. Francis Fox (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member may recall, the Minister of Supply and Services yesterday assured the House he would co-operate fully with the commission and appear before it, if it asks him to do so. As to whether that appearance will take place in a public hearing, that matter must be determined by the commission, and I believe it is proper for the commission to determine it.

Mr. Leggatt: Mr. Speaker, I presume the Solicitor General can give us his commitment not to request that particular session to be held in camera. My supplementary concerns some information I gave the Solicitor General privately. It concerns the admission of the Five Dragons to Canada. Has the Solicitor General been able to determine if the RCMP liaison officer in Hong Kong received information from Hong Kong authorities concerning the Five Dragons, in particular Mr. Lui Lock of the Five Dragons? If so, was that information passed on to immigration authorities before those five men were admitted to Canada?

Mr. Hnatyshyn: Where is the connection? How is that a supplementary?

Mr. Fox: Mr. Speaker, I should like the hon. member—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Even with the best of goodwill I have difficulty relating the hon. member's question to his previous question. I do not think it is a supplementary.

* * *

HEALTH

HYPERLIPEMIA—GOVERNMENT ACTION TO ASSESS MEANS OF CONTROL

Mr. P. B. Rynard (Simcoe North): Mr. Speaker, my question to the Minister of National Health and Welfare arises from his recent address in Vancouver to the public health association. I always read the minister's speeches with care and interest, and that speech was about the startling and galloping increase in the incidence of heart attacks at all ages, particularly younger age groups. We have seen a 250 per cent increase in males, 25 to 44, and a 150 per cent increase in women. Since the minister is concerned about all the attendant suffering, about the deaths, disabilities, loss of earning power and sorrow, I ask, why did the minister not mention that well recognized groups of people are suffering from hyperlipemia, which may be hereditary, or from allied diseases, and how their disease is to be treated?

Hon. Marc Lalonde (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, hyperlipemia is a serious disease but there is no consensus within the medical profession on the usefulness or cost effectiveness of a nation-wide screening program for children. As I said in my speech in Vancouver, we are planning to test the best possible strategies and approaches on a limited scale and will adopt nationally only those which appear to be most promising. I can assure the hon. member that we shall look at the specific disease he mentioned, to see if it would be appropriate to institute a test project or pilot program.

Mr. Rynard: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Since blood cholesterol rises steadily from age one to age seven, why was it not considered appropriate to study children in those age groups in our schools?

● (1450)

Mr. Lalonde: I am advised, Mr. Speaker, that there is some recent evidence from animal experiments, in particular from Dr. Hahn's in Vancouver, that if newborn animals are fed low cholesterol diets they will develop excess cholesterol in later life. This particular aspect must be looked into further.

* * *

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

ROSEAU RIVER PROJECT—IDENTIFICATION OF MITIGATING WORKS

Mr. Jake Epp (Provencher): Mr. Speaker, I should like to address my question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. It concerns the discussions with his United States counterpart on the effect of the Roseau River project and specifically its effect on southeastern Manitoba. Have the mitigating works all been identified? Who will pay for the mitigating works and more important, will they prevent any adverse effects that have been identified?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I apologize to the hon. member for not having that information at hand. I will take note of the question and provide the information either in the House or in writing within a couple of days.

* * *

ROYAL CANADIAN MOUNTED POLICE

INVESTIGATION OF ALLEGED ILLEGALITIES CONNECTED WITH SALE OF NUCLEAR REACTORS—REQUEST FOR REPORT

Mr. Allan Lawrence (Northumberland-Durham): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Solicitor General. Has he received any report from the RCMP about the obviously crooked nuclear fee dealings of AECL and if he has not yet received a report, has he been kept up-to-date on the progress of the investigation in Canada, Switzerland, Italy and Argentina?

[Mr. Rynard.]

Hon. Francis Fox (Solicitor General): The answer to the first part of the question, Mr. Speaker, is yes, the investigation is an ongoing one and is progressing.

Mr. Lawrence: A supplementary question. Can the minister inform the House if he has been keeping the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources informed of the progress of this investigation?

Mr. Fox: Mr. Speaker, it is a police investigation that is in progress. Once it has come to an end, I will of course get in touch with my colleague.

* * *

TRANSPORT

REPLACEMENT FOR "WILLIAM CARSON"—POSSIBILITY AIR CANADA WILL PROVIDE ADDITIONAL SERVICE TO NEWFOUNDLAND

Mr. James A. McGrath (St. John's East): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Transport. I welcome his announcement made yesterday that there will be a judicial inquiry into the sinking of the *William Carson.* My question stems from that in a way because I want to know if a decision has been made on a replacement for the *William Carson* or if there has been a rationalization of existing modes to help clear up the backlog created as a result of the sinking of this ship and aggravated by the fact that Air Canada has reduced the number of seats available to Newfoundland this year?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, work has been going on to make sure that the demand for seats and passage for freight is provided by such movement of vessels from one route to another and additional vessels where required. This will continue. I do not know when I will be in a position to announce the final solution. Because of the nature of things we will be assessing the demand and attempting at all times to ensure that vessels are available.

Mr. McGrath: Mr. Speaker, may I by way of a supplementary and in the form of a representation ask the minister, who answers for Air Canada, if he would discuss with the President of Air Canada the possibility of providing additional seats to the province this year in light of the summer games in Newfoundland in August and especially because of the demand created by the sinking of the *William Carson*?

Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, I would imagine that Air Canada has the potential of travel to Newfoundland for the games very much in mind but I will take up the matter with the President of Air Canada in order to be sure that he has taken this into consideration.

NATIONAL BUILDING CODE

SUGGESTED AMENDMENT TO IMPROVE FIRE ESCAPE ROUTES IN HIGHRISE BUILDINGS

Mrs. Jean E. Pigott (Ottawa-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of State for Urban Affairs, may I address my question to his parliamentary secretary. With the rising population in urban centres in Canada and the increase in highrise buildings, new problems have arisen in connection with fire safety. Since the tallest ladders available to fire departments reach only between the sixth and eighth floors of most buildings and since stairway escape routes can become blocked with smoke, thus preventing safe exit, can the minister inform the House whether consideration has been given to the inclusion of improved evacuation systems in the National Building Code?

Mr. Jean-Robert Gauthier (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of State for Urban Affairs): Mr. Speaker, this matter comes under provincial jurisdiction but I will inform the minister and look into the matter.

* * *

PUBLIC BUILDINGS

PLACE DU PORTAGE—REQUEST FOR IMPROVED FIRE EXITS—GOVERNMENT ACTION

Mrs. Jean E. Pigott (Ottawa-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, may I put my supplementary question to the Minister of Public Works. Since the landscaping and architecture of the government's new complex, Place du Portage in Hull, is suspected by fire experts of inhibiting safe exit from the building in case of an emergency and since this situation seems especially critical in light of recent reports that some fire alarm bells ring seven times a day in that complex causing concern about what will happen when a genuine emergency arises, can the minister inform the House whether consideration has been given to the installation of a balcony evacuation system in Place du Portage in an effort to better protect the lives of public servants relocated in that office building? Can the minister tell the House whether the department has complied with all local fire regulations of the city of Hull and the National Building Code?

Hon. Judd Buchanan (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that the buildings do comply with the codes but we are looking at the situation. The comment vis-à-vis the landscaping is a new wrinkle, however. It is my understanding that we have met the standards as laid down and the buildings comply with them.

ENERGY

PIPELINE TREATY WITH UNITED STATES—INQUIRY AS TO IMPLEMENTATION

Mr. Gordon Ritchie (Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources. In view of the announced lobbying in Washington by the State of Alaska and El Paso, joined by Southern Gas and Tenneco, and as one of the major uncertainties of the Alcan route is that unreasonable tariffs and uncertain political actions in Canada might not be controlled, is the pipeline treaty signed, in place, and functioning?

Hon. Alastair Gillespie (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, I should like to be able to consult with my colleague, the Secretary of State for External Affairs, on the exact status of the pipeline treaty. I know there has been initialling by both sides, but whether there has been formal approval because there was an agreement, I am not in a position at the moment to indicate.

ALCAN PIPELINE—POSSIBILITY APPROVAL OF ROUTE INVOLVES EXCHANGING OIL AND GAS WITH UNITED STATES

Mr. Gordon Ritchie (Dauphin): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Does the approval of the Alcan route involve a degree of swapping and a type of continental energy exchange of oil and gas to some extent, with these products being treated as a marketable commodity in some way?

Hon. Alastair Gillespie (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, those are the kinds of questions which the National Energy Board raised in its reports and the kinds of questions Cabinet will be looking at in the weeks to come.

* * *

[*Translation*]

AIRPORTS

SUGGESTED RE-ESTABLISHMENT OF FRENCH LANGUAGE FOR VISUAL FLIGHTS AT MIRABEL

Mr. Serge Joyal (Maisonneuve-Rosemont): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct my question to the Minister of Transport. In view of the fact that Mirabel is now operating at less that 50 per cent of its capacity and that visual flights are authorized in other international airports of Canada, that the Minister of Transport sent some instructions on June 30, 1977, to the regional manager of Montreal to prohibit entirely landings and take-offs for visual flights at this airport and that the report on the investigation of bilingualism implementation for visual flights has not yet been made public, can the Minister of Transport tell the House if he would consider cancelling his instructions of June 30, 1977, providing the necessary services to Mirabel airport for visual flights and allowing pilots who hold a qualification certificate to land and take-off on visual flights at Mirabel airport?

[*English*]

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I believe the hon. member will appreciate that the current rules on the use of language in connection with air travel in the province of Quebec are subject to consideration by a commission. Tomorrow I will table an interim report. The situation in relation to Mirabel airport continues to be that only English is permitted in both VFR and IFR operations. Consideration is being given to the whole question of the future of the VFR flights in Mirabel. We have a study which indicates the wisdom of not allowing the landing and take-off of VFR flights at that airport in order that it be promoted as an ideal international airport for major aircraft. We have indicated those conclusions to the various interested associations and have requested their response. At this time that is only in relation to our indication that we would like to stop the landing and take-off of VFR flights at Mirabel. At the present time that is only done in English.

* * *

PUBLIC WORKS

COST OF MOVING DEPARTMENT OF INDUSTRY, TRADE AND COMMERCE TO NEW QUARTERS—REASON FOR ERECTING NEW BUILDING

Mr. Stan Darling (Parry Sound-Muskoka): Mr. Speaker, may I put a question to the Minister of Public Works regarding the move of the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce which his department is coordinating. The cost of moving this one small department a few yards down Sparks Street will be some $3.8 million, equivalent to the cost of hiring 300 movers for an entire year. The official reason for the cost is given as "coordination". God only knows what the cost would be if there were no coordination. Can the minister explain how it is possible for such a small move to cost so much, and is he prepared to tell the House what the full cost of moving 15,000 civil servants to Hull will be?

Hon. Judd Buchanan (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, it sounds as if the move were rather uncoordinated. I will have to check and get that information for the hon. member.

● (1500)

Mr. Darling: The new building into which Industry, Trade and Commerce will move is going to cost some $50 million. I would ask the Minister why the government built a new complex for occupancy in downtown Ottawa at the same precise time that four million square feet of office space will become vacant in downtown Ottawa? Is Public Works so incapable of planning the long range space requirements of government departments that it will build even when construction is not necessary?

Mr. Buchanan: That is blatant nonsense. The move was announced by one of my predecessors eight years ago. The intention of the government was to build these buildings, to occupy their own buildings and diminish the amount of rented space, thus getting into a better balanced position in the National Capital region. That is the policy which has been pursued and which is being carried out.

Mr. Broadbent: Mr. Speaker, I gave you notice of my intention to raise a question of privilege and I am now doing so. On June 20, replying to a question from the hon. member for Greenwood (Mr. Brewin) who raised the issue of the accountability of the RCMP to the government authority, the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) said that it was an important and serious question and that it was causing the government concern. He went on to say he was discussing this precise matter with the Solicitor General (Mr. Fox). Two days later, on June 22, the Prime Minister indicated he still believed that the Montreal break-in was "an abberation, an incident and an isolated one". He then said: "I cannot say the question of accountability has been completely settled to the satisfaction of the government."

I have cited these references to show there has been on the part of the government itself a clearly expressed concern, at least in general terms, about the issue of governmental authority being clearly established over the operations of the RCMP.

I bring to your attention the following additional information. On June 15, 1976 the parliamentary secretary to the then solicitor general reported to the House that an "investigation" had just been completed into the 1972 break-in. It is evident now that either the investigation referred to was completely superficial, as we have reason to believe was the case, or that there was some kind of cover-up by either the RCMP or the government or by both. In any case political accountability is a central aspect of the recent allegations and convictions involving wrongdoing by the RCMP which have led to the government's decision to establish a Royal Commission to look into the matter. Unfortunately, though, it is a Commission which must ignore completely, under its terms of reference, the accountability issue which the Prime Minister and other members of the cabinet have regarded as being so central to this case.

Finally, as another illustration—

Mr. Speaker: Order. The hon. member has given ample illustrations. I am waiting for something which bears on the question of privilege.

Mr. Broadbent: I shall come to that, Your Honour. I was about to cite the contradiction between statements offered by the present Minister of Supply and Services (Mr. Goyer) and by the then Commissioner of the RCMP, Mr. Higgitt as to the degree of knowledge possessed by the then solicitor general at the time of the break-in in 1972.

I submit if we are to exercise our responsibility as members of parliament in this most serious matter involving allegations and convictions for criminal wrongdoing against the RCMP and, in particular, suggestions of political incompetence, and perhaps more than that, in the exercise of political responsibility for the RCMP, we should require not only that the Royal

Commission investigate the RCMP in the narrow sense of the terms of reference, but also that it should be able to inquire into the question of political accountability, both in terms of general procedures and of the course followed in 1972 and in the alleged investigation which took place in 1976.

If Your Honour rules I have a prima facie case of privilege, I shall be happy to move a specific motion.

Mr. Speaker: As the hon. member will realize, I am sure, what he has done, in effect, is to express disagreement with the terms of reference of the Royal Commission and is questioning the value of the inquiry announced yesterday by the Solicitor General (Mr. Fox).

Despite the importance of the subject matter, that is a straight matter of debate and discussion. This subject was taken up extensively during the question period and it would be an unprecedented extension of the definition of privilege to extend the umbrella of privilege to cover a matter of straight disagreement of the sort the hon. member has raised.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Pelletier: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order to apologize to the hon. member for Wellington-Grey-Dufferin-Waterloo who asked me a question earlier concerning a recently published report. I was listening to the simultaneous interpretation and I misunderstood his question. In fact, the document is now being studied by the Department of Agriculture and, in some cases, its recommendations will be accepted by the department.

[*English*]

Mr. Beatty: On that point of order, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate the clarification which has been forthcoming from the parliamentary secretary. I must tell him, however, that I intend to ask the minister tomorrow, in the question period, for the information I sought today. I will also ask about the bilingualism program, moonlighting and the serious indictment of the senior staff of the Corporation including the allegation that "corporate senior leadership is widely viewed at all levels as being less than adequate, this feeling being more pronounced and widespread the higher one probes the corporate ladder." Perhaps the parliamentary secretary could ensure that whoever is answering for the department tomorrow is prepared to deal with that question.

Mr. Speaker: Order. A couple of days ago, the hon. member for Northumberland-Durham (Mr. Lawrence) contended, by way of a point of order, that the Minister of Supply and Services (Mr. Goyer) should be compelled to table a document following an argument put forward by the hon. member for St. John's East (Mr. McGrath) that the minister, having quoted from a letter, should be required to table it. The hon. member for St. John's East was satisfied when the minister tabled the letter, but the hon. member for Northumberland-Durham then pointed out, by way of a further submission to the Chair, that the letter contained a reference to certain enclosures and that the enclosures had not been tabled by the minister, leaving the tabling incomplete. I indicated then that if there were any

further arguments on the point I would hear them at this time, so if there are any hon. members who wish to address the Chair and advance further argument on the point I will hear them now. If not, I will make a ruling perhaps tomorrow or Monday.

• (1510)

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

Fifth report (supplementary) of Standing Committee on Transport and Communications—Mr. Campbell.

Second report of Standing Committee on Public Accounts entitled "The Polysar Report"—Mr. Lawrence.

Second report of Standing Committee on Broadcasting, Films and Assistance to the Arts—Mr. Douglas (Bruce-Grey).

[*Editor's Note: For text of above reports, see today's Votes and Proceedings.*]

* * *

ATOMIC ENERGY OF CANADA LIMITED

TABLING OF ANNUAL REPORT—STATEMENT BY MINISTER

Hon. Alastair Gillespie (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, I intend to table, with the permission of the House, the annual report, financial statements and auditor's report for the operations of Atomic Energy of Canada Limited for the fiscal year 1976-77. In so doing, I wish to draw the attention of the House to the fact that the financial statements reveal an operating deficit of $180 million. All but $10 million of this is accounted for by provision for projected losses associated with existing contracts running over the course of this and the next several years. While the full magnitude of the losses and their timing is uncertain, the company, with the concurrence of the auditors, was of the opinion that a conservative approach should be taken. Therefore full provision for possible losses has been made in the statement for the year just ended.

In assessing this report, hon. members should reflect on the nature of the nuclear energy industry in which Canada chose some years ago to be a major participant. The industry is made up largely of a few major corporations having immense resources and technical competence and competing fiercely in the international market. The objective has been to seek the broadest possible markets, thereby staking out a preferred position for future sales to maintain a continuing workload for large, highly technical design and engineering staffs.

With the success of the Pickering generating station, AECL emerged abruptly from its research and development activity to compete in this difficult international market. Foreign sales

were seen as essential for the continuity of the nuclear energy industry in Canada until the domestic market had grown to the required level. Given the nature of the competition it faced, and the rapid transition of the character of the corporation, it had always been recognized that there was considerable risk that losses would be incurred in AECL's first major foreign sale. Indeed, given the international competitive climate in the industry, it would have been surprising if this were not the case. The size of the potential loss, however, must be viewed very seriously.

Of the $170 million provision for projected losses, nearly $37 million is related to the provision of engineering services and heavy water to the domestic nuclear program. Most of this potential loss is associated with the Gentilly II reactor now being built for Hydro Quebec. Nearly all of the balance of the loss provision, about $130 million, relates to the Cordoba nuclear station in Argentina and arises in spite of the $70 to $80 million saving from last year's renegotiation of that contract. The new number makes provision for large contingency items and delay penalties.

The Corporation's serious financial situation calls for vigorous changes in both the short and long term. Additional working capital is required in this year and possibilities for its provision are now being explored. One appropriate measure would be to vest in the Company the federal government's return on AECL's investment in Ontario Hydro's Pickering power station. That investment is now achieving a substantial return because of the efficient and highly competitive nuclear power technology developed by AECL. For the longer term the board of directors has undertaken to provide the government with a proposal for a major financial restructuring of the Corporation early in the fall.

It must be recognized that the roots of the projected losses lie in management decisions taken a number of years ago and the inflationary international situation that broke upon the world in the early 1970's. When the situation first came to light I immediately took the steps appropriate for a minister in his relation with a Crown corporation to secure the major management and financial reforms that were necessary. As part of this process I moved last year to alter the composition of the board of directors to bring greater business experience to the direction of the company's affairs and closer coordination with government policies. Management consultants were brought in to advise the board and senior management on the introduction of new financial management control systems. Indeed, it was this program of reform and special audits undertaken by management which produced the figures on projected losses for uncompleted projects which I am reporting today.

In addition, a new vice-president for finance was brought in from the private sector to build a strong team of financial managers. Details of the reforms introduced so far were tabled in the public accounts committee on May 10 and have been commented on favourably by the Auditor General.

Nevertheless, the serious financial situation facing the Corporation has reinforced the board's concern to increase the commercial competence within the top level of management. To this end the board of directors recommended to me that Dr. J. S. Foster be asked to step down as president and chief executive officer and I have already acted on that proposal. It is an action which we all regret having to take. Dr. Foster is one of Canada's most distinguished nuclear engineers whose contribution to the design and development of the highly successful CANDU system has brought great credit to Canada and himself.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Gillespie: I am hopeful that the Company will continue to benefit from his pre-eminent technical knowledge and experience in the nuclear field. A committee of the board is now engaged in a search for a new president and chief executive officer with the business training and experience needed to manage AECL.

AECL has passed through a year of controversy and difficulty. It is a large company composed of many highly skilled and dedicated men and women. They have developed a unique and complex technology of which Canada is justly proud. AECL is Canada's chosen instrument in a highly competitive international industry of enormous importance not only to our future but that of people in many countries. When the situation now disclosed was first manifested the government chose to remedy it by developing a strong management team. In selecting that path I believe the government has chosen not only the fastest and most effective course but also the one which best protects the future potential of the Corporation. AECL with its revised board of directors and changes in management procedures is well on the way to remedying the problems it faces. More reforms will be decided upon by the board and implemented during the next few months under the direction of Mr. Ross Campbell, the chairman of the board of AECL, who has agreed to the recommendation of the board transmitted to me that he be requested to serve on a temporary basis as president and chief executive officer. No doubt, the public accounts committee will wish to keep abreast of the progress in this regard and I am certain that when management reports in the fall the Committee will be well satisfied with what has been accomplished.

I ask the indulgence of the House to receive the annual report in one language only, Mr. Speaker, English. The French copies will be tabled just as soon as they become available; otherwise it would, I believe, have delayed this statement of mine until after parliament had adjourned for the summer. With your permission I should like to table two copies.

Mr. Speaker: Is that agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Don Mazankowski (Vegreville): Mr. Speaker, the announcement by the minister this afternoon and the tabling of the annual report of AECL for the fiscal year 1976-77 is yet another sad chapter in the bizarre and unwieldy operations of AECL. As the story unfolds it causes further embarrassment

to Canada, and I am sure further embarrassment to the many loyal and dedicated people employed by AECL, some 6,000 in number.

● (1520)

The annual report indicates that there has been 25 years of nuclear progress. More appropriately, it has been a résumé of 25 years of nuclear fallout. The 1977 year of operation represents a $290 million drain on the taxpayers of Canada. We on this side wonder how many more disciplinary actions, how many more royal commissions, how many more royal inquiries do we need to bring out the sheer incompetence and mismanagement of this government? We have had example upon example of the denial of ministerial responsibility, examples of flip-flops, examples of stonewalling, gross examples of incompetence and waste by this administration. Surely, the time has come when the taxpayers of Canada can no longer tolerate the mismanagement and waste of public funds. Surely, the corruption which surrounds this whole fiasco must be stopped.

According to the minister's statement this afternoon, Dr. Foster has been fired for running a Crown corporation at a loss. If this is true, it makes him a remarkable individual, virtually unique in Canadian history. It is incredible in the full sense of the word because AECL has always lost money. Every year over the past decade it has managed to lose close to half a billion dollars. No one was fired and no one was even reprimanded. Now, we are told that Dr. Foster has been fired for incompetence in managing the financial affairs of AECL. It is truly amazing. That seems to be a mere trifle compared to the reasons for which Dr. Foster was not fired. He was not fired for stonewalling the Public Accounts Committee for nearly nine months. He was not fired for making totally unaccountable payments of $18.3 million. He was not fired for forgetting to check whether Shaul Eisenberg had performed any of the services he claimed he performed in the Korean deal. He was not fired for sitting on a billing of nearly $20 million for nearly a year without taking any effective action. He was not fired for his professed ignorance about the identity of the Argentine agent, despite the fact that when he was vice-president it was his division that was clearly concerned and directly responsible for that particular negotiation.

This afternoon we were told by the minister that the Cordoba nuclear station in Argentina is going to experience a loss of approximately $130 million, in spite of the negotiations of the minister which we were told saved some $70 million or $80 million. Three or four months ago the minister indicated that the loss was going to be in the order of $25 million. Whom are we to believe? Dr. Foster was not fired for his role in that particular area. According to the minister, he was fired for doing what every president of AECL has done, and that is running the financial affairs of AECL incompetently.

We on this side of the House find the minister's reasoning very hard to swallow. There are just too many coincidences involved in this whole fiasco. Coincidence No. 1—the RCMP have been investigating the deals related to the Argentine and South Korean negotiations for the past seven months. Surely, the report must be almost ready. Coincidence No. 2—the report of the Public Accounts Committee on its investigation into this sordid affair should be on its way to completion soon.

It is interesting to note that it is Dr. Foster, and not the chairman, Ross Campbell, who is carrying the can for AECL's spectacular financial incompetence. What about the role of the chairman in this whole fiasco? He was asked to come in and straighten out the affair. Is he going to be the next one to go? Will it be the minister? These are perfectly legitimate questions to which we require answers.

Last December the *Globe and Mail* editorialized this situation in this manner: "It is time for straight answers". We on this side of the House want to have some straight answers. I take it from the answer of the Solicitor General (Mr. Fox) this afternoon that he has not yet received the report of the RCMP. Has he received an interim report? When will we receive it? Is he going to present the report to the Public Accounts Committee? When can we expect it? Were any funds channelled back into Canadian hands as a result of these deals? What exactly did Eisenberg do for AECL, especially in light of the statements made by senior Korean electric officials that they had never met the man or his associates? Is the minister or his predecessor constitutionally responsible for this action? What action is being taken against the former president of AECL, namely Lorne Gray, who was the perpetrator of this mess?

Finally, in view of the rear guard action this government appears to have been waging against those who want to get to the bottom of the affair, is the government interested in knowing who got the $2½ million in slush money which went to some unknown agent in Argentina? The efforts to get to the bottom of the under-handed dealings of AECL, which surround the sale of CANDU reactors to South Korea and Argentina, have been stymied, hampered and stonewalled by this government.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Mazankowski: The government, the minister and his predecessors have been less than forthcoming in their evidence before the committee. They have been less than aggressive and obviously reluctant to ascertain who was responsible for these substantial sums of money which we suggest are tantamount to a bribe.

We want to know why the minister has approved, under section 70(1) of the Financial Administration Act, the operating budget of the corporation for the year in question. Does the minister now consider himself to be responsible for this mismanagement? More importantly, does the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) consider the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Gillespie) to be responsible for this mess? We should like to know why the estimates of $408 million were rammed through this House for the next financial year when the Auditor General clearly warned that AECL is not financially competent. Financial control and management were weak and ineffective, and in many cases, grossly inadequate.

We want to know whether the minister will implement all the Auditor General's recommendations before AECL gets another cent of taxpayers' money. We want to know what type of fundamental changes are going to take place in relationships of Crown corporations to government and to parliament—the question of total accountability of Crown corporations. There is legislation being drafted in secret, but it behooves the government to come forth and come clean with the kind of legislation it proposes to this House.

We want some answers. We want to assure the minister that we will not sit back until we get a full explanation of this whole mess. We demand that every cent of taxpayers' money invested in AECL's incompetence be fully accounted for and approved by parliament, and not channelled through some flim-flam arrangement like the one mentioned by the minister in his statement today. The minister's statement raises a lot more questions than it answers. We on this side are not going to be in a position to swallow the weak, lame-duck approach the minister has taken in this whole affair.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

• (1530)

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, when ministers make statements on motion it has been customary to make copies of their statements and any financial reports available to opposition parties 15 minutes or half an hour before the House opens. Sometimes we got them one or two hours before, if the minister was very courteous. Lately the time has been shrinking; more recently it has been ten minutes before two o'clock. We received this statement—not just the statement but the financial statement and the auditor's report—at 2.15 p.m. after the House opened, with no opportunity to check our files or look up any of the data which we might need to discuss a matter as important as this.

Mr. Paproski: You are lucky to get it even then.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): I can understand the minister's reluctance to give the opposition too much time to look at this very sorry mess for which he has tried to excuse the government in the statement which he made today. This is a statement to tell the House that in this year the Atomic Energy Corporation of Canada has lost not just $180 million but, if you add to that the appropriation by parliament for this year of another $110 million, we are talking about a loss, in so far as the Canadian taxpayer is concerned, of $290 million.

As the minister has pointed out, some $37 million of that comes as a result of the heavy water operations. If ever there was a political boondoggle, it was the heavy water plant in Glace Bay, Nova Scotia. When the government first announced that it was looking at this project, I asked the government some questions because I knew that the people who had the process had peddled it in ten or 20 countries and had been rejected by the governments in those countries on the recommendation of their top scientists.

All I got for my pains was that the President of the Privy Council (Mr. MacEachen) went down to Nova Scotia and made a broadcast in Sydney. He said over the radio that I was trying to prevent Glace Bay from getting the heavy water plant so that it could be taken out to Saskatchewan. I did not care where the plant went; I did not want the government to buy a lemon, which is what they bought, and having spent millions of dollars on the plant, they had to scrap it and start all over again. What they should have done was the kind of research which any reasonable company would have done before starting to spend a hundred million dollars on a heavy water plant.

The second item in the loss has to do with the Cordoba nuclear station in Argentina, and here again I can understand the minister when he says: "while the full magnitude of the losses and their timing is uncertain". They are certainly uncertain because let me remind the House that I think I was the first person to raise in the Committee on National Resources and Public Works the fact that the agreement with the Argentine government, in which there was no inflation clause, was going to result in a loss, I estimated, of $163 million. Dr. Foster said that was an exaggeration, it would be somewhere in the neighbourhood of $100 million, and the minister assured us, as did Dr. Foster, that the government would renegotiate the agreement and that they would knock off $70 million or $80 million. The minister has repeatedly said in the House that the final loss would be about $25 million. What do we find now? The loss is $130 million on selling the reactor.

Miss MacDonald: That is after renegotiation.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): If we keep on selling reactors in this fashion, we will go broke. The more we sell, the more we lose.

An hon. Member: Think of the turnover.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): The fact is that AECL from the very beginning has been sales oriented. I have no objection to a company being sales oriented provided it also has some financial policy and administrative controls. AECL has not had either. It entered into an agreement with reference to the nuclear station in Cordoba, Argentina, in company with Italimpianti as a partner and paid out over $2 million into a numbered bank account. The president, the chairman of the board, the minister and members of the government all tell us that they do not know to whom the money went. To take over $2 million and spend it and still say they do not know who got the money is the height of incompetence.

Some hon. Members: Resign.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): They went into an agreement with Mr. Shaul Eisenberg with reference to the construction of a nuclear plant in South Korea. I have the transcript of the interview with the president and the vice-president of the Korean Power Company in which they say repeatedly that they never saw Mr. Eisenberg; they never met

him; they never dealt with any agent at all. From the beginning they told AECL they wanted to deal directly government to government. Not only has over $18 million been paid to Mr. Eisenberg but he has a contract that, if another plant is built payment will be made to Mr. Eisenberg.

An hon. Member: Incredible.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): It is difficult to believe that a group of people who, for as long as I can remember them, claim to be the technicians of government—they might not be experts in policy but in technical and administrative matters they are highly competent—could possibly have carried on a program such as this.

I am not laying all the blame at the door of the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Gillespie). I say that for the last ten years the ministers to whom this agency has reported have been guilty of gross negligence and there should be a public inquiry into the manner in which they have been guilty of almost criminal negligence in handling public funds.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): I do not make any of these remarks with relish because I believe that there is a useful role for Crown corporations to play if the people are to have some control of the economic means by which they live. Also, a Crown corporation can be a most useful economic tool for a government. But it will only be an effective tool if there is adequate control by the minister to whom it reports and by the cabinet, if there are adequate guidelines set down with respect to the policies pursued and to the business procedures which are carried out.

Let me give a small example of the business procedure. Mr. Gray wrote to Mr. Eisenberg telling him that the board of directors had agreed to appoint him as their agent and to a contract which would pay him over $18 million. There were no minutes. Nobody on that board can remember ever having been asked by the president of the corporation about appointing Mr. Eisenberg as an agent. If Crown corporations are going to work—I believe they can work and I have played a small part in supervising the operation of some small Crown corporations—then clear administrative procedures have to be set down and there has to be adequate control and adequate accountability.

● (1540)

There must also be accountability to parliament. I have said in this House for many years that the financial statements of every Crown corporation should be referred to the relevant standing committee of the House of Commons. If the standing committee is satisfied that it examined them the year before and does not want to call officers of a particular Crown corporation, that is its decision, but there are Crown corporations being operated by the present government which have not been investigated by any standing committee of the House in years. They go on spending public funds, carrying out policies and introducing programs not only with no reference to parliament but in many cases with no reference to the minister to whom they are supposed to report. Therefore, I contend that what has happened in AECL—and it is a sad and sorry mess—will happen again and again unless legislation is introduced to provide for proper parliamentary control of all Crown corporations and the requirement of their accountability to the representatives of the people. For in the final analysis the people have to foot the bill.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Léonel Beaudoin (Richmond): Mr. Speaker, we on this side of the House are very disappointed because we have received the statement made by the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Gillespie) in English only. Moreover, the minister's secretary said this:

[*English*]

We apologize for the delay in getting this material.

Yours sincerely,

Jamie Deacey.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, we have spent nearly two and a half days in the House debating the national unity issue. These two days had been made necessary by the initiative the Quebec government has taken, namely, Bill No. 1, which deals with languages, linguistic rights and so on. Mr. Speaker, on June 25 last, I had been sitting in this House for nine years. We have been hearing the same jeremiads for nine years—apologize, waiting, and this, and that. Mr. Speaker, we have been deluding ourselves long enough. At a certain point, we are going to have to decide—excuse my temper, I am a little angry but I'll get over it—we are going to have to decide who we are and what we want to be. If the hon. minister does not know I will tell him. He can hire able public servants who are now unemployed, who are coming out of universities with degrees, Ph.D.'s in languages, to translate from English into French as fast as they can speak. Some French Canadians are bilingual. He can also hire English Canadians. There is no discrimination between the two ethnic groups. So I say that today it is an insult to this House. And then, Mr. Speaker, we sat down and listened for two days to pious wishes. Canada must be kept united. That is not possible the way things are going. To keep Canada united Anglophones, particularly Crown ministers, are going to have to accept the fact that we, French Canadians, have the right to have the translation of an English statement at the time the minister makes his statement in the House.

I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, but I find it disgusting that a minister of the Crown should have added that he could not wait for the French translation because that might delay his statement. What are French Canadians doing in this country, particularly in this place? I ask you, Mr. Speaker, what are we doing here if we are not on an equal footing with all Canadians of all languages, particularly those sitting here! This has been going on for 109 years, and I hope it is the last time a minister

does that. I am very sorry, and I respect French Canadians who want to remain as they are and well-intentioned English Canadians in this House who want Canadian unity, not for fun but for real. I respect those people and for that reason I will not answer the minister's statement. And I will add, Mr. Speaker, that in due time to prove to the minister how sincere I am I will move a motion to prove to him that we, on this side of this House as well as all right-minded members on the government side, will act differently, we will be moving a motion a little later on today under the rules of this House.

[*English*]

Mr. Mazankowski: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the minister would elaborate on this statement. At the bottom of page two the minister refers to the requirement of additional working capital, and he talks about one appropriate measure being to vest in the company the federal government's return on AECL's investment in Ontario Hydro's Pickering power station. Could the minister elaborate on that? Then perhaps I might be able to follow up with a supplementary.

Mr. Gillespie: Mr. Speaker, I would be pleased to do that, but before I do I would like to address one or two remarks to the Créditiste Party and particularly to its spokesman. I would like to tell him how very hurt I was, too, that I had to table in only one language. I can assure the hon. member that as far as I am concerned that will not happen again.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

An hon. Member: Too late.

Mr. Gillespie: I can also tell him that because I wanted to place this before the House before parliament adjourned, I took this action today.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Gillespie: On the question put by the hon. member for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski), the original arrangement was made between AECL, Ontario Hydro and the Ontario government, and it involved financing by AECL for the first two reactors at Pickering. The basis of the arrangement was that AECL would be repaid for the funds advanced according to the differential between the power costs brought about by coal versus those which were brought about by the Pickering I and Pickering II reactors. The confidence of AECL was such that when it was negotiating this arrangement with the Ontario government and with Ontario Hydro, it was prepared to say it believed it could provide reactors which would provide lower priced power than coal-fired reactors, which was the alternative the Ontario government and Ontario Hydro had at that time.

● (1550)

The arrangement was that the funds advanced would be repaid with whatever additional increment there might be in the differential between coal-fired costs and costs from the nuclear reactor. I am very happy to say that the nuclear power generated by those reactors is returning a substantial repayment to the federal government. At the present time it is not going to the credit of AECL, the Crown corporation which undertook the research and made the arrangements. The funds are coming back into the Consolidated Revenue Fund. One of the possibilities of financial restructuring is to consider the funds that we advanced as equity rather than as debt. The return of revenues would then go to the credit of the corporation where I believe they belong, rather than into the Consolidated Revenue Fund where they are perhaps lost sight of.

Mr. Mazankowski: Mr. Speaker, do I take it in a broader sense that any major financial restructuring will be brought about by legislation and not internally? We have had the financial restructuring of another Crown corporation, Air Canada, along somewhat similar lines. Is the minister contemplating bringing legislation which would provide for such major financial restructuring?

Mr. Gillespie: Mr. Speaker, I am contemplating bringing this before the House but whether in the form of legislation or whether some of those arrangements can be handled through supplementary estimates is something on which I will have to seek advice. Quite clearly parliamentary approval is going to be involved in most of the major questions. Whenever we are concerned with such matters as conversion of debt to equity, I think we are dealing with some major considerations.

Mr. Mazankowski: May I warn the minister right now, Mr. Speaker, that if he thinks he is going to bring forth the major financial restructuring of AECL through supplementary estimates, we will regard such a move as less than adequate.

Dealing specifically now with the affair of Dr. Foster, may I ask the minister if he is sure that Dr. Foster was not implicated in any way in the questionable dealings surrounding the sale of CANDU reactors to Argentina and South Korea?

Mr. Gillespie: Mr. Speaker, I want to make it clear that the recommendations which came to me from the board of directors with respect to the removal of Dr. Foster were specifically couched in language which made it clear that the reasons for the recommendation had nothing to do with any arrangement such as has been alluded to by the hon. member but were specifically and exclusively directed to the question of accountability for the financial management and control of the organization itself.

Miss MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, my question concerns Dr. Foster's dismissal for financial incompetence. If he is being held uniquely responsible in the organization for this, he is being made the scapegoat for this entire, sordid mess or can we expect further resignations or disciplinary action?

Mr. Gillespie: Mr. Speaker, first of all I think one has to make the point that Dr. Foster was president and chief executive officer, and as such had full responsibility for the day-to-day operations of the corporation, subject to the policies set forth by the board of directors. A number of changes have already taken place in the course of a year. A number of

additional personnel have been hired; a chief financial officer was hired at the beginning of this year and other additional financial people have been hired.

There has already been a significant effort to increase and improve the financial competence and financial controls of the organization. Mr. H. W. Macdonell, a member of the board of directors, heads a steering committee of consultants, directors and some officers of the corporation with a view to changing what had become a grievously inadequate system. He presented to the Public Accounts Committee a statement giving up-to-date account of matters. He was followed by the Auditor General who indicated that he believed the corporation was progressing in the right direction. He said in very forthcoming terms that he endorsed the actions of the corporation.

Miss MacDonald: My question really was whether there would be further resignations or disciplinary action. I say that in light of the minister's statement that the renegotiated contract in the Cordoba plant will result in a loss of $130 million. I want to refer him to page 3280 of *Hansard* for February 22, 1977. At that time, I raised the question of whether the loss would be in that vicinity or whether it would be the $40 million that the minister projected. I asked the minister what the upper limit of the loss would be and he replied:

That, if I understand it, is $40 million.

After an interjection he continued:

I do not know what further information the hon. member wants. All I can tell her is that I think Mr. Campbell was able to negotiate a good deal for Canada.

If the minister thinks that a $130 million loss, which he earlier stated would be only a $40 million loss, negotiated by Mr. Campbell is a good deal, does he not also consider that to be financial incompetence of a grave magnitude? If so, what is the fate of Mr. Campbell?

Mr. Gillespie: Mr. Speaker, I think it is very important to understand some of the specifics of a very complicated situation. The hon. member may recall that this was a large and complicated contract, a summary of which was placed before the Public Accounts Committee by the Auditor General. Mr. Campbell and his team were not renegotiating the language of the contract because that was never at issue. There was, unfortunately, no basis in law for seeking that kind of renegotiation but there was a basis in law for seeking renegotiation based on the numbers, on the inflationary impact that had occurred. He was successful in reducing the potential loss, for example in heavy water, by nearly $40 million and most of the balance was with respect to a new escalation provision covering Canadian goods and services on that contract.

He was not authorized, and I understand there was no basis in law for him to renegotiate the language or renegotiate the initial errors concerning estimating. Quite clearly, the estimates have proved to be inaccurate. In some cases the number of man-hours is wrong by as much as 100 per cent. Some of these man-hours had been increased because Canada imposed greater safeguards, and I am sure the hon. lady would be one of the first to endorse that approach. Under the contract that was negotiated with Argentina, however, we had no basis on which to renegotiate the terms to recover the greater costs associated with safeguard initiatives which Canada took, supported by the opposition parties in this House.

Where the errors seem to have occurred were in the language—in some cases rather loose language—of the contract. This was the first internationl contract of its kind. There were errors in the estimating. The second error which we moved to anticipate a year ago, was the inadequacy with respect to matters of financial control. It was not until sometime after we had finalized it that I was able to ascertain this.

• (1600)

Mr. Mazankowski: What a Mickey Mouse operation this is.

Mr. Gillespie: Mr. Speaker, I am not trying to defend inadequacies. Clearly, I have been on the other side pushing for a change.

Mr. Mazankowski: How does the Minister of Finance (Mr. Macdonald) feel? What a Mickey Mouse operation.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Disneyland is a successful operation.

Mr. Gillespie: I am also trying to be forthright and explain a situation concerning a corporation which is most important to Canada.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Perhaps we can conclude this questioning after I recognize the hon. member for Kingston and the Islands (Miss MacDonald) for a supplementary question, and the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands (Mr. Douglas).

Miss MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, my question will be brief, and I ask for a brief answer. After the chairman of AECL, Mr. Campbell, returned from renegotiating the deal in Cordoba, Argentina, did he tell the minister the loss had been reduced to $40 million?

Mr. Gillespie: The information I gave the House is based upon information I received from senior officers of the corporation. The loss, according to the information I gave the House, was between $23 million and $38 million. I believe those figures are on record. The hon. lady once mentioned $40 million. I did not take issue with that $40 million figure. The House knows the range of figures I was given.

Miss MacDonald: Did you get that information from Mr. Campbell?

Mr. Gillespie: Mr. Speaker, I cannot say if it came from Mr. Campbell or Mr. Foster. It came from a senior officer. Both Mr. Foster and Mr. Campbell were involved in the renegotiations, as the hon. lady no doubt knows.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, since the minister said that the loss at the nuclear station at

Cordoba, Argentina, is anticipated to be $130 million, despite between $70 million and $80 million having been written off, are we to assume that under the original agreement AECL signed with the government of Argentina the loss, before renegotiation, would have amounted to between $200 million and $210 million?

Mr. Gillespie: Mr. Speaker, one can say, from hindsight, that if the contract entered into by AECL and the Argentinian agency had not been renegotiated, the loss would have been of the order the hon. member mentioned.

Mr. Mazankowski: Including agents' fees?

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. The minister said the report he received from those who reviewed the activities of AECL gave Dr. Foster a clean bill of health with respect to any questionable relationships concerning the renegotiated agreements. Is the same true about Mr. Lorne Gray, who was largely responsible for negotiating those agreements? I think a moment ago I talked of Dr. Foster. Actually, Mr. Gray negotiated most of these agreements. Has the minister's investigation considered that aspect of it, and does it give Mr. Lorne Gray the same clean bill of health which those who looked into this matter have given Dr. Foster?

Mr. Gillespie: Mr. Speaker, I made clear in my statement earlier that there had been managerial deficiencies going back many years. Undoubtedly, as I told the hon. lady for Kingston and the Islands (Miss MacDonald), the original contract was poorly written. It was also based on poor estimates. Most of this was done some years, certainly some months, before Dr. Foster took over as chief executive officer of the corporation.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): A final supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. The minister has not really answered my question. I am not talking about incompetence or lack of judgment in the making of estimates. I am following up on questions the hon. member for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski) asked. Large sums of money, for which we cannot account, changed hands. The public accounts committee cannot account for them; the minister cannot account; nobody in AECL can account for these moneys. Naturally, one wants to know where this money went. It is perfectly clear that Dr. Foster has a clean bill of health with respect to any questionable practices. I ask the minister this question: Has he investigated, and can he give the House the same assurance about Mr. Lorne Gray?

Mr. Gillespie: Mr. Speaker, I am glad the hon. member made that point clear. The investigation is being conducted by the RCMP. I have not directed the RCMP to investigate any persons in connection with the series of transactions to which the hon. member alluded.

Mr. Paproski: You had best ask Goyer about that.

[Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands).]

Mr. Gillespie: I can tell the hon. member that I have no reason to believe Dr. Foster in any way was involved in any improper action.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): What about Mr. Gray?

Mr. Gillespie: Nor have I received information showing Mr. Gray was involved in any way in improper actions.

Mr. Symes: What about other officials?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

* * *

[*English*]

ANTI-INFLATION ACT

MEASURE TO EXTEND RANGE OF PERSONS TO WHOM ANTI-INFLATION GUIDELINES APPLY

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-59, to amend the Anti-Inflation Act.

Motion agreed to, bill read the first time and ordered to be printed.

* * *

[*Translation*]

HOUSE OF COMMONS

MOTION TO ADJOURN

Mr. Léonel Beaudoin (Richmond): Mr. Speaker, because the government makes fun of national unity by not allowing the House to work in the two official languages, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Témiscamingue (Mr. Caouette):

That this House do now adjourn.

Mr. Speaker: Order. The question is on the motion of the hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Beaudoin) and seconded by the hon. member for Témiscamingue (Mr. Caouette): That this House do now adjourn. Does the House adopt said motion?

Some hon. Members: Yes.

Some hon. Members: No.

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

Some hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Speaker: All those opposed to the motion will please say nay.

Some hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.
And more than five members having risen:

Mr. Speaker: Call in the members.

The House divided on the amendment (Mr. Beaudoin) which was negatived on the following division:

● (1610) *(Division No. 73)*

YEAS

Messrs.

Baker (Grenville-Carleton)	Fairweather	Mazankowski
Beatty	Firth	McCain
Beaudoin	Friesen	McCleave
Brewin	Gilbert	McGrath
Brisco	Grafftey	McKenzie
Broadbent	Halliday	Mitges
Cadieu	Hargrave	Muir
Caouette (Villeneuve)	Hnatyshyn	Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich)
Caouette (Témiscamingue)	Hogan	Neil
Clark (Rocky Mountain)	Huntington	Orlikow
Coates	Jarvis	Paproski
Crosbie	Jelinek	Patterson
Darling	Johnston	Peters
Dick	Kempling	Pigott (Mrs.)
Dionne (Kamouraska)	Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre)	Ritchie
Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands)	La Salle	Rodriguez
Ellis	Lawrence	Rondeau
Epp	Leggatt	Rynard
	MacDonald (Miss) (Kingston and the Islands)	Stanfield
	Malone	Stevens
	Marshall	Symes
		Towers
		Whiteway
		Whittaker
		Wise—64.

NAYS

Messrs.

Andras (Port Arthur)	Dupras	MacDonald (Cardigan)
Andres (Lincoln)	Ethier	Macdonald (Rosedale)
Appolloni (Mrs.)	Faulkner	MacEachen
Baker (Gander-Twillingate)	Fleming	MacFarlane
Bégin (Miss)	Fox	Martin
Blais	Francis	McIsaac
Blaker	Gauthier (Ottawa-Vanier)	McRae
Blouin	Gendron	Milne
Boulanger	Gillespie	Munro (Hamilton East)
Breau	Goodale	Nicholson (Miss)
Buchanan	Goyer	O'Connell
Caccia	Gray	Olivier
Cafik	Guay (St. Boniface)	Parent
Campagnolo (Mrs.)	Haidasz	Pearsall
Campbell (LaSalle-Émard-Côte Saint-Paul)	Harquail	Philbrook
Clermont	Herbert	Pinard
Comtois	Hopkins	Portelance
Corriveau	Jamieson	Poulin
Cullen	Kaplan	Railton
Cyr	Lajoie	Reid
Danson	Lalonde	Roberts
Daudlin	Lamontagne	Robinson
Dawson	Lang	Sauvé (Mrs.)
Dionne (Northumberland-Miramichi)	Langlois	Savard
Douglas (Bruce-Grey)	Lapointe	Sharp
Drury	Lavoie	Stanbury
Duclos	Leblanc (Laurier)	Stollery
Dupont	LeBlanc (Westmorland-Kent)	Tessier
	Lefebvre	Trudel
	Loiselle (Saint-Henri)	Turner
	Lumley	Watson
		Wood
		Yanakis—92.

● (1650)

Mr. Speaker: I declare the motion lost.

* * *

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

Order Paper Questions

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, the following questions will be answered today: Nos. 1,527, 1,775, 2,156, 2,219, 2,231, 2,276, 2,329, 2,354 (revised), 2,403, 2,411, 2,471, 2,472, 2,473, 2,474, 2,537 and 2,717.

[*Text*]

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORT—EMPLOYEES FROM PRIVATE EMPLOYMENT AGENCIES

Question No. 1,527—**Mr. McKenzie:**

1. Has the Department of Transport obtained (a) part-time (b) full-time employees from private employment agencies in (i) British Columbia (ii) Alberta (iii) Saskatchewan (iv) Manitoba (v) Ontario (vi) Quebec (vii) New Brunswick (viii) Nova Scotia (ix) Prince Edward Island (x) Newfoundland and, if so, in each case, how many?

2. Are such employees paid from supplementary estimates and, if not, from what estimates are they paid?

3. By province, what was the (a) average hourly rate paid to employment agencies (b) average hourly rate paid to employees (c) total amount paid by the Department in (i) 1975 (ii) 1976?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): 1. (a) Yes.

		1975-76
(i)	British Columbia	67
(ii)	Alberta	17
(iii)	Saskatchewan	Nil
(iv)	Manitoba	33
(v)	Ontario	769
(vi)	Quebec	273
(vii)	New Brunswick	Nil
(viii)	Nova Scotia	17
(ix)	Prince Edward Island	Nil
(x)	Newfoundland	Nil

(b) Yes.	1975-76
(i)	Nil
(ii)	Nil
(iii)	Nil
(iv)	Nil
(v)	63
(vi)	25
(vii)	Nil
(viii)	Nil
(ix)	Nil
(x)	Nil

2. No. Paid from Main Estimates.

3. (a)

	(i)	(ii)
British Columbia	$5.05	$5.85
Alberta	4.09	4.70
Manitoba	4.45	5.11
Ontario	5.58	6.23
Quebec	4.80	5.51
Nova Scotia	3.82	5.38

(b) Not available from our records. This information is known only to the private employment agency and its employees.

(c)	(i)	(ii)
British Columbia	$ 14,472	$ 36,679
Alberta	8,672	14,539
Manitoba	20,645	16,743
Ontario	863,565	1,221,348
Quebec	134,301	388,897
Nova Scotia	11,147	9,935

Order Paper Questions

CBC OBJECTIVES

Question No. 1,775—**Mr. Herbert:**

1. Is one of the sub-objectives of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation "to contribute to the development of national unity..." and, if so, are there expressions of discontent that CBC may not be conforming to this objective?

2. Is the sub-objective "... should provide reasonable, balanced opportunity for the expression of different views on matters of public concern.", considered to conflict with the sub-objective quoted in Part 1 and, if so, in what manner is it proposed to resolve this conflict?

Hon. John Roberts (Secretary of State): I am informed by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation as follows: 1. The Broadcasting Act states that the national broadcasting service should "contribute to the development of national unity and provide for a continuing expression of Canadian identity". The question of the CBC and its contribution to the development of national unity has recently been a topic of public discussion.

2. No. In its general programming—drama, music, biographies and documentaries—the CBC contributes to the development of national unity by reflecting and interpreting Canada to Canadians. Communication between the different peoples and regions of the country is the key to achieving this goal. That communication is maintained and strengthened not only through the physical network of communications that the CBC has built up across Canada, but more particularly through the content of programmes. Mutual understanding and an appreciation of the cultural diversity of the various regions of Canada is fostered through these programmes, programmes which celebrate Canada's greatness as well as reflecting on its problems. The current affairs programming of the CBC, on the other hand, has as its objective informing Canadians about the underlying issues confronting them—analyzing these issues and reflecting different perspectives on them in order that Canadians might better decide how to resolve such issues. The CBC sees this contribution to knowledge and understanding as being consistent with that part of the mandate which calls for a "reasonable, balanced opportunity for the expression of differing views on matters of public concern". In the area of news programming the role of the CBC is to inform Canadians of major news events on the national, international and local levels. An informed Canadian public, again, is in a better position to take the decisions which must be taken by them in determining the economic, political and cultural future of the country.

CNR INVESTMENT IN THE CAST GROUP OF COMPANIES

Question No. 2,156—**Mr. Forrestall:**

1. (a) How many (i) Board of Directors meetings (ii) other meetings pertaining to business affairs of the CAST Group of Companies were attended by Dr. R. A. Bandeen or his representative since Canadian National Railways invested money in the Group (b) in what locations were the meetings held (c) what Companies paid the travel expenses of Dr. Bandeen (d) how many days of Dr. Bandeen's time were occupied on each occasion?

2. With reference to the answer to Question No. 1,248, what specific indirect benefits accrued to CNR from its investment in the CAST Group of Companies?

[Mr. Lang.]

3. Under what conditions can the capital invested by CNR in the Group be withdrawn?

4. For (a) 1974 (b) 1975 (c) 1976, what was the amount paid by the Group to CNR for rail services in North America?

5. Did the Board of Directors of the Group approve the move of that Group's operations in whole or in part from the Port of Montreal to the Port of Halifax and, if so, did Dr. R. A. Bandeen concur in this decision and for what reason?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): The Management of Canadian National Railways advises as follows: 1. Canadian National Railway Company advises that since it is but a minority shareholder it would be improper to divulge information relative to the business affairs of the CAST group. Since Dr. Bandeen was appointed to the board he has attended three Directors Meetings and several other meetings. This has involved less than one week of his time. The CAST group is responsible for out of pocket expenses associated with such meetings.

2. There has been a very substantial increase in the total number of containers handled by CN.

3. Upon the sale of its shares.

4. It is not the policy of CN to divulge by specific Companies the amounts of its revenues.

5. It would be improper to give details of the internal management of companies comprising the CAST group.

CAST NORTH AMERICA LIMITED—LOCATION OF OPERATIONS

Question No. 2,219—**Mr. Forrestall:**

Did the government or any of its agencies exercise influence over CAST North America Limited to maintain its port operations in Montreal rather than Halifax and, if so (a) in what manner (b) through what individual, department or agency was such influence exercised?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): No, the government or any of its agencies did not exercise influence over CAST North America Limited to maintain its port operations in Montreal rather than Halifax; (a) Not applicable; (b) Not applicable.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORT—VALUE OF CONSTRUCTION WORK

Question No. 2,231—**Mr. Herbert:**

In each of the past five years, what was the value of construction work carried out by the Department of Transport?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): In each of the past five years, the value of construction work, including capital expenditures from the Airports Revolving Fund, is as follows:

Fiscal Year	Amount
1972-73	$ 80,175,042
1973-74	126,243,029
1974-75	179,409,151
1975-76	167,273,403
1976-77 (to March 31/77)	161,485,317
	$714,585,942

CBC MEMBERS SENT TO TORONTO BLUE JAYS BASEBALL CLUB'S TRAINING CAMP IN FLORIDA

Question No. 2,276—**Mr. Cossitt:**

1. Did CBC send 26 members of its staff to the Toronto Blue Jays Baseball Club's training camp in Florida and, if not, what was the exact number?

2. What are all the reasons such a number of personnel were assigned to cover this event?

3. How many represented the (a) English (b) French network?

4. What was the total cost to CBC of all aspects of this assignment including the cost of (a) transportation (b) accommodation, food and drink (c) wages?

Hon. John Roberts (Secretary of State): I am informed by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation as follows: 1. No. English Services television and radio, 16. The French Services Division had a crew of six in Florida to prepare programmes on the Montreal Expos training camp, after which they spent a day covering the Toronto Blue Jays training camp.

2. English Services: TV—to prepare a one-hour network special (fully paid for by its sponsor), a half-hour Toronto local special, sports and news items several times a day for national, Toronto local and syndication use; Radio—to prepare items for national sports and news programmes. French Services: see answer to part 1 above. TV—the crew prepared three network items on the Blue Jays. Radio-news from the Blue Jays camp was added to daily reports from the Expos camp.

3. See answer to part 1 above.

4. It has not been customary to require the CBC to provide such details of its internal management and administration as salaries and costs incurred in preparing programmes. The background to this custom is explained in detail in the reply to question No. 2,530, May 22, 1975.

AIRPORTS—OPERATING SURPLUS OR DEFICIT

Question No. 2,329—**Mr. Stevens:**

For each year 1971 to 1976, what was the operating surplus or deficit for (a) Toronto International Malton Airport (b) Montreal International Dorval Airport (c) Vancouver International Airport (d) Calgary International Airport (e) Winnipeg International Airport (f) Montreal International Mirabel Airport (g) Ottawa International Airport?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport):

Operating Surplus (Deficit)
1970-71 to 1975-76
($000's)

	(a) Malton	(b) Dorval	(c) Vancouver	(d) Calgary	(e) Winnipeg	(f) Mirabel	(g) Ottawa
1970-71	4,698	5,075	(2,920)	(593)	(2,309)	—	(2,321)
1971-72	3,521	3,953	(3,197)	(822)	(2,644)	—	(2,654)
1972-73	3,591	5,035	(2,668)	(892)	(2,943)	—	(2,864)
1973-74	540	5,847	(2,224)	(1,361)	(2,800)	—	(3,207)
1974-75	4,675	6,706	(2,762)	(2,491)	(4,212)	—	(3,870)
1975-76	15,288	9,669	1,845	(2,744)	(2,137)	(18,382)*	(3,129)

* Period December 1, 1975 to March 31, 1976.

Order Paper Questions

TANKERS CALLING AT PORTS IN QUEBEC

Question No. 2,354—**Mr. Forrestall:** (Revised)

1. During (a) January (b) February (c) March 1976, what percentage of the total number of vessels calling at the Port of (i) Quebec (ii) Trois Rivières (iii) Montreal, to load or discharge cargo, were tankers?

2. How many square feet of National Harbours Board shedded area is currently available at (a) Montreal (b) Quebec (c) Halifax (d) Saint John?

3. For the year (a) 1975 (b) 1976, what was the total volume of general cargo shipped over piers associated with the sheds, excluding facilities used primarily for container handling?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): The National Harbours Board advises as follows: 1.

	(a) January 1976	(b) February 1976	(c) March 1976
(i) Quebec	50%	52%	48%
(ii) Trois-Rivières	30%	50%	18%
(iii) Montreal	32%	34%	30%

2. (a) Montreal, 2,870,454 square feet; (b) Quebec, 599,300 square feet; (c) Halifax, 760,604 square feet; (d) Saint-John, 813,665 square feet.

3. (Revised).

	Cargo handled through transit sheds (a) 1975 (Tons)	(b) 1976 (Tons)
Montreal	1,203,612	1,390,042
Quebec	160,846	280,739
Halifax	455,831	387,382
Saint John	974,903	977,695

QUOTAS FOR RAPESEED

Question No. 2,403—**Mr. Hnatyshyn:**

Is it the intention of the Minister in charge of the Wheat Board to guarantee minimum quotas for rapeseed, as is the case for the three major grains, as recommended by the Prairie Rapeseed Growers Council at their recent meeting in Vancouver?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): In so far as the Canadian Wheat Board is concerned: On May 20, opening delivery quotas for rapeseed, flaxseed and rye were announced for the coming 1977-78 crop year. The Canadian Wheat Board will establish quotas on August 1, 1977 of eight bushels per assigned acre for the delivery of rapeseed, flaxseed and rye to primary elevators. The initial quota for the delivery of rapeseed and flaxseed to crushing plants will be 20 bushels per assigned acre, while the opening quota for deliveries of rye to distillers will be 15 bushels per assigned acre. In future years the initial quotas for these three crops will be announced in

March, prior to seeding, at the same time that the minimum guaranteed quota levels for wheat, oats and barley are established. In addition to a guaranteed minimum eight bushel quota for rapeseed before October 1 of the crop year, the Prairie Rapeseed Growers Council had also recommended that there be guaranteed quota increases at certain times during the crop year to a minimum final quota level of 30 bushels per acre or an open quota. However, it is not considered practical for the Canadian Wheat Board to guarantee the establishment of a minimum 30 bushel quota for rapeseed. The amount of rapeseed that producers can deliver ultimately depends on the success of the trade in marketing rapeseed and rape oil and meal. Consequently, further adjustments during the crop year above the eight bushel quota level for rapeseed will be made by the Board when and at such time as they are warranted by domestic and export demand.

POSSIBLE BENEFITS TO POORER PROVINCES FROM TRANSFER OF TAX POINTS

Question No. 2,411—**Mr. Howie:**

Will the transfer of tax points, plus the benefits of equalization formula and tax grants, provide the poorer provinces with the funds to maintain health, hospital and secondary education services at the same level as in the wealthier provinces and catch up in those areas where such services are below the comparable level in wealthier provinces or is the catch up feature to be the subject of another agreement or another programme?

Mr. Bob Kaplan (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Finance): Yes. Two aspects of the federal-provincial fiscal arrangements are relevant here. The first is the equalization programmes and the second is the established programmes financing programme. Taken together, these programs ensure that all provinces are in a position to provide comparable services in the areas of hospital insurance, medicare and post-secondary education. The purpose of the equalization programme, under which provincial revenues from own sources are equalized to the national average, is to ensure that all provinces can provide a reasonable standard of basic public services without having to resort to levels of taxation significantly above the national average. The purpose of the established programmes financing arrangements is to assist the provinces in the financing of the so-called "established" programmes. Federal contributions take the form of a mix of cash and tax transfers. These arrangements are designed to increase the fiscal flexibility of the provinces and to eliminate the per capita differences which existed under the prior, shared-cost arrangements. Fiscal flexibility is achieved through a tax transfer equalized to the national average; per capita differences in programmes costs are eliminated through levelling adjustment payments designed to ensure that all provinces receive equal per capita grants within five years. Hence, a "catch-up" feature has been built into the new arrangements. It is also worth noting that all provinces are better off financially than they would have been had the prior, shared-cost arrangements continued. For example, by the year 1981-82, the transfer under the new arrangements is estimated to be $10.5 billion, while the transfer under the old shared-cost arrangements would have been approximately $8.7 billion.

[Mr. Lang.]

OXFAM-CANADA

Question No. 2,471—**Mr. Brisco:**

1. As of April 1, 1977, is OXFAM-Canada registered as a Canadian charitable organization with the Department of National Revenue?

2. Are donations to OXFAM-Canada tax deductible within the provisions of paragraph 110 (1)(a) of the Income Tax Act?

3. (a) What is the location and address of the head office of OXFAM-Canada (b) who are the present registered members of the Board?

4. Are there any patrons of OXFAM-Canada and, if so, who are they?

5. Did the Secretary of State respond to the concerns expressed by certain members of the Board of the Western Region of OXFAM on their resignation, when they wrote to the Secretary of State regarding the political education projects of OXFAM and, if so, what was the nature of the response?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): I am informed by the Departments of National Revenue, Consumer and Corporate Affairs and Secretary of State as follows: 1. Yes.

2. Yes.

3. According to information filed by the company as at March 31, 1976, (a) the location and address of the head office of OXFAM-Canada are: location: Ottawa, Ontario; address: 251 Laurier St. W., Suite 301, Ottawa, Ontario K1P 5J6. (b) The members of the Board of Directors are: Muriel Duckworth, 6250 South Street, Halifax, Nova Scotia; Peter Bietenholz, 117 Albert Avenue, Saskatoon, Saskatchewan; Mike Bradfield, 6324 Cornwall Street, Halifax, Nova Scotia; Meyer Brownstone, 57 Poplar Plains Road, Toronto, Ontario; Mac Freeman, Queen's University, Faculty of Education, Duncan McArthur Hall, Kingston, Ontario; Jonathan Forbes, Development Education Centre, 121 A Avenue Road, Toronto, Ontario; Irving Greenberg, 11 Clemow Avenue, Ottawa, Ontario; Theo Hills, 35 de Bretagne, St-Lambert, Quebec; John Loxley, Legislative Building, Room 338, Winnipeg, Manitoba; Charlotte Maxwell, 37 Burnside Drive, Toronto, Ontario; Ralph Miller, Department of Education Foundations, Faculty of Education, University of Calgary, Alberta; Vern Ratzlaff, 77 Henderson Highway, Winnipeg, Manitoba; Bill Saul, Ogilvy & Mather (Canada) Ltd., 88 University Avenue, Toronto, Ontario; David Thompson, 143 Pleasant Street, St. John's, Newfoundland; Ed Wellwood, 6th Avenue—R.R. # 1, Okanagan Falls, B.C; John Williams, 7 Newton Road, St. John's, Newfoundland; Bob White, 37 Amelia Street, Toronto, Ontario.

4. The information requested may be obtained directly from OXFAM-Canada.

5. The Department of the Secretary of State can find no record of this correspondence.

AIR CANADA FLIGHTS FROM FREDERICTON TO SAINT JOHN, NEW BRUNSWICK

Question No. 2,472—**Mr. Howie:**

1. On (a) April 20 (b) April 27, 1977, how many flights were made by Air Canada from Fredericton to Saint John, New Brunswick?

2. In each case, how many seats were available for passengers travelling from Fredericton and how many were filled?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): The management of Air Canada advises as follows: 1. (a) One. (b) Two.

2. (a) 75 seats available, 44 passengers. (b) 75 seats available, 36 passengers; 102 seats available, 34 passengers.

NUMBER OF DIRECT FLIGHTS BY AIR CANADA TO FREDERICTON

Question No. 2,473—**Mr. Howie:**

1. On (a) April 20 (b) April 27, 1977, what was the total number of direct flights made by Air Canada to Fredericton, New Brunswick from (i) Montreal (ii) Quebec City (iii) Toronto and, in each case, what were the departure times and what were the arrival times in Fredericton, New Brunswick?

2. How many seats were available for Fredericton bound passengers on each flight and how many were filled?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): The management of Air Canada advises as follows: 1. (a) (i) Three: AC674 Dep. 0810 Arv. 1055; AC640 Dep. 0920 Arv. 1120; AC660 Dep. 1455 Arv. 1655. (ii) One: AC674 Dep. 0910 Arv. 1055. (iii) Two: AC640 Dep. 0700 Arv. 1120; AC642 Dep. 1015 Arv. 1250. (b) (i) Two: AC674 Dep. 0810 Arv. 1055; AC660 Dep. 1450 Arv. 1650. (ii) One: AC674 Dep. 0910 Arv. 1055. (iii) One: AC642 Dep. 0905 Arv. 1140.

2. (a) (i) 75 seats available, 50 passengers; 75 seats available, 30 passengers; 102 seats available, 30 passengers. (ii) 75 seats available, 28 passengers. (iii) 75 seats available, 64 passengers; 95 seats available, 37 passengers. (b) (i) 75 seats available, 75 passengers; 102 seats available, 34 passengers. (ii) 75 seats available, 57 passengers. (iii) 102 seats available, 60 passengers.

DIRECT FLIGHTS BY AIR CANADA FROM FREDERICTON

Question No. 2,474—**Mr. Howie:**

1. On (a) April 20 (b) April 27, 1977, how many direct flights were made by Air Canada from Fredericton, New Brunswick to (i) Montreal (ii) Quebec City (iii) Toronto?

2. How many seats were available for passengers travelling from Fredericton and how many were filled?

3. What was the weight of the cargo in each case?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): The management of Air Canada advises as follows: 1. (a) (i) Three. (ii) One. (iii) Two. (b) (i) Two. (ii) One. (iii) Two.

2. (a) (i) 252 seats available. 139 passengers; (ii) 75 seats available. 46 passengers; (iii) 197 seats available. 84 passengers; (b) (i) 177 seats available. 145 passengers; (ii) 75 seats available. 45 passengers; (iii) 204 seats available. 173 passengers.

3. (a) (i) Total 767 pounds; (ii) Total 5 pounds; (iii) Total 574 pounds. (b) (i) Total 770 pounds; (ii) Total 7 pounds; (iii) Total 605 pounds.

DRAGGER FISHERY

Question No. 2,537—**Mr. McCleave:**

1. Has the Department of the Environment (Fisheries) received a suggestion from any group of Nova Scotian fishermen that "grandfather" rights be placed on small draggers operating within the fifty-mile territorial sea and, if so, from which groups?

2. Would such a proposal remove all draggers, eventually, from operating inside such a sea and, if so, what type of vessel would be left to operate in the sea?

3. What consideration is being given to the request from inshore fishermen?

Mr. Jim Fleming (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Fisheries and the Environment): 1. If the question refers to the claim of some inshore fishermen in Nova Scotia for an exclusive fishing zone of 50 miles, the department has not received a suggestion from any group of Nova Scotia fishermen that "grandfather"rights be placed on small draggers operating within such a zone, were it to be established, but the Guysborough County Fishermen's Association has proposed that all groundfish draggers be phased out, and that no new groundfish dragger construction be permitted.

2. As indicated, the department has not received such a proposal. If draggers were excluded from prosecuting fisheries within 50 miles of our coast, then only vessels operating in the hook and line, trap, or gill-net fishery would be allowed to fish in this area.

3. The drawing of arbitrary lines is not at this time seen to be necessary. However, because of the high priority attached to the interests of the near shore fishermen, the protection of those interests is under continual review by regional officials. Should exclusive areas be required in future to ensure the livelihood of near shore fishermen, action would then be taken to provide for this.

ATLANTIC PILOTAGE AUTHORITY—SALARIES

Question No. 2,717—**Mr. Robinson:**

What is the salary of the (a) Executive (b) Director (c) Chairman (d) Vice-Chairman (e) board members of the Atlantic Pilotage Authority?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): (a) Not applicable; (b) not applicable; (c) $27,500.0—$36,500; (d) not applicable; (e) $75 for each day engaged on the business of the authority.

* * *

[*English*]

QUESTION PASSED AS ORDER FOR RETURN

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, if question No. 2,009 could be made an order for return, this return would be tabled

immediately. The reason, once again, is the lengthy nature of the answer.

[*Text*]

SECRETARY OF STATE FOR EXTERNAL AFFAIRS—PRODUCTION OF MOVIE FILM

Question No. 2,009—**Mr. Crosbie:**

1. Did the Secretary of State for External Affairs have produced a movie film in colour, during the present financial year, containing his season's greetings to external affairs staff at diplomatic and consular posts around the world and, if so, how many prints were made and to how many diplomatic or consular posts were they shipped?

2. Was the film produced in colour by Crawley Films Limited, Ottawa and, if not, by whom?

3. What was the amount paid by the government for the film including all costs in connection with the making of prints and shipping them around the world?

4. How long does the film take to screen and will the government Table a transcript of the dialogue?

5. Has the Department or any former Secretary of State for External Affairs produced such a film in the past and (a) if so (i) in what year (ii) which Secretaries of State (b) if not, in what manner were season's greetings conveyed to the staff around the world and what was the cost for the last year in which such greetings were sent?

6. During the fiscal year 1976-77, did any other cabinet Minister send Christmas greetings or a Christmas message to departmental staff or to anyone by way of a film production and, if so, in each case (a) what was his/her name (b) what was the cost (c) to whom?

Return tabled.

[*English*]

Mr. Goodale: I ask, Mr. Speaker, that the remaining questions be allowed to stand.

Mr. Brisco: Mr. Speaker, I will continue to raise this issue with the parliamentary secretary until I receive a positive and appropriate response as to why question No. 506, which has been on the order paper since October 14, standing in my name, containing very simple inquiries has not been answered in spite of the promises the parliamentary secretary has made to me. I would like a reasonable response from him.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[*English*]

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED

Mr. Speaker: Order. It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 40, to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: the hon. member for Ottawa-Carleton (Mrs. Pigott)—Urban Affairs—Allegation government owes taxes to municipality of Ottawa-Carleton—Government action; the hon. member for Parkdale (Mr. Haidasz)—Consumer Affairs—Possibility of prohibiting use of asbestos fibres in preparation of food and beverages; the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Philbrook)—Finance—Taxing of benefits from life insurance policies—Government action.

Order, please. The House yesterday came to an agreement that two hours would be allocated today for the termination of the debate on national unity; that if the House were to begin that debate prior to four o'clock, it would end in two hours' time; and that if the House were to begin the debate after four o'clock—which is the case today—two continuous hours should be allocated to the debate.

● (1700)

Therefore, pursuant to that agreement the debate will conclude at two minutes past seven. Furthermore, I should call to the attention of hon. members that the description of that agreement which is contained in *Votes and Proceedings* is not entirely in accord with the description of it as put by the President of the Privy Council yesterday. I simply want to clarify for the record that the interpretation I put on it today is clearly the one that the House agreed to yesterday, and it is slightly different from that described in *Votes and Proceedings*. On the basis of that agreement we will now proceed to the debate on that motion.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Caouette (Témiscamingue): I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Témiscamingue on a point of order.

Mr. Caouette (Témiscamingue): Yes, I rise on a point of order. I want to advise the House that concerning the continuation of the debate on national unity this afternoon, in view of the strong position the ministers took by refusing to give us a French copy . . .

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. This question has already been raised by the hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Beaudoin). Now, it is simply in order to give the floor to the hon. member for Hamilton Mountain (Mr. MacFarlane) and to conclude that debate.

Mr. Caouette (Témiscamingue): On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Témiscamingue on a point of order.

Mr. Caouette (Témiscamingue): In the circumstances, we refuse to take part in the debate on national unity, and hon. members of the Social Credit Party of Canada leave the House immediately.

[*English*]

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I thought the point of order, if there was one, was disposed of. I hope the government House leader has now gathered himself together sufficiently so that he can indicate the business for tonight, if we reach it, for tomorrow and perhaps for next week.

Mrs. Sauvé: Mr. Speaker—

Some hon. Members: Sit down.

Mr. Speaker: I believe the minister is seeking the floor on the point of order raised by the hon. member for Témiscamingue.

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Sauvé: Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words about the point of order raised by the interim leader of the Social Credit Party.

Some hon. Members: No!

Mrs. Sauvé: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker—

[*English*]

An hon. Member: Mr. Speaker disposed of that point of order.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Témiscamingue rose on a point of order, which I indicated obviously was not a point of order. He continued to indicate to the House that the Social Credit members were withdrawing, which is not a point of order. It is not relevant to the subject which has now been called for debate and upon which the hon. member for Hamilton Mountain has been recognized. I think we should continue with that debate. However, the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton did raise a fresh point of order concerning House business.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, never in my life have I seen the other side so confused.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): My question is very simple. The government House leader may not be able to answer it now because there is so much confusion. If that is the case, we will give him the courtesy of asking again at eight o'clock tonight. However, can he tell us now, if it is within his ken, what the government proposes for business later tonight, tomorrow and into next week, because it is quite obvious that we are going to be here.

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Speaker, there is no confusion on this side of the House. I was delaying rising to reply in order to give the Minister of Communications an opportunity to state a point of order.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): It was not a point of order.

Mr. MacEachen: The hon. member says it is not a point of order. It has not yet been heard. Apparently he has some terrestrial view, or he can hear without listening. He talked about confusion. He is so confused that he cannot organize an effective motion under Standing Order 43, as we discovered the day before yesterday.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. MacEachen: The business tonight is the unemployment insurance bill. Tomorrow it is understood that we will deal until noon or one o'clock with the Canada Pension Plan, and in the afternoon we will resume the debate on the unemployment insurance bill, and then deal with Air Canada.

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Sauvé: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order regarding the incident which sparked a vote a while ago.

The leader of the Social Credit Party has decided to leave the House; however, I would like to point out that he did give his consent to the tabling of these documents earlier this afternoon—

Some hon. Members: Order!

[*English*]

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

Mr. Goodale: Every one of you over there consented. You consented, Joe.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The Minister of Communications sought the floor and indicated she was doing so on the same point of order—not on a fresh point of order—as that raised by the hon. member for Témiscamingue. I indicated that it was not a valid point of order and that I would not hear hon. members further. I gave the minister the floor to raise a fresh point of order. Her remarks seem to be a reflection on a vote and on events which have taken place in the past.

Some hon. Members: Shame.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

[*English*]

CONFEDERATION

DEBATE ON NATIONAL UNITY

The House resumed, from Wednesday, July 6, consideration of the motion of Mr. Trudeau:

That members of this House dedicate themselves anew to the continuing unity of Canada as a free and independent country organized on the basis of a federal form of government with two official languages and a diversity of cultures; and the amendment thereto of Mr. Clark.

Mr. Gus MacFarlane (Hamilton Mountain): Mr. Speaker, when I began speaking last evening I was trying to say something positive about national unity. I intend to say something positive today. Even if hon. members opposite are rude, I shall not be, so they should not worry about it. I intend to speak about something which is important to me and to everyone else in this House, and I intend to speak in a completely non-partisan way.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. MacFarlane: I do not intend to reflect on what anyone before me has said, so perhaps hon. members opposite should listen. When I go back to my riding—and I am sure this happens to other hon. members—I am always asked, "What can we do?" People do not say that the situation is lost; they ask what they can do and how they can help. I thought this national unity debate would be one in which hon. members would contribute what they had to offer, and I am willing to admit that there are many better minds that mine. However, in my small way I will contribute what I can to this debate on the unity of our country.

I may be old-fashioned, but the way I face a situation like this is to research it, identify the problem and state the simple solutions which come to my mind. The research is easy for me, because I lived it. I do not have to go to books. I lived on Fifth Avenue. I remember that there were the Stirlings, the MacFarlanes, the Edwards, the Hughes, the Cousineaus and the Heberts. The Cousineaus had 27 children, and the Heberts 17. When we applied for summer jobs, I got a job in a factory, the Stirlings got jobs at the university, and Guy Cousineau became the deliverer of beer for Beausoleil and Markey.

People said the Cousineaus and Heberts had too many children and that their churches were too big. Notre Dame de Sept Douleurs was their church, but the president of the Bank of Montreal attended a little Presbyterian church. It was always that way. Is it not interesting that by 1947 in one of the largest department stores in the second largest French-speaking city in the world a French Canadian made it as manager of men's hats? That was in 1947. The French Canadian girls who worked there spoke English to the French customers. Nobody got a holiday on St. Jean Baptiste day, either. That was the situation we lived in. It is interesting to see what happened to those families which grew up on that little street, Mr. Speaker. The Stirlings became principals of schools and honours graduates in physics, an Edwards became vice-president of Northern Electric, but the Cousineaus never got out of grade four.

• (1710)

When we left McGill University we went to jobs with the Protestant school board at $1,900 a year. We thought that was terrible, but the French school board was paying only $700 a year. The money that put us through McGill came from men like Duplessis who were supposed to be hated. We had gymnasia in our schools, and $4,000 rugs so that girls could learn to clean them in the home economics course. Those teachers who were earning $700 a year did not even have a gymnasium or any athletic facilities. We were the most favoured minority in all of Canada. In Montreal, the second largest French-speaking city in the world, English-speaking people were the most favoured in all of Canada. We were in charge: we acted as if we were, and we lived as if we were. It is René Lévesque who wants to take away the favour which that minority has enjoyed, not this federal parliament. I do not know of any member of this House who does not want to protect that minority. We will see that is done. We must guarantee that kind of minority right to others, however, in other areas.

My research turned up something else. Some people ask what we are to do with the Péquistes and their ideas. I will be blunt about it, Mr. Speaker. No one in this parliament, the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau), opposition leaders or any member, wants to divide this country. Just one person does, and the group that surrounds him: it is René Lévesque and the Parti Québécois who speak of separation. When they speak of separation we had better listen carefully, Mr. Speaker. In 1972, when Yves Morin wrote that supposed constitution, he said they should take over certain contiguous areas in New Brunswick and Ontario where there might be a majority French population. Think of that, Mr. Speaker. This is the party that wants to talk of some kind of union. Separation is not negotiable. I am not embarrassed to say that; I am not afraid to say it.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. MacFarlane: They cannot come to my table to eat, they cannot come to my table to drink, if they want to come as separatists. They come as we have to come—with what we have, all our failings, all our faults, all our mistakes, to work together to bring about what has been building in the country. When I coached football in Verdun they said, "Those French guys cannot play football. Don't let them on your team. What is that big stupid guy from Saint-Hyacinthe doing there?" It was Gilles Archambault, and he was not so stupid. He made it because in that little community of Verdun we recognized our own faults. We went to Ivan Livingston's home, and sitting at dinner suddenly knew what it was like to sit with ten little negro piccaninnies around, realizing you were the only white person and thinking how strange they might feel. This is the thing French Canadians have had to face.

Somebody now wants English Canadians to face that in Montreal. Not this parliament, not these people, but people who in order to achieve their aims would deal with the minority and make it less. There are no members from Quebec on this side of the House who feel that way, and there are no members on the other side of the House who feel that way. If anybody wants to sit down—and I will not—and try to deal with the separatist option, they can answer the questions that I will not answer. Who wants to answer what we are going to do about Ungava? Are we going to take it back if Quebec is not part of Canada? And what about Labrador? Are we going to make a decision for Newfoundland?

Mr. McGrath: That decision was made.

Mr. MacFarlane: If you enter into a separatist negotiation, you had better look at something else. If they come to the table as Canadians, you are right. What will we do with our great economic union? Are we going to discuss common banking, common trade? Quebec will say they need more money because they have lots of unemployment, and we will say that because of inflation we cannot give them more money. How do we negotiate? Somebody else can to it, because it is not going to be in my bivouac. We are not going to go that route. We are going to recognize the tactic of René Lévesque,

which is simply to make certain that the English get so fed up with arguments about Quebec, about French and language and everything else that they will say, "Let them go." Then there is the other tactic of saying the federal government will withdraw support and the French will say, "They do not want us." The tactic is not that he will succeed with separation and constitutional matters: it is separation by attrition.

I faced that two weeks ago when I went back to Quebec to bury my brother, Mr. Speaker. On his deathbed he told me that one son was staying and taking a bilingual job, and one son was leaving. I know of other people who moved out of Quebec, not because they were English and would not stay but because their company moved. And who will move in, Mr. Speaker? Who wants that French force here, or the English force outside? That is separation by attrition. I have no time for it.

Having done the research, I identify the problem as one of communication. We now have a commission which will travel across the country. We have no right, as members of parliament, to make all these decisions. There are people in St. Louis, there are people in Skeena, people in Hamilton Mountain who have something to say. It is their right to say it to the commission and to make recommendations. The kind of thing I would recommend may not be terribly important, but at least it is practical.

I have prepared a paper to present to the commission, saying that we are long past the date when we should have created a department of provincial affairs, and the first minister of each province should name a contact to that group so that when people in the province want information they can get it.

If members of this House want information from the government, not a grant for a new speaking tour but something that will enable them to make a case for federalism in their constituencies, they should be able to get it from the department I propose. Such a department should deal with bilingualism and multiculturalism. We have to accept that we have come a long way and have reached the stage of talking about two founding races. It is like those great slats of wood on a stained-glass window. Because of multiculturalism, we recognize the colours of the glass. This is the mosaic that is important, supported by two founding races and many minorities.

How is a separatist Quebec going to support the minority and guarantee their rights in the west or in the east? How is the province of Ontario going to guarantee the rights of the English in Montreal? One of the first priorities of the federal government is to guarantee the rights of the minorities. Nobody else can do it. I have heard members on both sides of the House express anger because their country has not done what they thought it should do. The expression of such sentiments is perfectly justifiable. Such hon. members can disagree with me. However, I suggest I have put on record some of the reasons for our country's present condition and some of the ways out of the impasse. Others in the House have said what I have said. I have listened to the contributions hon. members made in this debate and I can say that at this moment in this country there exists a greater will than many would believe for going forward and solving our difficulties. I recall the words of John Donne:

● (1720)

No man is an Island, intire of it selfe; every man is a piece of the Continent, a part of the maine; if a Clod bee washed away by the Sea, Europe is the lesse, as well as if a Promontorie were, as well as if a Mannor of thy friends or of thine owne were—

If Quebec goes, Canada is less. Do not ask for whom the bell tolls. It tolls for thee. For the first time since coming to parliament I feel that the member for Hamilton Mountain may stand in his place, say what he feels, and influence the course of events in this country. Mr. Speaker, I speak for the people of Hamilton Mountain, the people with a Scottish background, who recall the words of the Scottish poet to this effect, "Let us say God Save the Queen, but let us not forget the people." And the words to this effect, "It is coming yet, and yet shall be, when man to man shall brother be." We have this opportunity; we have this right.

I have great pride in serving on this side of the House and under our Prime Minister, but I will join hands with anyone on the opposite side or on my side, including the Prime Minister, join hands with any single, living soul who will say, "Let's work it out." Because, Mr. Speaker, we are going to work it out.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Roch La Salle (Joliette): Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that I am speaking in the House as a member of a political party and as the representative of a province and constituency which have shown much concern and uncertainty for some time now. As all members of this House, we are seeking that harmony, but how?

First, Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate our leader for his brilliant speech and for sternly reminding us of the responsibilities of Parliament. I would be remiss if I did not mention the excellent speech made by the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Stanfield), an experienced man who has been shrewd and farsighted, of whose valuable advice the government is being deprived.

I cannot ignore the sad incident which happened this afternoon. I would like to congratulate the member for Richmond (Mr. Beaudoin) who raised the basic question, the basic objective of the Prime Minister in 1968: bilingualism in federal institutions. As a result, we saw the members of the Social Credit who withdrew, surely humiliated and frustrated. Personally, I was very disappointed to see some Quebec members or French-speaking members on the government side refuse to warn the minister responsible for such frustration involving all French-speaking people in Canada. It is most humiliating not to have seen fit to get action today and, in the Prime Minister's image, we have seen the party in power give lip service only. It is true that we are being accused about the objective of the official languages.

It has been said that people are judged by their acts and not by their words. This afternoon, I must say to the government members, and especially those of my province, how ashamed I am for our Quebecers. I think about the hon. member for Gaspé (Mr. Cyr), for instance, who was openly applauding the hon. member for Richmond and who I imagine reluctantly supported the government's attitude. I think about the hon. member for Hochelaga (Mr. Lavoie) who, until recently, I know, would not let one day go by without requesting that services be given in the French language and who, today, lamentably betrayed his own thinking by supporting the government. I am thinking about all those from Quebec who are shaming us, and the hon. member for Longueuil (Mr. Olivier) is one of them.

Mr. Olivier: Tell us why you have become independent.

Mr. La Salle: The hon. member for Longueuil is one of those who open their mouths more to interrupt others than to speak on behalf of their constituencies.

Mr. Speaker, I should be ashamed as a Quebecer for supporting the Liberal party this afternoon. Not a single Quebecer or Francophone had the right to miss this opportunity, my colleagues were right to do so, and it is this government which talks about maintaining national unity through bilingual services. The Canadian public must be told what happened this afternoon in this House, and so must Quebecers, and the minister of Communications. (Mrs. Sauvé) dared quickly support the position of her party which, I repeat, is shaming all French speaking members in this House.

● (1730)

And in that respect, Mr. Speaker, I would like to recall certain allegations made yesterday by the Secretary of State (Mr. Roberts) which coincide perfectly well today. He blamed the leader of my party (Mr. Clark) for expressing the opinion that the bilingual policy as applied by the Liberal government had become an element of division in this country. Manipulating the words astutely, as the Liberals are so wont to do when they want to brandish the specter of racism for electoral purposes, Mr. Speaker, the Secretary of State tried to make believe that the Leader of the Official Opposition and his party were accepting bilingualism relunctantly and did not care for the official languages policy as an element of national identity. Mr. Speaker, I say that those remarks by the minister are among the lowest and most dishonest form of demagogy one can imagine. When, Mr. Speaker, will this government stop cultivating those prejudices for purely political purposes? When, Mr. Speaker, will it stop those shameless manipulations to make Quebecers believe that Conservatives are anti-francophone and opposed to the best interests of Quebec? But they are not prepared to stop, Mr. Speaker, because the appeal to prejudices has been their favourite weapon for ten years. They know it quite well and it is with that weapon that division is being perpetuated, but that is politically profitable. And is it any wonder after that that there should be an aggressive nationalist feeling in Quebec.

We, of the Conservative Party, say that it is too easy for this government to want to sweep under the rug of a bilingualism whose principle we clearly approve, Mr. Speaker, but whose application we are rightfully discussing, all the monumental mistakes that government members made in the past ten years as well as all the problems they brought about and are tragically letting rot without ever solving them. Of course, bilingualism is very important, Mr. Speaker; we, of the official opposition, sincerely believe in it whatever the government might say, a government which incidentally came to get within our ranks the main opponent of bilingualism to make him a minister and its major spokesman for western Canada. That gives you an idea of the intellectual honesty and credibility of the members on the government side.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, we fully agree with the principle of both official languages, as we have supported until now the implementation of the program, with certain qualifications, but we will not accept that this essential principle be used to distract the attention from the problems of unemployment, inflation, regional disparities and tense federal-provincial relations. The only thing that these tragic problems have in common with the linguistic issue is that they affect all Canadian citizens, whatever their language and their culture. Mr. Speaker, this is the essence of the problem that we are now discussing; this is what the Prime Minister and the Secretary of State should have been saying when they had the opportunity if they had not been concerned only with the need to worsen the language controversy to prepare their electoral platform for next fall or next spring.

Mr. Grafftey: Explain Horner to the Quebecers!

Mr. La Salle: Mr. Speaker, this debate is the unfortunate and unavoidable issue of a deep uneasiness which was felt for the first time at the end of the last century, has since then grown continuously and has seriously worsened in the last ten years. At this point, it is useless to play on words and we must have the honesty to recognize that what we are now discussing is the future of our country. We have to recognize that what we are now undertaking is nothing else but the review of Confederation, and if our colleagues refuse to see it, if they find it unthinkable to examine the basic concept of the federative pact, I am afraid that we shall have in months and years to come more and more difficulty in understanding each other. Mr. Speaker, I have used the words "federative pact" quite intentionally, because it is precisely from the interpretation of this term that springs the lack of understanding which is threatening to divide us even more.

From 1867 until now, French Canadians always thought that Confederation was the result of a pact or an alliance between Upper and Lower Canada, between the two growing nationalities which guaranteed each other equality and total autonomy. It is under those specific and often repeated conditions that Lower Canada agreed to join Confederation and that Sir Georges-Etienne Cartier became its protagonist. All politicians of the time as well as all historians since then agree

unanimously that without Cartier, the federation would have never existed.

An hon. Member: True!

Mr. La Salle: Moreover, it is not accidentally that Lower Canada positively refused any proposition for a mere legislative union. As well, it was not a fancy of the French Canadians to require assurances of equality and autonomy. They knew that this was an absolute condition allowing them to maintain their identity, their institutions, their language and their culture. So much so that Cartier himself maintained with conviction, and I quote:

> Some people have regretted that there is in the federation a diversity of races, and hoped that with time an end would come to this . . . The melting of the races into one is sheer impossibility.

I did not say that, Mr. Speaker. The Father of Confederation did. A pact enshrining the association and equality of two peoples into a common will to live together, but respecting each one's autonomy, such has been the perception of Confederation among French Canadians from 1867 to this day. Even after so many years, Quebecers and other French-speaking Canadians have lost patience, put claims, made requests, pleas, demands and even entreaties. But there is no way they could go over that so easily, forget everything and blindly support the badly implemented, ill-conceived and overly rigid kind of federalism we now have.

French Canadians have tired legs that made too many unfruitful steps, a tired hand that drafted brief after brief, a tired mind that tried pointlessly to explain, persuade and convince. Some may think this is all exaggeration. If by any chance someone still believes that Quebec's feelings towards Confederation have deteriorated since the coming into power of the Parti Québécois, I will quote from a short work titled "Georges Etienne Cartier, a Canadian Statesman" published in 1914 by Mr. Lavergne. The author had this to say about Confederation:

> The political status established by Cartier cannot be permanent. Two peoples can live together in a small country, but we believe this is impossible in a large country once those peoples have come of age. The day will come when there will be a separation between east and west. The former will break into three or four republics whose frontiers will be dictated by geography.

Mr. Speaker, I am striving to show what we French Canadians were expecting from the 1867 alliance, and to what extent our hopes have been disappointed from generation to generation. I have no intention of inflaming the debate by accusing any group. But I would remain with a bad conscience and even a feeling of not telling the truth if I did not emphasize that national unity mainly deteriorated during the year after Confederation's 100th birthday, when federal-provincial relations turned into a war of attrition. Let me state quite bluntly that this coincided with the coming to power of the gentleman who this very day is holding the office of Prime Minister.

● (1740)

Until then, the federal government had tried to be flexible enough, to compromise enough, to meet, after a fashion, the primary claims of Quebec, as those of the other provinces as well. All was not going smoothly, of course, and Quebec nationalism did rear its head frequently, but the fact remains that the federal government showed more understanding, more compassion, more good will, while in Quebec, formulas of agreement and adjustments were advocated.

These attitudes, on both parts, created a tolerable *modus vivendi* which could eventually have led to a profitable dialogue; but all was cut short by the pithy expression hurled by the Prime Minister in Montreal: "Finies les folies!" From that time on, a policy was built up of hardening, refusal, ultimatums, intrigues, arrogance and provocation. Until then, federalism which had at times meant difficulties for Quebec suddenly took on the shape of a threat, of an obstacle. And that is why we are pleading anew the case of the future of this country, Mr. Speaker. Unless the Prime Minister modifies to a great extent his concept of confederation and of the relationship between the central government and the provinces, I think he runs the risk of being recorded by history as having badly served the cause of his French-speaking fellows citizens. Because, without trying to indulge in cheap politics and without trying to minimize the merits of the Prime Minister in enforcing respect for the rights of the French language in Canada, I must tell him that he is deluding himself if he believes that his policy of bilingualism alone will silence the desires for independence on the part a segment of the Quebec population and that it will solve the differences between Canadians.

It is wrong to pretend that it is only an issue of language, Mr. Speaker. I notice that in his speech, the Prime Minister spoke of a new Canada since November 15. I think it is important that members of parliament and Canadians at large know what happened before November 15. Why is it that on the evening of November 15, a majority of Quebecers rejected this approach, this kind of federalism, that system which we have now? Do we have to remind our friends opposite that everything started deteriorating seriously some 10 years ago, when our present Prime Minister came to power. He was right. How to explain, for example, that this situation dates back in history to the time of the then premier of Quebec, Mr. Johnson, who had to fight with the Prime Minister of today? Then it was the turn of Mr. Bertrand, of Mr. Bourassa and finally now Mr. Lévesque. There is nothing new in the fact that the team which represents Quebec on the government benches is regarded by a majority of Quebecers as a gang of traitors on so many issues.

I remember quite well what caused this discontent among Quebecers, the attitude of this government under the leadership of the Prime Minister. They offered a refusal, which I still remember quite well, Mr. Speaker, to proposals which matched the legitimate aspirations of my province, and were presented by Mr. L'Allier, or Mr. Hardy or Mr. St. Pierre. And I still remember, and perhaps the member for Longueuil was one of the people involved that evening, of being accused of separatism because I supported the representations made by the province of Quebec.

Mr. Olivier: On a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

National Unity

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): The hon. member for Longueuil on a question of privilege.

Mr. Olivier: The hon. member for Joliette (Mr. La Salle) has just accused me of levelling accusations against him. I should like him to prove what he said, but he cannot. In view of his remarks, I ask the hon. member for Joliette to withdraw the statement he has just made, unless he can prove it is true.

[*English*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): I suggest this is a point of debate not a point of order.

[*Translation*]

Mr. La Salle: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As I was saying, the Quebec situation results from the fact that Quebec representatives within the federal government have not fulfilled their duties. Over the past ten years, the right hon. Prime Minister and his Quebec colleagues have chosen to hide the truth from their cabinet colleagues from the other provinces by not telling them what was really going on in the province of Quebec. I remember that . . .

[*English*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Order. I regret to interrupt the hon. member but his time has expired.

Mr. Grafftey: Continue!

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): I believe there was an understanding that all leaders would get 40 minutes and that other members would get 20 minutes, so I am trying to divide the remaining time fairly.

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, I regret having to open my remarks this afternoon by saying something I did not expect to say, and in a tone I had not intended to use. I want to say I regret very deeply, as I am sure, does my party, the insensitivity of the government toward this issue. We are in the middle of a debate on national unity. The Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Gillespie) has taken this occasion to demonstrate his insensitivity, his disregard for the history and traditions both of the country and of parliament.

I will continue, but perhaps because of my advancing age I find difficulty in overcoming a loud babble of other voices.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Don't let either of those things bother you.

Mr. Brewin: I want to express the feelings which I believe are held by many Canadians across this land, feeling of passionate concern for the maintenance and development of a strong, federally-united Canada. This would not be the achievement of one man or of one party but of very many Canadians.

It is the particular responsibility of parliament, working through its elected representatives, to lead the way. I am not sure that a formal committee is the best way of doing this. I was a member of the Joint Committee on the Constitution and, as I recall only too well, that committee came up with some 202 recommendations and, to the best of my knowledge, not a single one of them was ever carried out. I would not want any further committee to have such an experience. The Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau), or the government, should at least prepare and present to parliament its proposals, albeit in outline, for the unity of Canada. Eight months have now gone by since the election of November 15 and we have yet to hear in this parliament any concrete proposal about what should be done to change the system.

I welcome very strongly the decision of the recent convention of my party in Winnipeg, under the effective leadership of my hon. friend from Oshawa-Whitby (Mr. Broadbent), because it stresses the need for national priorities and national political leadership, emphasizing that economic and egalitarian changes make an essential contribution to Canadian unity. We must establish a national planning and investment strategy and commit our country to full employment. Our key national goal should be political and economic independence.

Canada has an important role to play in the world of nations by constructing a new economic order which would tackle the immense problem of poverty throughout the world. She could play this role if united and independent. We must recognize the basic human needs for housing, food and energy at reasonable prices, and access to health care as a social right. To achieve an equitable redistribution we must reshape our taxation system. However, important economic policies are not the sole means of achieving a united Canada. We must make it clear to French Canada, and particularly the province of Quebec, that we recognize and admire the wonderful and attractive culture which is theirs, and are prepared to do everything we can to see that it is protected and maintained. We must also make it clear that although Quebec has the right to make its own choice without coercion, we strongly support a federal Canada and believe that a majority of the people of Quebec will decide to remain in Canada.

While it is true that the federal parliament must have full authority to deal with external affairs, banking and other economic matters if it is to maintain equality of standards across Canada, we do believe that increased administrative authority can be devolved to the provinces and that this can be done in such a way as to maintain a fair balance between the federal and provincial governments. This is not a request for general decentralization, because if we carry on a process of decentralization we shall find before long that the federal government does not have sufficient remaining powers to enable it to carry out its tasks. That is a real danger if we pursue the role of decentralization too far.

● (1750)

I am one of those, Mr. Speaker, who believes that we need a new constitution. I do not think that constitutional change in itself is the answer to all our problems, but just think for a moment about what is our constitution. We have an ancient British statute which is obviously completely lacking any sort of emotional appeal to modern Canadians. A constitution is necessary in a federal state not only to clarify the division of powers but, perhaps even more important, to provide an

inspiring statement of the purposes and aims of the Canadian federation.

I should like a new constitution to contain clear references to the equal partnership between the two founding nations, and also to mention the multicultural fact of Canadian life and the special rights of our native people. I should also like this new constitution to state clearly that Canada is based upon democratic government and the protection of fundamental human rights. It should also be clear that there should be firm guarantees of the linguistic and cultural rights of Canadians.

I think that the present crisis is no time for the politics of confrontation. It is true, as I and others of my party have said before, that a firm federal attitude is justified. We do not accept the proposals of the Parti Québécois. Nevertheless, we believe that the discussions between that government, which after all represents the people of Quebec at the present time, and the rest of Canada should be at a high level of courtesy and consideration. It is our earnest desire to persuade the people of Quebec to opt for a continuing role in our federal system. We think that a civilized tone of debate will help this objective.

The Prime Minister announced yesterday the creation of a task force. I must say that I view this with something less than enthusiasm. It seems to me to be just an extra piece of machinery. I think parliament should be the primary instrument for debating questions relating to Canadian unity. It sometimes seems to me that the task force is being appointed because the government really does not know were it is going and does not have any definite proposals to make. The task force, in my opinion, is window dressing, though I hope I am wrong and that it will do something useful. I will be glad to be proven wrong in my pessimistic assumptions about it. I must say that the remarks of one of the co-chairmen, Jean-Luc Pepin, seemed so casual as to make one wonder how serious he was about the task assigned to him.

The whole question of Canadian unity requires us to think about the place of nationalism in the world today. Personally I do not wish to think of myself as primarily a Canadian nationalist. First of all, I believe that the test of a healthy nationalism is respect for human rights and individual welfare. When nationalism takes on an extravagant, chauvinistic form, then such nationalism can become a curse and not a blessing.

I also think of myself as an internationalist. It is trite but true to say that no nation can live unto itself, least of all in a modern world. To my way of thinking, one of the great reasons for the maintenance of a strong federal system is the strengthened contribution we can make as a united nation to the building of co-operation in the world of nations. That is why I put emphasis on the independence of Canada. It is one reason why I would regard the break-up of Canada as being tragic in its nature. But there is a healthy form of nationalism which concerns itself with the welfare, living standards, and aspirations of the people of a certain nation, and which is proud of its role in the international world.

Therefore, I think we in Canada are entitled to assert that we have an abiding faith in Canada but that both creative leadership and restraint are necessary to achieve this unity. Hitherto the government, under the leadership of the right hon. member for Mount Royal, has failed to promote Canadian unity successfully. I do not question his sincerity in any way; I am sure that he is convinced that his particular approach and formula are the only ones and the essential ones, and that he is sincere in that. But I do say that a stubborn insistence upon language questions has obviously not succeeded in resolving the problems of Canadian unity.

We supported and we still support the Official Languages Act, but we think that it requires substantial changes. I must not be regarded as some sort of panacea which would make other aspects of Canadian unity irrelevant.

I heard one member on the other side of the House complain in his speech that we in the opposition parties are using this debate to score bitter, partisan points against the Prime Minister of this country. I believe in all sincerity that the time has come, indeed that it has long since passed, when somebody has to point out to the people of this country the degree of failure, and the degree of responsibility for the failure, which can only rest on the shoulders of the Prime Minister.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Brewin: I conclude, Mr. Speaker, by re-asserting—I do not think it needs re-asserting since it was supported by an overwhelming majority of the representatives of our party at our Winnipeg convention—that we in this party will do our utmost to contribute to a stronger, more just, and more united Canada.

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, it is rather difficult to resist the impulse which I suppose members on all sides feel on occasions such as this to engage in a lot of superfluous argument back and forth, so I shall resist the temptation to comment upon some of the references in the last half hour or so to incidents which occurred this afternoon. But I do think it is important to record, in terms of the righteous indignation that has been expressed, that my colleague, the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Gillespie), did in fact obtain the unanimous consent of the House—which includes all parties—to take the action which he did, and which I think was for very good and valid reasons. I just put that on the record. I gather that otherwise he would not have been able to table the report in the manner he did.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I would have to say that the hon. gentleman is correct in terms of the fact that permission was granted. But there was in fact a discussion today between the minister and me with respect to the statement to be made, and there was never any feeling in my mind—indeed the matter never came up in the discussion—that there would be any attempt by the government to table a document or to make a statement or to do anything which did not comply with the Standing Orders of the House.

Mr. Jamieson: Mr. Speaker, it is precisely because such comments as have been made generate this kind of argument that I said it was unfortunate that it had to come up at all. I merely point out that I distinctly heard—and I think *Hansard* will show—the hon. minister asked for unanimous consent, and explained why. I understand that in many instances perhaps it can pass some members by, but there was no objection taken to what was done. I just wanted to record that fact without commenting further upon it.

As to the main substance of the matter now before the House, I do not profess to any special qualifications more than any other member in talking about the issue of national unity. However, I bring to this debate one unique qualification which gives me a somewhat different perspective on Canada and on its future. I think I am the only member of this House who voted on two separate occasions against becoming a Canadian. I suspect the hon. member for St. John's East (Mr. McGrath) would have done so, but he was too young to vote at that time.

● (1800)

From the perspective of nearly 30 years it is quite startling and surprising to me to note the similarities between many of the events of 1977 when compared with those of 1947, when my province of Newfoundland first considered, in modern times, the prospect of uniting with Canada. Referenda are nothing new to me. I can recall using many of the arguments which I now hear being used by advocates of separatism. I can recall using them in Newfoundland terms and saying, for example, that confederation would clearly be the loss of our distinctive culture and our centuries old identity. Also I recall saying that economically the province of Newfoundland would be far better off if it had stayed out of Confederation. I can hear echoes of these kinds of arguments in almost precisely the same words at the present time.

I welcome this first chance I have had in 11 years in parliament to tell Your Honour and members of this House that I was totally wrong in my assessment. I cannot conceive of a Newfoundland today being anything like as well off under any arrangement other than Confederation.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Jamieson: This is not to say that all is perfect by any manner or means. Newfoundland continues to suffer many deprivations, and by comparison with national standards can be regarded as one of the less fortunate of our Canadian provinces. In relation to any other political situation, there is no question about the fact that we have made tremendous progress.

I hope some outside of this Chamber, who advocate the separation of the province of Quebec from Canada, would take a look at those events of 30 years ago. Among other things it is interesting to note that only now are the documents from the era being released to the public. Some of them have already been placed on the public record and, as I look at them, it is quite remarkable to see how incredibly wrong most of the economists and most of the experts were in terms of their projections of what was going to happen—the shares of revenue and the likely levels of service. There is not a single statistic or forecast made in 1947 and 1948 which bears any resemblance to the facts today.

Those people who seek to make the case for or against separatism on the grounds of economic projections and the like, had best take a look at those and realize that no one is that clairvoyant or that capable of projecting that far into the future, or of really assessing what the economic impact is going to be. When one weighs that against the obvious gains Newfoundland has made, which were manifold more than what the most optimistic people had predicted, then I suggest there are strong grounds for arguing that Confederation is by far the best route for Quebec, as it was for the province of Newfoundland.

I have heard some of this debate and I have read all of it. It seems to me there are three or four recurring themes which come up time and time again in the observations and the comments of members of the opposition. I should like to deal with them in a rational and reasonable manner, and not in any sense seeking to be combative. I want to put some of these issues in the perspective that I see them in and, as a result, help to generate a reasonable and continuing dialogue on this issue.

One of the things which the opposition appears to have concentrated on throughout this debate is the fact that the government has put an almost total emphasis on the bilingual aspects of national unity to the almost total exclusion of everything else. This has come up time after time. The record does not support that kind of claim or that sort of criticism. Referring once again back to my province of Newfoundland, it is clear that over the past years of this administration there has been a recognition that national unity must be attacked on a wide variety of fronts. If anyone doubts this, let him come with me to Newfoundland; let him drive over DREE financed highways to visit DREE financed schools, some of which are the best in the country; and let him see DREE subsidized industries, particularly fish plants and the like, employing many thousands of people who, year after year, retain their jobs because of subsidies in the ten of millions of dollars provided by the federal government.

What is true in the case of Newfoundland is equally true in many parts of the province of Quebec, in the other Atlantic provinces, and in virtually every area of this country which is more deprived than the prosperous central region. While the regional development program, and everything associated with it, are not the total answer, the program indicates by itself that the government has been aware since its inception that there is more to national unity than simply resolving the problem of bilingualism or language rights, as important or vital as they may be. It is demonstrably untrue that there has been a one-dimensional policy by this government. In fact it has covered a wide range of issues and programs designed to bring about greater equality across the country and to attack the whole problem of national unity on the economic, social, and linguistic fronts.

The second point which has been made consistently by most members of the opposition is that there has been too much rigidity in the attitude of the federal government, that in some way or another we have brought about contrived confrontation and that it has been a calculated program to create divisiveness, particularly between the federal government and the government in Quebec city. They have broadened that to take in all the provinces and, in addition to that, to take in a whole range of issues. Once again the record makes it perfectly clear that this simply is not the case. Repeatedly over these last eight or nine years this government has sought and has accomplished, in many instances, accommodations with the provinces on a scale and an importance not anticipated nor envisaged earlier in the history of this country.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Jamieson: It is obvious some of the hon. members opposite are not impressed.

Mr. Grafftey: We love you, though.

Mr. Jamieson: I love you, too. In the interests of national unity I would even embrace the hon. member for Brome-Missisquoi (Mr. Grafftey).

Mr. Grafftey: I could not get my arms around you.

• (1810)

Mr. Jamieson: He might have a little more difficulty embracing me, but the way I am going, even that may be possible before very long.

However, in terms of what I was saying a moment ago about what I describe as the legitimate willingness for accommodation on the part of the federal government, let me emphasize the word legitimate because hon. members opposite—coming back to my point about Newfoundland—must realize also that if there is too great a confusion of federal power and authority and the ability to control in terms of national events and items of national importance, then provinces like mine, Newfoundland, like the whole of the Atlantic area and indeed much of the rest of the country, would be in an extremely difficult position.

I say that anybody opposite who argues for a greater decentralization in terms of letting those smaller provinces stand on their own bottoms or float in their own dory, as we might say in Newfoundland, that he is underestimating the difficulties and problems that it would create. I also say that if we weaken the federal government to such an extent that it is impotent to deal with national issues, we are going to be in a much more serious position than any we have had up to the present time.

Newfoundlanders in particular about whom I have been speaking—but I am sure it is true of many other people in this country—would certainly not thank a government of Canada which dispensed its legitimate authority in ways which made it impossible for those provinces to turn, as they have to do, to a government at Ottawa to look after so many of their needs.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Jamieson: In Newfoundland today some 60 cents to 65 cents out of every $1 is originated from, or in another way provided, by the federal government, and many of those programs and plans are ones which are not in the classical concept a federal responsibility but ones which have been delightedly and glady given by the federal government to a provincial government which it knows cannot possibly manage on its own.

So there has not been confrontation in the sense that hon. members opposite sometimes suggest. There has been, I repeat, a willingness to co-operate. I do not believe that you can find a government in the whole history of this country that has had a greater range of consultations and that has shown itself more willing to make adjustments and compromises where these were clearly to the advantage of the provinces, and where they did not at the same time undermine the essential strength that the federal government requires.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Clark: That is nonsense.

Mr. Jamieson: There is another aspect to this question of contrived confrontation that frankly puzzles me more than any other, and that is the suggestion that in some way or other there was no problem with national unity in this country until the government assumed office.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

An hon. Member: That's it.

Mr. Paproski: Why not?

An hon. Member: Right on.

Mr. Jamieson: Hon. members opposite can applaud, but let me tell them as someone who went through a Confederation argument on the other side of the issue that I brought people from the province of Quebec, as the hon. member for St. John's East knows, who made separatist speeches in Newfoundland in 1947. For goodness sake, to suggest now that nothing ever happened before 1968 is ridiculous.

An hon. Member: What has that got to do with it?

Mr. Jamieson: It has to do with your enthusiasm for the idea that everything was perfect before 1968.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

An hon. Member: It was much better.

Mr. Jamieson: Let us look at the record with regard to the separatist problem. When did the first bombings take place in the province of Quebec, in 1968? No, it began back in 1961 and 1962. They should know, because they were the government of this country at that time.

An hon. Member: Oh, no, we were not.

Mr. Grafftey: That is not true.

Mr. Jamieson: The hon. member says it is not true that the bombs were planted in 1962. If I am not mistaken, one of the first casualties, if not the first, was a gentleman named O'Neil who came from Newfoundland who, I believe, was the first victim of a bombing. I believe it was in 1962. Let the hon. member look it up if he wants to.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Jamieson: That aside, let us look at who created the slogan, "maître chez nous" and when was it? It was a long time before this government assumed office. Furthermore, there are many other evidences—indeed, they go back to the point we all know—that these tensions have been present within Confederation since its earliest beginnings. To suggest therefore that in some way or other the policies of this government have served to start this kind of process is sheer nonsense, and the record makes it perfectly clear that it is sheer nonsense.

Miss MacDonald: It has escalated since 1968.

Mr. Jamieson: There is another point which also is puzzling me about the attitude of the opposition. It has to do with their attitude on the whole question of bilingualism. I give all hon. members opposite, without exception, full credit for believing sincerely in national unity and in bilingualism, but the problem arises when we start to define what it is. Once again in these last couple of days new problems have been created for me in trying to understand the position of the opposition because, somehow or other, they seem to be saying that bilingualism is necessary but that it is a burden that we have to carry in the interests of national unity.

Mr. Grafftey: Pure poppycock.

Mr. Jamieson: I refer the hon. member to the speeches of his colleagues. Let him look at them. Are hon. members opposite prepared to say that that is not the weight of some of the arguments that we have heard from the other side? I have read them fairly thoroughly.

An hon. Member: Go back and read them again.

Mr. Jamieson: They have said, as I understand it—

An hon. Member: Have you consulted Horner?

Mr. Jamieson: —that bilingualism is a continuing problem for this country and it is one with which we have to live. That seems to be the gist of what was said.

Mr. Paproski: That is what Don Macdonald would have to say.

Mr. Jamieson: But you are not arguing with the position I have just stated.

Miss MacDonald: You have changed it.

[Mr. Jamieson.]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Order, please. The minister has only one minute left, and I suggest hon. members listen to him.

Mr. Jamieson: The hon. member says I have changed it. I ask hon. members opposite, before this debate is out to say categorically and without equivocation that in fact they do not believe that bilingualism is a burden for this country but that it is an opportunity for this country.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Jamieson: Mr. Speaker, I would have to ask you for some extra time if hon. members continue this, but let me conclude by saying this: I think the opposition should remember a saying which is very common in Newfoundland and which has survived until this day—another example that our culture is healthy despite Confederation—and that is that on the issue of bilingualism they had better fish or cut bait, because at the present time they are trying to come down squarely on both sides of the issue.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Paproski: You are sucking and blowing at the same time. You know what that means.

Mr. James A. McGrath (St. John's East): Mr. Speaker, I have just listened to a very eloquent speech.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. McGrath: I have known the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Jamieson) for a long time. I have worked with him. He is my friend. As a matter of fact when I was elected to this place 20 years ago the hon. gentleman was my boss. Evening after evening I used to sit in the TV studio enthralled at his eloquence when reading the news on television. However, on soft news nights when there was not a great deal to relate, the hon. gentleman was at his most eloquent best. The weaker the argument, I have learned, as I have watched the hon. gentleman over the years, the more eloquent he gets.

● (1820)

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. McGrath: I would like to deal with some of the points raised by the minister, who is my friend, and with whom I differ. He has tried to misinterpret what my leader has said and what this party has said on language. He has tried—without, I believe, fully examining the record or listening to the speech of my leader—to distort the record.

I want to tell the minister that he and his colleagues have not cornered the market on language equality in this country. Language problems may be ongoing problems. I recall coming here in 1957. I recall the very first meeting we had as a minority government caucus. I was absolutely amazed. As a

very young man who had been a Canadian for only eight years I thought this was a great country of two founding races. In our very first caucus held out in that lobby opposite—and this was after 22 years of Liberal government under a distinguished French Canadian prime minister—we decided to bring in bilingual cheques. Cheques were going to be sent to French Canadians in the French language, and so it has been going ever since.

There was no simultaneous translation in this House until the right hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker), as a first act of his new administration, brought simultaneous translation into this House.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. McGrath: Up to that time a member of parliament coming from a French speaking constituency had to speak in English, or not at all, because he could not be understood in French. That was the kind of linguistic policy we inherited from the Liberal government in 1957. Oh, no, the Liberal government has not cornered the market on language rights, not by a long shot.

Mr. Jamieson: Nobody said we had.

Mr. McGrath: I will tell the House what the government has cornered the market on—and I listened very carefully to the hon. gentleman. This government has cornered the market on the curse of regional disparity, which has flourished under this administration. It has certainly cornered the market on unemployment, which is at an all-time high in this country. The hon. gentleman quoted statistics indicating that Newfoundland is receiving 60 cents to 65 cents out of every dollar spent from the federal treasury. What a sad reflection that is for a province which is blessed with an abundance of natural resources.

We do not have a government which will introduce policies so that Newfoundland can develop those resources to the fullest and to its own benefit. We have in my province the ongoing curse of regional disparity, from which our people still suffer. The minister nods his head because when he was minister of regional economic expansion he tried very hard, but you cannot make a bad policy work.

DREE was brought in by this government in 1969 after a solemn promise by the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) when he went to the Atlantic provinces in 1968 to introduce Marshall Plan type aid to end, once and for all, the curse of regional disparity. Notwithstanding the expenditure of hundreds of millions of dollars not only in Newfoundland but throughout the Atlantic provinces and Quebec, the DREE program has only created record high unemployment. The hon. gentleman, with his characteristic eloquence, can describe a drive through Newfoundland where you can look at magnificent DREE financed schools—and they are good schools—DREE financed fish plants, or drive over DREE financed roads, but if you go a little further you can find the hopelessness of a 25 per cent unemployed work force; you can look into the hopelessness that is represented in the faces of those who have no job opportunities. That is just as much a threat to the continuing unity of this country as any other issue which can come before this House.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. McGrath: Unemployment is not particularly characteristic to Newfoundland, although we seem to have considerably more that anybody else. We have more than we can take, more than any province can afford to have. We cannot afford that loss in productivity. We cannot afford the social problems which are created by a system which seems to perpetuate unemployment. All you have to do is go into the home of an unemployed family and look at the second generation on unemployment insurance and welfare. That is what concerns me about the future of Canada. However, that is not peculiar to my province. What has happened to the DREE program in the eastern portion of Quebec? Oh, we can probably find DREE financed schools, DREE financed fish plants, and drive over DREE financed roads, but we can also find the second or third highest rate of unemployment in this country.

My leader and members of my party have said in this House that language policy is important, and nobody, but nobody, can doubt for a moment where this party stands on language policy.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. McGrath: There will come a day in this country when these problems are but an unhappy memory, and I hope that day will come soon. When that day comes, people will realize the outstanding contribution to the continuing unity and growth of this country of the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Stanfield).

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. McGrath: Perhaps it would be well for me to quote from a speech made by the hon. member for Halifax, the former leader of the opposition, on May 16, 1969, when he said, as reported at page 8790 of *Hansard:*

> I believe the existence of the two official languages of the two founding peoples of this country has made Canada distinctive and has created a tradition and respect for diversity which also show our appreciation of the nature of the people who have come to Canada from many other lands. Our task is to strengthen their union and our country as it exists. Canada, of course, is not a melting pot but a country which respects diversity.

That was said at a time when the hon. gentleman was taking two hours out from a busy schedule every day to learn, and eventually master, the French language.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. McGrath: One day the country will recognize the outstanding contribution of the hon. member for Halifax.

Nobody can doubt the position of this party. If hon. members sat and listened objectively to what my leader had to say in what I consider to be the outstanding speech of this debate—indeed, the outstanding speech of this session—

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. McGrath: —they could not doubt for a moment the position of the official opposition. The record will reflect that this party has not only supported the official languages policy but has in fact been in the forefront of those who would advocate the implementation of an official languages policy for Canada. What we quarrel with is not the policy but the implementation of the policy.

• (1830)

There has to be something wrong with an Official Languages Act which, according to the figures for 1974-75, is costing the country $105 million. That is not a very big price to pay, of course, but there has to be something wrong when we cannot get a ministerial statement to the House printed in two official languages.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Some hon. Members: Shame!

Mr. McGrath: We saw what happened today. It would be easy to pass over it, but let the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Gillespie), with the substantial expenditures he has to support him in this House, explain to the House, to the Social Credit Party, and to the unilingual members in this House, why he would have to come before the House with a statement in only one language. I would look forward to hearing him explain that in the House at the earliest possible moment.

I quarrel with a language policy that would deny children in my province the right to learn the second language of this country, the right to be enriched by French culture, because it is to be enriched to have access to it.

My children attend school in the city of Ottawa and they are bilingual. I am proud of that because another world is open to them. Not only are they better Canadians but they can enjoy a much wider and enriching experience of the world. They are bilingual because they were able to take advantage of a French immersion program that was funded, albeit as an experiment, by this government in the city of Ottawa. If they had been going to school in St. John's, Newfoundland, they would not have had that opportunity as the children living there do not have it.

Let us look at what we are getting for $100 million. Does it provide French immersion to the towns and villages of this country where only one language is spoken? Failure to do that is to deny children in Newfoundland equality of opportunity in this country. If they opt for a career in the Public Service they know they could not get beyond the local level because no opportunity is open to them in a unilingual province to learn French so that they could have the same opportunities as Canadians in other parts of the country.

An hon. Member: Ask Frank Moores about it.

Mr. McGrath: Let me tell the hon. member something about the government of Newfoundland that he does not know. Today our province is in debt to the extent that it can no longer afford to maintain existing levels of service because it has to operate within the framework of a policy that has its priorities all mixed up. That is what my leader is saying. The official languages policy is essential to the existence of this country but it is not the glue; by itself it is divisive.

What my French Canadian compatriots in the province of Quebec want is jobs. It comes down to a question of bread and butter, Mr. Speaker. Unemployment has always been a problem in Quebec, just as it has always been a problem in the Atlantic provinces. The curse of ongoing unemployment is a direct result of ongoing regional disparity. I can only hope that events will transpire in this House—and perhaps this debate will be the turning point—so that the people of this country will understand we must have an Official Languages Act in order to keep the country together; we must provide equality of opportunity for our French Canadian compatriots in Quebec and elsewhere, and for Canadians in other parts of Canada. You cannot on the one hand solve a problem in Quebec and on the other hand create one in Newfoundland. In my opinion this is where the system gets off the rails.

I should like now to address myself to the amendment before the House. The hon. member for Hamilton Mountain (Mr. MacFarlane) said he wants to involve his constituents in this great dialogue. I want to involve my constituents too, Mr. Speaker, and what better or more appropriate way can this be done than by involving the parliament of this country?

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. McGrath: My constituents look to me for leadership, not to some task force that will perhaps report at some obscure date—I do not think it is even going to report to this House.

It is passing strange that eight months after the election of a separatist government in Quebec, the greatest threat in 110 years to the continued existence of this country, this government brings a resolution before the House saying it would like the rest of the country to involve itself in this great debate. Even then they had to be literally dragged in here to get that resolution on the order paper.

I say to the government that it can serve this parliament and this country by agreeing to the very realistic and responsible amendment of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Clark) and strike a joint parliamentary committee to go across the country and hear from the average people—not just the academics, although they have an ongoing contribution to make, but the average person, the unemployed in St. John's, Newfoundland, the people on welfare, the native peoples, unilingual French Canadians in Lac St. Jean, Quebec, unilingual Anglophones on the west island of Montreal, and in the foothills of Alberta. Only a parliamentary committee has the heart and soul to understand these people and get input from them, not some high-falutin', almighty, all-important task force that is going to frighten the ordinary person.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. McGrath: I do not mean any disrespect to the hon. Jean-Luc Pepin, Mr. Robarts, or anybody else on that committee—I have nothing but respect for them—but I say, let the government have its task force and let us have a joint parliamentary committee so that we can get on with our responsibility to our constituents in this great debate.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

● (1840)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Louis Duclos (Montmorency): Mr. Speaker, I have decided to enter this debate first of all to assert my hope and my confidence that my country, Canada, will maintain its territorial integrity, but also to tell the House how in the view of a young Quebecer who became aware of government affairs at the time of the "quiet revolution" in Quebec, this Canadian crisis could be defused.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to deal successively in my speech with four points which I feel sum up rather well the whole range of claims French speaking Canadians have been making for much too long already. Here they are. I will deal first with the status of the French language in Quebec, next with the status of French minorities in predominantly English-speaking provinces, next with the role of francophone civil servants and the use of the French language within the federal public service, and finally with the constitutional reform.

The debate on Bill No. 1 in the Quebec legislative assembly has over the last few months emphasized a point which I believe will be decisive for the future of Canada. It would seem however that one cannot deal intelligently with a matter if one is not familiar with some population data taken from the last decennial census conducted by Statistics Canada. Therefore, I want to submit to the House some statistics which should enable us to better understand the Quebec francophones' concerns about language matters as well as the steps the Quebec government must take to alleviate their concerns.

First of all, in the 1971 census, 270,600 Quebecers whose origin is neither British nor French reported one of the two official languages was their mother tongue. Now, 64 per cent of them said English was their mother tongue. Second, on the other hand, in the same census, 358,600 Quebecers whose origin was neither French nor English reported one of the two official languages in Canada was their working language. Of those, 69 per cent said English was their working language. Third, for each new Quebecer who joins the French-speaking group, two are joining the English-speaking group. Now, French-speaking Canadians can only maintain their present level of demographic prevalence if 80 per cent of the new Quebecers adopt the French language. Fourth, almost 100,000 Quebecers whose mother tongue is not English use English as their working language, whereas only 4,000 Quebecers whose mother tongue is not French use this language as their working language. Should the present trends of natural growth, language mobility and migration be maintained, French-speaking Canadians would represent less than 60 per cent of the whole population of greater Montreal by the turn of the century.

Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that Bill 1 introduced by the Quebec government contains some provisions which go against the linguistic ideal sought by this government for the past ten years. Other provisions such as that which makes the use of French compulsory in public notices as well as in formal proceedings of townhalls or school boards which may include an English-speaking majority, seem useless to me and unlikely to contribute to the development of the French language and culture in Quebec. Similarly, several provisions regarding the francization of businesses seem to be uselessly niggling and they may open the door to bureaucratic arbitrary decisions. Having said that, Mr. Speaker, I feel nevertheless that this legislation does not deserve the criticism it gave rise to in some circles. For example, to claim that the Quebec government is trying with this legislation to get rid of the English-speaking community in Quebec is sheer demagogy.

As far as the language of instruction is concerned, this legislation fully respects the acquired rights of Anglophones and other Quebecers who are already attending English schools. It ensures that in the future, English schools will not be an assimilation tool for New Quebecers into the English speaking minority. Indeed, no one could object to this legislation if it were to give to children of English Canadians who will settle down in Quebec after the bill is passed, access to english schools. I am very sorry that Canadian citizens are being treated like immigrants, especially as their reduced number does not threaten in any way the linguistic balance of the province of Quebec.

But frankly, Mr. Speaker, we must admit that even after the adoption of Bill 1, the English minority in Quebec will still be the best treated minority in the whole country with its own schools, colleges, universities, radio and television stations, newspapers, in short, practically a complete range of institutions. And I, as a Quebecer, will be proud of it, Mr. Speaker, because the respect and tolerance a nation shows towards its minorities is in my view the unmistakable sign of its collective maturity.

Of course, we can regret the restrictions imposed by this bill on the principle of free choice for the language of instruction but apart from the fact that it is an ideal that in any case could not materialize for quite awhile in English Canada, and even so only in a few provinces, a policy which would ensure a completely free choice of the language of education would for the time being, be a menace to the Quebec linguistic balance. We can only hope that within ten years or so when the francophone majority has reinforced its positions through active government participation in the selection of immigrants Quebec will be able to offer once again a free choice in the language of education.

Mr. Speaker, I am surprised that people who have never protested the plight of the French minorities outside Quebec are suddenly embarking on a crusade to protect the English speaking minority in Quebec and urge the federal government to disavow the Quebec legislation and even question its constitutionality before the courts. It would be paradoxical to say the least, Mr. Speaker, that the province which respects the

rights of its linguistic minorities the most be the first one to bear federal disavowal.

It would be just as unacceptable, Mr. Speaker, if the federal government undertook to challenge the constitutionality of that legislation before the courts. Political wisdom prompts us to let the Quebec people rate by themselves the actions of their own government at the next provincial elections. In addition, it is a fine opportunity to show Quebecers that the federal system does not stand in the way of their government as far as the promotion of the French language and culture in Quebec is concerned and consequently, independence is really not necessary. Anyway, how could the federal government justify fighting to the death a legislation which gives the English-speaking minority in Quebec a treatment which would delight French-speaking minorities outside Quebec, if it were given to them?

Mr. Speaker, at a time when in some quarters people are groundlessly panic-stricken at the prospects of the English-speaking community in Quebec, in the years ahead I feel we should turn our attention to the conditions French-speaking minorities have to put up with outside Quebec. In six out of nine English-speaking provinces, the percentage of people of French origin whose mother tongue is now English is over 45 per cent. The assimilation rate has even reached 65 per cent in British Columbia and 80 per cent in Newfoundland. Indeed, only New Brunswick, Ontario and Manitoba have French-speaking minorities whose future is not ineluctably doomed, more especially in New Brunswick and in Ontario which are contiguous to Quebec. However, they will resist assimilation only if their provincial governments, following the example of the Quebec government, is sympathetic to their cause and provides them with a complete educational system in which instruction will be given in French.

● (1850)

In that respect, I cannot understand the attitude of the premier of Ontario who keeps repeating that he wants to reinforce Canadian unity, yet he remains the perfect usage of stinginess when it comes to accommodating the Franco-Ontarian community about the language issues. I wish he would realize soon that he would contribute remarkably to Canadian unity if he were courageous enough to deal with the French community from Ontario just in the same way as our English conpatriots are treated in Quebec.

Mr. Speaker, if governments from New Brunswick, from Ontario and possibly from Manitoba could take concrete measures to stop this policy of assimilation of French-speaking people who live in those provinces, this would be perceived by a majority of Quebecers as a determination on English Canadian's part to establish at last a true equality in Canada. While most of the language problems are beyond the scope of the federal government since it lacks jurisdiction over education, still it must ensure equal language opportunities for all in all federal institutions. Many projects have been accomplished these last few years. Suffice to mention that the rate of management positions held by French-speaking Canadians in the federal public service has gone up from 12 to 20 per cent between 1965 and 1976. It is encouraging to see that 32 per cent of federal civil servants under 35 are French-speaking, a reason to feel optimistic about our future. But we must not forget either that only 13 per cent of the federal civil servants who earn more than $30,000 a year are French Canadians. Besides, there are still too many organizations in our federal departments which do not seem to care very much to ensure a fair French presence at senior levels.

According to the last annual report of the Canadian Public Service Commission, the Anti-Inflation Board does not have one single French-speaking member among its 18 senior officers. In the agriculture and national defence departments, less than 5 per cent of management jobs are held by French Canadians. The Departments of Veteran Affairs, Finance and Energy, Mines and Resources, have only 5 to 10 per cent French-speaking Canadians among senior officers. Even then, those are filling only 10 to 15 per cent of management jobs in the following departments and organizations: the Department of Transport, the Canadian Transport Commission, the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, the National Energy Board, the Department of National Revenue and the Department of Science and Technology.

Mr. Speaker, in spite of significant progress during the last decade, it is evident that we have not yet a true sharing between French speaking and English speaking Canadians in public administration. Therefore we must accelerate the hiring of French speaking public employees, but particularly we must positively recognize the right for the employee to work in the language of his choice in federal public administration. It is essential that French speaking people have the opportunity to use their language in doing their job, because they can show their full capacity and their career could be badly affected.

To that end, Mr. Speaker, we will have to amend the federal Official Languages Act within a few months. Even though it is possible for people under that law, to communicate in the language of their choice with the federal administration, we cannot say the same concerning the right to work in French. As French speaking people would not commit their language rights to a legislation which would be limited in scope, and which might be interpreted, as we have seen recently, in many ways by courts, I urge the government to amend that legislation in order to clear up any ambiguity and to make a true language rights charter which would serve equally English speaking and French speaking people.

Mr. Speaker, recently the government reiterated in a paper entitled "A National Understanding" tabled before the House by the Secretary of State, that he wants to institute language equality across our country. Sometimes I wonder whether the government is really determined to go beyond a simple statement of principles when I think of the unfairness demonstrated by Air Canada which still forbids its French speaking mechanics to work in their language in Montreal workshops, and when I consider the government takes no action in face of that shocking situation. It is evident that the federal government would gain much credibility for the French speaking Quebec-

ers if he would take the necessary measures to bring that corporation to its senses.

Thus, I strongly urge the government to act firmly in this matter in order to bring Air Canada around to respecting the rights of its French-speaking workers. In the same way, Mr. Speaker, the federal government is bound to settle the bilingualism issue in air communications in Quebec, and that in a satisfactory manner for Quebecers, otherwise the suspicion in this regard will grow dangerously. Mr. Speaker, regardless of the progress made in linguistic equality in English provinces and in the federal civil service, the outcome of the Canadian crisis must inevitably bring in an in-depth review of our federalist system, recognizing Quebec as the mainstay of Francophones in Canada. Such a review must result in a new division of legislative jurisdictions between provinces and the federal government, and on an institutional reform related more specifically to the Senate and the Supreme Court of Canada.

Mr. Speaker, Quebec is no longer alone, as it was in the past, in confronting the central government on the matter of a new sharing of legislative powers. The letter addressed on October 14 last by the Alberta premier to the right hon. Prime Minister of Canada (Mr. Trudeau), on behalf of all his provincial counterparts, reveals full well the emergence of a well articulated provincial awareness which will inevitably lead to a new Canada whose political structure will reflect more closely the true nature of Canada. In fact, it is in that new attitude on the part of the Anglophone provinces that lies for Canada the opportunity to perpetuate itself as a political entity.

It is clear, however, that Quebec, as the national homeland of Francophones, has its very own imperatives in requesting a constitutional revision which would confer upon her primary legislative powers in the fields bearing on the existence and fulfilment of Francophones as a cultural group. It would indeed be foolhardy for the Francophone minority of Canada to depend, in matters affecting the very basis of its collective life, to rely on the will of a government, in this instance, the federal government, which will increasingly be dominated by the Anglophone majority. It must be pointed out, Mr. Speaker, that because of Quebec's slower growth in population, as compared with the rest of Canada, the political weight of Quebec at the federal level is bound to decrease with the years. For instance, the electoral redistribution following the 1971 census increased the number of seats in the House of Commons from 264 to 282, but only one of the 18 new seats will be added to the Quebec representation. In addition, according to the estimates of Statistics Canada, Quebec, which for a long time represented about 30 per cent of the Canadian population, which still represent 28 per cent of it today, could easily only make up 22 or 23 per cent of it by the year 2000.

Mr. Speaker, I feel a constitutional reform should be undertaken on the basis of seven guidelines as follows:

(1) Any matter other than foreign affairs, national defence, monetary policy and interprovincial commerce could, if need be, be entrusted to the provinces.

(2) The federal government should keep fiscal powers which are wide enough to be able to implement equalization programs directed to less favoured provinces and programs for a better redistribution of the national revenue in favour of Canadians at the bottom of the income scale.

(3) It is absolutely impossible to give the provinces some responsibilities in areas where the federal government can obviously better meet the needs of the population.

(4) The possibility of transferring to the federal government part of the provincial legislative jusrisdiction over such areas as natural resources should not be excluded.

(5) The new constitution should provide for a human rights charter whose specific objective would be to guarantee "minimum language rights" in all the provinces.

(6) The provinces could freely delegate to the federal government some of their powers under the new constitution.

(7) The new constitution should provide for an amending formula closely patterned on the most recent federal proposals in this respect.

I conclude, Mr. Speaker, by saying that an up-grading of the role of the Senate, with half of its members appointed by the provinces, and with 25 per cent of its members representing the province of Quebec, would likely reassure the Quebecers who are concerned about the reduced political weight their province carries at the federal level. As to the Supreme Court, it should be reformed in line with the general provisions of the Victoria Charter concerning it. Thus, Canada would have a truly constitutional tribunal whose decisions would never be questioned by the parties involved in a constitutional conflict.

Mr. Speaker, because federalism is per se an advanced form of political organization, we must do our utmost so that Quebec will be able to develop within the Canadian federal system.

Mr. Speaker: I regret to inform the hon. member that it is now seven o'clock.

Mr. Duclos: One last sentence, Mr. Speaker, and I am finished with my remarks.

Mr. Speaker: In that case, the hon. member may finish his remarks.

[*English*]

Order, please. I understand that the hon. member is simply finishing a sentence to conclude his speech. I will then see the hon. member for Battle River (Mr. Malone).

[*Translation*]

Mr. Duclos: Mr. Speaker, only a reformed Canadian federalism will allow Quebec to reconcile its need for self-government with the interdependency which is necessary to build a society which is dynamic and capable of accepting the challenges of the modern world.

• (1900)

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker: Order. There was some confusion earlier in the day when the two-hour debate was beginning. At that time it was about two minutes past five and I indicated, therefore, that the debate would stop at two minutes past seven. Then we got into some discussion about a point of order, about government business and so on, and the debate did not in fact begin until closer to ten minutes past five, so I wonder if the House would not think it appropriate to allow the hon. member for Battle River five minutes rather than two.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Arnold Malone (Battle River): Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I should like to say first of all how pleased I am to have this opportunity to participate, even for a short time, in a debate on such an important topic as national unity. It has been labelled one of the most important debates in this decade or perhaps since Confederation.

While we must all pay due attention to the issue of language the fact of the matter is that language is not the only issue that is dividing people in this country, and that we have to pay attention to many other important problems which are facing the country. I have a whole list here but will be unable to illustrate my point because of the lack of time. I would like to draw attention to what I think is a very sad situation indeed—that while we are debating one of the most important problems facing the nation in the last decade, the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) has seen fit not to be in the House this day but has instead put politics above Canada; he has instead put the Liberal party above the country. He has moved to the western part of the country, together with the Minister without Portfolio (Mr. Horner), carrying with him a basket of plums, and I might suggest that those plums were not raised from seed but come from the result of clever grafting—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Malone: Here he is, not in the House on what is an issue of absolute and utmost importance.

There is a need for a much greater extension of time to speak in this debate and with this in mind, and with the feeling that there ought to be more time for this debate, and recognizing the reasoned amendment which was put forward by the leader of my party, and because I do not have time, in this short allotment which was given to me, to put forward the case I would like to, I will sit down at this time and ask that a vote be taken on the amendment because I think the House should have the opportunity to have that parliamentary task force; there is no one quite like a member of parliament who has touched on all the various kinds of natures of people in the various constituencies of this country, and I would hope the amendment could be put.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

[Mr. Duclos.]

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member must realize, of course, that there is nothing inherent in the setting aside of a limited time for debate to indicate that at the expiry of the time the debate is concluded. It would be implicit in the hon. member's suggestion that the debate on the subject or upon the amendment concludes at this point. That is not a part of the order, and it is certainly not a part of the understanding which has been expressed.

An hon. Member: Let them stand up and we will have a vote now.

Mr. Speaker: I simply wish to advise the hon. member that there is no such understanding. I am sure hon. members would not want to consider that the debate on this subject is now concluded.

Mr. Malone: My proposal is that the vote be taken now, because that would be a reflection of the view of the House—that parliament ought to have more say.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member should realize that what he would be asking me to do is not to recognize other speakers in the debate, which I must do, of course. In any event I have indicated that the hon. member for Battle River ought to have five minutes in which to speak. Those five minutes have almost expired and as we approach 7.06 p.m. the debate does, in fact, come to a conclusion at this point.

It being 7.06 p.m. I do now leave the chair until eight o'clock this evening.

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 8 p.m.

• (2010)

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

EMPLOYMENT AND IMMIGRATION REORGANIZATION ACT

MEASURE TO ESTABLISH DEPARTMENT OF EMPLOYMENT AND IMMIGRATION, ETC.

The House resumed, from Tuesday, July 5, consideration of the motion of Mr. Cullen that Bill C-27, an act to establish the Department of Employment and Immigration, the Canada Employment and Immigration Commission and the Canada Employment and Immigration Advisory Council, to amend the Unemployment Insurance Act, 1971, and to amend certain other statutes in consequence thereof, be read the third time and do pass.

Mr. Arnold Peters (Timiskaming): Mr. Speaker, I would think that the members of the government are cutting it pretty thin. In another couple of minutes we would have adjourned for want of a quorum, but I would not have wanted that to happen.

Some hon. Members: No, no!

Mr. Peters: An adjournment would eliminate my opportunity for making a plea to the government to dispose of this bill by withdrawing it. It has been our contention in third reading debate, as it has been our contention all along, that the reason this bill was introduced at all was because we have an unacceptable amount of unemployment. Our unemployment is of a cyclical nature, and there does not seem to be any end to the cycle of unemployment. There has been no upturn to date in our economy, therefore it has been increasingly difficult to pay the necessary unemployment benefits. The easiest solution would be to cut down on the number of people who can draw benefits under the unemployment insurance scheme, but that is no substitute for employment.

Some of the unemployment we are suffering today is the kind that is going to cause considerable difficulty in the outlying areas of the country, in the areas which are dependent on one industry. There is difficulty in the service industry where employment often is of a short duration and is difficult to come by. This is not true in terms of full employment periods, but it is true in those periods when employment is more difficult to come by. We are also very concerned about the fact that much of this cyclical unemployment takes place with those between the ages of 15 and 25. If members are unaware of how serious this is, they may, as I have done in the last few days, get in touch with Manpower. It is very surprising to see the calibre of people who go to our Manpower offices. Some of them have degrees, but they have been unable to obtain employment.

For these reasons this bill should be reconsidered. It should be reconsidered not only in light of eliminating some of the discretionary clauses in the bill, namely, the extension in the period when a person must work before qualifying for any benefits. It should be reviewed as well in light of finding a way to provide employment for the 1½ million people who are now looking for employment.

We cannot support the bill in its present form. We are insistent that reconsideration be given to the establishment in Canada of an employment factor rather than unemployment insurance, and point out the failure of this bill to do this. Therefore I move, seconded by the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Blackburn):

That the motion be amended by deleting all the words after the word "that" and by substituting therefor the following words:

"Bill C-27 be not read a third time, but that it be read a third time this day six months hence."

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): The question is now on the amendment. Is the House ready for the question?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Armand Caouette (Villeneuve): Mr. Speaker, let me first congratulate the hon. member for Témiscaming (Mr. Peters) who put forward the amendment proposing to postpone third reading of this bill for six months. As far as I am concerned, there are several proposals in the bill which are desirable and acceptable. I do not want to be negative about it, alleging that there is nothing good in Bill C-27. However, we must admit that this bill more than any other piece of legislation on the order paper has prompted reactions from many groups of citizens who are against one or several of its provisions.

● (2020)

Mr. Speaker, when a bill is a cause of division and hate in a country, in my opinion, it is only logical to postpone its implementation and to listen to those who are not satisfied with it. Later on it can be passed with amendments that make it more acceptable, with the knowledge that Canadians do not feel that they have been had, to use a colloquialism. This is why, Mr. Speaker, I believe that the amendment suggested today by the hon. member for Timiskaming is sound and warrants our reflecting on all the problems that this bill can cause. I also believe that the government would be well-advised to listen to this suggestion and to let things quiet down for a while before implementing this bill about which, as I said earlier, so many Canadians are deeply divided.

It is a secret for no one, Mr. Speaker, that nobody agrees on the period required to qualify for unemployment insurance. The minister himself recognized the explosive nature of this issue when he jumped the gun and suggested an amendment to the bill so as to replace the original requirement of twelve weeks of employment by a more streamlined and more complex provision allowing the number of weeks to vary from one region to another according to the local unemployment rate. The minister has tried to have it both ways. He has tried to please everyone, but let us face it, his bill pleases almost no one. As my colleague from Kamouraska (Mr. Dionne) and my colleague from Timiskaming said so well earlier, the people mainly affected by this bill are those who can work only a few weeks at a job, which forces their employers to hire them for a set period.

Mr. Speaker, this issue is important and I believe that all members must recognize that bill C-27 is a source of dissension among the citizens of our country. On the one hand, we have individuals who need the security provided by the unemployment insurance and groups representing the poor, and on the other hand, we have the business people who are sufficiently well off not to need unemployment insurance. The first group demands of course that the qualifying period remains at eight weeks while the other group would like it to be increased to at least twelve weeks.

Mr. Speaker, how can we reconcile these two points of view? It is certainly difficult and it is easy to understand the failure of the minister in this regard. Anyone else would probably not have done better, but the minister should be man enough to

recognize that the situation is dramatic and that any attempt on his part to have this bill passed quickly will only worsen the situation and cause more anger, especially on the part of those who will have the feeling that they have not been heard and that no one has listened to them.

The flexibility shown by the minister in trying to amend his bill may be commendable. However, it must be admitted that the act would be harder to implement because it would apply differently in various regions. For example, when a person moves, he may find himself disqualified because the region to which he moves may be subject to stricter criteria under the minister's plan. This will be once again a selective legislation which will require additional civil servants to determine the unemployment rate in each region, in order to make adjustments and figure out how many weeks of employment will be needed to qualify for unemployment insurance; if the unemployment rate is higher, more weeks will be needed, and if it is lower, fewer weeks.

Once again, Mr. Speaker, additional civil servants will be required, more categories, further calculations and also increased costs in order to provide the same service that we are now providing to the unemployed. The Minister of Manpower and Immigration (Mr. Cullen) knows how long I have been waiting for this bill. Like many other members, I had the opportunity to deal personally with hundreds of unemployment insurance cases which were submitted by my constituents or other persons. In certain cases, I had occasion to notice that the present act gives rise to blatant injustices. I have often tried to solve the problem of an unemployed constituent and found that the reason for his problem was not necessarily due to the mistake of an official or to the negligence of a claimant but actually to the working of the act. However, in spite of our eagerness to have some changes made in the field of unemployment insurance, we feel nevertheless that it would be a mistake to pass this bill at a time when so many Canadians are dissatisfied.

What I am asking the minister when I suggest that he allow this amendment to be passed, which is designed to defer for 6 months the third reading of this bill, is to try actually to seek a consensus among the population instead of ramming this bill through Parliament against the will of almost everybody. The minister should show his good faith by saying himself: "I am aware that many people oppose this bill", in order to show them that he wants to come up with a measure that will answer the needs and the expectations of these people. Let his bill be shelved for 6 months so that we may listen to the people and inform them at the same time. That is the approach the minister should take now. Mr. Speaker, I have said before and I say it again, it is no time to play politics and to show partisanship regarding this issue, because we feel it is too important for that. We do not want to filibuster.

● (2030)

As I said earlier, there are aspects in this legislation that are quite commendable and acceptable, and I think that, in principle it is a good idea to bring immigration and employment under one department. Clearly in our future immigration policy we will have to take into account the employment situation in Canada, and I submit it would be inhuman to invite immigrants to come here if we were not in a position to offer them suitable employment.

Therefore, by creating one department combining immigration and employment it should allow for better planning of our future immigration policy. It will make it easier for us on the basis of the employment-unemployment situation to decide upon the number of immigrants to be accepted. Delaying the establishment of such a department by delaying the legislation is certainly not a pleasant task, but we must consider the whole bill and its implications before rushing it through.

Let us suppose the bill is postponed for six months, Mr. Speaker. This would only leave the government with more time to plan for the establishment of the new department. This would have positive effects, in that it would be possible to identify in advance and avoid errors that usually mar the implementation of any new legislation. So the minister would be well advised to use the six months' delay before bringing back Bill C-27, to prepare and make plans for the integration of the new department. Of course all will depend on how the new department will be created.

It is often said that the road to hell is paved with good intentions. In order to create a more efficient department, a department that is better equipped to coordinate immigration based on the availability of jobs, more than good intentions will be needed. There will have to be first sound management and competent people. Of course, considering the poor performance of the present government in the administration of this country, one is not too sure of the effects of this new legislation as far as administration is concerned. The fact remains, however, that the concept of a better coordination between these interdependent areas is a commendable initiative. And, Mr. Speaker, I do not hesitate to recognize it.

Mr. Speaker, if I support this amendment which calls for a six months' hoist for the consideration of this legislation, it is simply because too many of our fellow citizens find some specific aspects of this bill unacceptable. One thing is clear at present, Mr. Speaker: it is impossible to include in Bill C-27 provisions which are likely to satisfy all interested parties. We shall have to try to determine the root of this problem and find a solution before this bill can be passed. That is why, Mr. Speaker, I urge the government and the Minister of Manpower and Immigration (Mr. Cullen) in particular, to consider seriously the amendment put forward by the hon. member for Timiskaming. We know this government has absolute majority in the House. We also know that they can, if they wish, ignore the proposals of opposition parties and the requests of Canadians.

I also think that the government should heed this advice which is given not in a partisan spirit but in a spirit of cooperation, with a view to giving the Canadian people some acceptable legislation and also sparing them confrontations and needless frustrations. Mr. Speaker, if I may, I should like to comment certain clauses of the bill. Let us refer to clause

[Mr. Caouette (Villeneuve).]

26. On the whole, that clause seems to favour unemployment insurance claimants. However, two comments are called for: On one hand, this clause is inconsistent with section 148(1) of the regulations and on the other hand, the last part of the clause provides that an interruption of earnings would be determined when an insured person is no longer working for an employer, and also when a reduction in his hours of work for that employer results in a prescribed reduction in earnings.

In my opinion, it would be wise to know the wording of the regulations governing the reduction in earnings mentioned in this clause. Obviously, this amendment is part of the work sharing program proposed in Bill C-27. That is why it is essential to know exactly and specifically all the implictions and provisions involved in this amendment. If we refer to clause 27, it says that the determination of an insurable job comes under the jurisdiction of the Department of National Revenue. Mr. Speaker, how many times we, as members of parliament, regardless of party lines, had to make numerous phone calls to the revenue deputy minister to obtain a ruling on the insurability of some employment. At this level of procedure, considerable delays are due, on the one hand, to the volume of applications made to the deputy minister and, on the other hand, to the usual dilatoriness of officials when dealing with unemployment insurance benefits matters.

Many of the petty annoyances of the civil service are also attached to the fact that determination of insurability has more to do with the Department of National Revenue than the Unemployment Insurance Commission. Since work sharing is a new way of granting subsidies to the enterprise, it is more likely that many employers will avail themselves of this new form of assistance. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, it would be wise to know immediately what will be the insurable and non-insurable jobs so as to avoid excessive number of appeals before the administrative court that is the commission or the Department of National Revenue.

Mr. Speaker, we recommend therefore that determination of insurability of salaries for shared work as well as for other kinds of employment be left with the Canada Employment and immigration Commission.

This afternoon we had the opportunity to hear hon. members on clause 29 of the bill. Mr. Speaker, requiring a claimant to have at least twelve weeks of insurable employment to be eligible for unemployment benefits is like launching a direct charge against the unemployed in making believe that they are responsible for their own predicament. This new provision proposed by the government is a direct attack against the most deprived among the working class, because the majority of workers who qualify with a minimum number of weeks of insurable employment are the following as the hon. member for Kamouraska (Mr. Dionne) pointed out so well this afternoon. The first group is older workers and those with a low income and a low level of education who generally keep their jobs for a shorter period of time because the kinds of jobs they are offered, or which are available to them, are often short term jobs. Second, students who no longer wish to continue their education and who as a first experience were hired for a summer period find themselves disentitled to unemployment insurance benefits under this new provision. Third, workers who work in the fruit, vegetable and tobacco fields in various provinces of Canada.

That proposed provision by the government does not take into consideration at all modern personnel hiring requirements in private, public or even parapublic industry. More and more frequently businesses only need skilled workers for a short period of time; skilled workers are generally hired for a specific short term job.

Let us look at clause 31, another provision of the government's proposed legislation to save at the expense of workers on compensation. Why limit the privilege of an extended qualifying period only to those workers who receive the maximum compensation for work inquiry? That clause discriminates against workers on compensation who do not get the maximum amounts obtainable on compensation. The proposed application of this clause would be unfair to workers on compensation who cannot work because of their work injury and who receive temporary total workmen's compensation payments and it is also unfair to those who receive permanent partial workmen's compensation payments.

All injured workers who cannot take their usual job back on a regular basis because of their work injury and who have the courage to work on a temporary basis should indiscriminately be able to get an extension of the qualifying period. There is a section in the act which I am happy to say will be advantageous in many cases. I am happy to have been one of the first promotors of that amendment. The Unemployment Insurance Commission could disqualify any person who had worked more than four weeks and less than eight.

The same Commission could disqualify that person as long as that person could not work. I even asked the minister at that time here in this House whether he thought it was good to encourage people to go back to work after a long period of unemployment. But in the area I have the pleasure to represent the rate of unemployment is not very very high, but the number of unemployed is still too high for us. How many times did people work at the request of the Unemployment Insurance Commission? Those same people after a period of four, six and even seven weeks had to leave their job because of a bankruptcy and absolutely nothing could be done to correct that problem.

After a few weeks of work, those people had to go to the Quebec welfare department to survive. I do not want to miss the opportunity to congratulate the minister for having done away with those controversial clauses and I hope the minister will listen to the suggestions put forward by opposition or government members, particularly the proposal of the member for Timiskaming to postpone for six months the third reading of this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I have other remarks to make on this bill, but first I would like to comment on clause 33. Mr. Speaker, that clause certainly demonstrates a degree of refinement and subtlety attained by juggling civil servants, supported by an anti-labour government, to express their disgust toward the

working class which, as I said earlier, is against the bill generally.

While the Unemployment Insurance Act allows the commission to claim, 36 months after the benefits have been paid, the overpayments made because the claimant did not meet all eligibility conditions that legislation does not recognize the same rights to the claimant. He has only 13 weeks to have set the beginning of the benefit period and he must find all kinds of reasons to convince UIC officials that he was justified to delay his application for benefits.

Mr. Speaker, we also object to clause 35 of the bill because it is unrealistic. That provision is detrimental to the workers who will accept a shorter work period to keep their job instead of being unemployed. However, when they are laid off because there is no more work, they suffer a loss because the calculations are based on average weekly wages. They should only take into account their ten best weeks for the purpose of calculating those qualifying weeks. It often happens in medium and small businesses that the employer, before laying off a worker, will cut down the wages and the number of hours worked.

And that is another reason why we support the motion introduced tonight by the hon. member for Témiscamingue. We could mention other sections, Mr. Speaker, such as section 36. When a claimant is not entitled to extended benefits for any working day of a period of benefits, this section of the bill should provide that the commission can subtract a fifth of the weekly amount of the benefits payable and not the whole week. What about section 38? In view of the fact that the Unemployment Insurance Act is by far the most complex legislation ever devised in a specific area, we assumed that this government would not have pretended that it was necessary, for the sake of its popularity to uphold a clause as ambiguous and mixed up as the one contained in section 30.1 of the Act.

Mr. Speaker, all my remarks and those of my colleagues as well as those of the New Democratic Party and the Social Credit Party of Canada are going to contribute something to this debate, especially to the one stemming from the motion of the hon. member for Timiskaming (Mr. Peters), and I hope that the ministers will bring to the attention of the minister concerned that it is unfair, to pass this bill. I am appealing to the hon. members' and broadmindedness before concluding my remarks at this stage of the debate on Bill C-27. I only hope that the government will not take advantage of its majority to crush the expectations and legitimate demands of Canadians who are affected by this bill. The government should avail itself of this amendment which aims at delaying for 6 months the passage of this bill, to listen to and inform the public as to the consequences of the reforms and changes involved in Bill C-27.

● (2040)

[*English*]

Mr. Derek Blackburn (Brant): Mr. Speaker, I should like to thank the hon. member for Timiskaming (Mr. Peters) for introducing his motion to hoist or delay passage of this bill for six months. As the previous speaker mentioned, many parts of the bill are ill-advised and not relevant to the times in which we live. This point has been made by all members of the New Democratic Party who have spoken, and also by members of the Social Credit party. I do not blame the minister entirely for this, but I do blame him for one aspect of it.

● (2050)

I am particularly concerned about clauses 39 and 40 dealing, I believe, with the qualifying period; they are based on the comprehensive study of two and a half years ago when economic conditions were better and people could move more readily to another job. I cannot think of a worse time for introducing this bill than the present, and although Liberal party members may accuse us of filibustering, let me say if we do not filibuster, who will? Certainly my friends to my right will not. They are not concerned about the qualifying period. But if we were debating the gun control bill, C-51, they would rise to their feet one after the other to keep this House in session all summer. So, I suffer from no sense of guilt because my party and my good Creditiste friends are continuing the debate on this bill. It is a bad bill in most respects, and could not have been introduced at a worse time.

Before I talk on the specific provisions of the bill, let me for a moment deal with the question of our unemployed younger people. We all know that some young people do not want to work, and many employers keep repeating such hackneyed sentiments. Many who are gainfully employed in industry and paying unemployment insurance premiums are fed up with this very small group which refuses to work in any circumstances. It is simplistic to say that most or all of our young people are lazy bums who don't want to work. That is an easy argument to make, and an easy way to try to score debating points. Therefore I suggest we should consider the position of young people in our society.

I taught high school for eleven years before being elected to this House, and know that during the 1960's, because of our rising expectations, many parents advised their children to stay at school. "Stay in school," they said, "and you will get a better job, a cleaner job, a better paying job. You will be respected more, not need to carry a lunch pail, and not need to get up at 5.30 a.m. or six o'clock. You can sleep in to 7.30 or eight, teach school, go to the office or practise a profession." Mr. Speaker, I do not look back in anger. Parents in those days thought those were admirable goals for our young people, and our school system went along with them, province by province.

We channelled ever more people into the academic field, even though we had opened some vocational training schools. But there was a stigma attached to those who went to vocational and industrial schools. In small communities and large, the youngsters who went to vocational schools were looked on as second rate and third rate students and people. And ever since they have not escaped the feeling that they are second class, inferior people.

Let us consider what happened to those who went to academic schools. Personally I think between 25 per cent and 30 per cent of them did not have the brains for an academic program. Those people today have a hard time finding work, and lay the blame at the feet of poor federal and provincial planning across this country. In the past seven or eight years many of our young people have been over-educated. They accepted their parents' advice, took financial assistance if it was available, stayed at school, graduated with a Master's or Bachelor's degree, or with a doctorate or a professional qualification, but cannot find work even in Toronto where unemployment rates are relatively low. Their education has not fitted them for a job. Mr. Speaker, the members of the medical and legal professions are limiting severely the numbers who can enroll for professional training. I think teacher training colleges should also cut down enrollment, for there is not enough work for more teachers.

What are our educated young people doing? A certain percentage drive a taxi, work in a restaurant, even work in a summer resort for two or three months. They take humble work, although they may have their Bachelor's degree, or their Master's. What happens to the well educated youngsters whose summer job ends after two and a half months and who must look for another job? Unemployment insurance will give them scant help in the period they are looking for another job, and we should thank this bill for that. Is it any wonder these people say, "Look, I spent X thousands of dollars educating myself; my parents helped me with several hundred dollars, and the taxpayers of this country paid for approximately 80 per cent of my education costs after I left grade 13; yet here I am, expected to wait on tables, drive a taxi, wash dishes in a restaurant, or work in a textile industry which pays close to minimum wages." Is it any wonder our young people say, "The hell with you; if that's how it is, we will not work at all."

Keep in mind that many of our young adults were told in their early or mid-teens to stay at school because more education would lead to a more abundant, or more materialistic life.

Actually our problems are outside the scope of this bill. They go to the root of our society. We placed too much emphasis on academic training, too much emphasis on materialism. We sowed the wind. Now we reap the whirlwind. There are no jobs for our highly educated young people.

What has happened to that other group which trained in a vocational or industrial school? Where are they today? Did their industrial high school give them an apprenticeship? Did they learn a skill or trade? Did they become electricians, plumbers, pipefitters, and so on? No. They are facing the same problems. They are a little further down the social scale in the eyes of some people in this country. I refer to those who have never had to go to an unemployment insurance office and be told by some snippy 18 or 19 year old gal "I don't know nothing about nothing". Believe me, that is the language some of them use.

● (2100)

These people are in the category of looking for work that is related to what they did at school. However, what they accomplished at school is something entirely different. I have more respect for a good plumber than a poor physician.

I notice that the public relations people in the Unemployment Insurance Commission have turned it around and are now calling it the employment commission. I hope they will place greater emphasis and exert greater pressure on provincial governments to re-establish apprenticeship programs. At the same time they should convince Industry, Trade and Commerce, Finance and other federal departments and their provincial counterparts to create more jobs for gifted people who work with their hands as well as their brains.

As I said earlier, there are too many highly educated people in this country who are unable to find work. Let us bring respect back to the work place, the factory, shop or mill. However, in order to do that we must create jobs that pay reasonable wages.

In May of every year, the planting season in my constituency, I receive complaints from 6 to 8 per cent of the tobacco farming community, and about the same percentage from the fruit and vegetable growers. Almost every time I check into the details I find there are two reasons why they cannot get local help and prefer offshore help from the Caribbean. Either the wage is too low, or the working and living conditions are very poor.

The vast majority of tobacco farmers and fruit and vegetable growers do not have labour problems. However, according to newspaper reports, telephone conversations, commentaries over radio and television, and some members of this House, our lazy youth will not work in the tobacco fields. I wonder how many members sitting here this evening would go out to pick tobacco for $3 an hour. This reminds me of what has been done in the past in the Soviet Union and in China. As my colleagues know, although my Conservative friends may not be aware, I am anything but a Communist.

It might be interesting if cabinet ministers and civil servants had to spend one month a year picking potatoes or tobacco. That might be interesting for those who drew up this Bill C-27, some of which is garbage. If they were laid off for six months and had to line up at the unemployment insurance offices and get some of the abuse that the claimants get, they might come back and rewrite this bill, or at least certain clauses of it, particularly the one dealing with the qualifying period.

In replying to remarks made by hon. members the other day, the minister referred to me, the member for Brant, as a faint ray of hope in the NDP. I took that as quite a compliment until I read his remarks in detail. He seemed to be under the impression that I agree with these variances that are built into the qualifying period. Nothing could be further from the truth.

I cannot quote verbatim, it is in *Hansard*, but what I said was that no statute is carved in granite and that it can be

adjusted and amended. I stated that if in two or three years time we have greater employment or much less unemployment, we could perhaps take a look at this eight week qualifying period. The minister seemed to confuse my statement. It is very clear in *Hansard* what I said, but he seemed to think that it was an agreement that we should have this variance. As I said, nothing could be further from the truth.

We have some very serious problems in this country with regard to employment and unemployment. I have talked about the problems facing young people. I neglected to mention the problems we had with retraining. Although the retraining program was originally conceived with the best of intentions, it was not only very costly but a dismal flop.

Once someone gets into the program, what does he learn? Even if you are a conscientious person in your twenties or thirties, and getting $50 a week, as well as unemployment insurance and so on, and have a barely liveable wage of around $100 or $125 a week, what are you learning? Welding. We have more welders in this country than we know what to do with.

Mr. Rodriguez: Hairdressers.

Mr. Blackburn: I have never been to a hairdresser so I do not know. My wife cuts my hair. That is why it looks the way it does.

Mr. Rodriguez: That is a good way to save money.

Mr. Blackburn: That is right. We in the NDP are very thrifty. The point is that we spend a lot of money retraining people, but after they are retrained, within a few weeks they are back on unemployment insurance because there are no jobs available for them.

I wonder whether retraining means anything in this country. I suspect that it is a slick way of getting people off the unemployment rolls. It makes the government look better from a statistical point of view.

There was another program that flopped. I am afraid that it may come back. I refer to on-the-job training. In some cases it was taken advantage of by the employees and also by the employers. The employers saw a wonderful way of getting a subsidy from the taxpayers for hiring people for a limited time at the lowest possible wages. Is it any wonder that bills like C-27 create an atmosphere of distrust, an atmosphere of bitterness, an atmosphere of class hatred, to use an old expression?

• (2110)

I fear that the feelings which were so prevalent in early twentieth century Europe are now beginning to permeate our society and that legislation from this House and from the government is to blame for a great deal of the growing mistrust and bitterness which are developing between various segments of our society. Unemployed in my constituency will have to wait for three and a half months in order to qualify. Most of the temporary work, certainly in Atlantic Canada, is of shorter duration than that; it is hard to get a job which lasts three and a half months; a person is lucky if it lasts for eight weeks.

I say this to the backbenchers opposite: your government is proposing a period of three and a half months in many areas of this country before workers are qualified for unemployment insurance benefit. Unemployment insurance is not welfare, but what happens is that legislation like this turns the Unemployment Insurance Commission into a welfare system.

An hon. Member: And you divide the people.

Mr. Blackburn: As to that subject, the other day in the debate on national unity we heard one of the worst speeches the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) has ever made.

An hon. Member: His annual speech.

Mr. Blackburn: I was interested in the headlines he got in the *Globe and Mail*—not on the front pages but on the editorial page. I do not recall the exact words, but they were something like this—"Prime Minister Makes Speech in House". That is news. I think it is the second speech he has made here in a year. The country has become more and more divided ever since he came to office because of, among other things, bills like C-27 which divide the country in social and economic terms. The Prime Minister's answer is bilingualism for the whole country—we should all speak French and we would become happy people. Mr. Speaker, my wife is a Francophone. I try to speak a little French; it is my fault we do not speak French more often. I am lazy in that respect. But we still get along.

An hon. Member: I hope so.

Mr. Blackburn: We get along, and one of the reasons is that we understand each other. And as Canadians we can understand each other provided we have a reasonable standard of living, a reasonable outlook on life, a reasonable prospect for the future. I am simply suggesting that if we can translate my personal relationship with my wife to the whole country—and I do not want anyone to misunderstand me—we would find that English speaking and French speaking people can get along together without having to speak both official languages.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Order. I am not interrupting the hon. member to tell him that his time has expired, but I do wish to suggest that he should keep his remarks within the scope of the bill or the amendment.

Mr. Blackburn: I respect your mild admonition, Mr. Speaker. The point I am trying to make is that this bill, which would drastically change the Unemployment Insurance Act in many respects, is a divisive piece of legislation which is injuring the working people. I have in mind specifically Clauses 29 and 30 and the amendment moved by my hon. friend from Timiskaming that it be given a six months hoist so that we could consider it again and bring in changes which would make it a more humane piece of legislation.

I do not know whether I was out of order earlier when I was talking about youthful applicants; I am sure I was directing my remarks toward the qualifying period and the attitude taken toward the Unemployment Insurance Commission. I see no reason why this would be irrelevant to the bill or to the way in which some unemployment insurance offices are run. My hon. friend from Timiskaming mentioned earlier today that it seems as though the worst qualified persons in the office were placed on the firing line—the ones who do not know the act, and that all the frustration builds up from that point. It is true most of the complaints we receive come from people who are experiencing trouble; we do not get complaints from people who receive their cheques on time. But sending out or receiving cheques is not the solution. The solution is employment, but there is nothing which is likely to improve employment prospects.

The marriage between the Unemployment Insurance Commission and Canada Manpower—what a fantastic leap forward into the 19th Century—

Mr. Rodriguez: Forward into the past!

Mr. Blackburn: Yes. "Forward into the past", as my hon. friend says. If one talks to the average person employed by Canada Manpower today, he or she will say that this anticipated coming together of the two services is likely to make a mish-mash of the whole thing. As a matter of fact the departments have been brought together, in practice, for several years. Certain pilot projects have been going on at at various places across the country for about a year and I should like to ask anyone on the other side whether this arrangement has resulted in a more efficient system or in more job placements. My information is that it has not. All it has done is to meld two bureaucracies into one. Instead of having to call surreptitiously from one office to another and say "John X is dogging it, cut him off UIC", he can be denied benefit more directly on the grounds that he is not looking for work when no work is available.

● (2120)

Bill C-27, along with the other bill I have referred to but which we are not discussing tonight, will place a tremendous burden on the social service agencies of this country. At the present time, if a person has to go from unemployment insurance to welfare, this is again one rung down the socially acceptable ladder of our society. The Lord giveth and the Lord taketh away. The federal government is going to deny the unemployed benefits by increasing the qualifying period, and those cut off UI benefits, approximately 226,000, will be unable to find work. We are facing a fall and winter in which the experts tell us unemployment will become worse, not better, so where are these people going to go? A few of the young will probably be caught breaking and entering and be sent to correctional institutions, but the vast majority are law abiding and will end up on welfare.

Who provides the funds to pay for welfare, Mr. Speaker? Fifty per cent comes from the federal government, 30 per cent from the provincial government, and 20 per cent from the municipalities. So here we are, caught in this vicious circle. On the one hand, the Unemployment Insurance Commission, or the employment commission, or whatever they call it now, think that they will save the taxpayers money by cutting people off unemployment insurance; on the other hand the federal government, through transfer payments of one kind or another, will have to provide more funds for welfare. So how much further are we ahead?

This brings me back to my first point, which is simply that we can pass any piece of legislation we want in this House to help someone who is unemployed, but unless we create employment and stimulate the economy, what is the use? Why not let them line up again in the bread lines? In fact I am convinced that this government would finally get off its butt and act on unemployment if unemployment insurance were done away with and we had walks on Ottawa, and violence in the streets—which I am not advocating. If we got back to the thirties, in other words. But as long as Liberal philosophy prevails and we allow just enough money for this and just enough money for that so as to keep people from getting angry, the government thinks this palliative will save it.

The Prime Minister will then come along and tell us that the only problem with national unity is that we should be friendly with French speaking Canadians and French speaking Canadians should be friendly with English speaking Canadians. This will not happen through Bill C-27; it will only happen by providing jobs for Quebecers young and old, indeed for people right across the country, who will then find a common bond. Unless this is done, the anger of the people will continue to rise, not because Quebecers hate Anglophones or because Anglophones hate Francophones, but because of the regional disparity and poverty which exist in this country.

This bill should be delayed for six months, Mr. Speaker. It should be reviewed; it should be rewritten in part. That is why I have spoken tonight.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gilbert Rondeau (Shefford): Mr. Speaker, like the NDPs and the Socreds who spoke before me, I would like to tell the government to-night that I agree this bill should be postponed for six months, and this for several reasons.

First, it seems to me that Bill C-27 emphasizes the failure of the government to create jobs. When we consider the unemployment rate, the economic situation and Bill C-27 we can only conclude that the government has no solution to the problem of job creation in Canada, except tampering with the Unemployment Insurance Act, I would say. Bill C-27 is the admission of the government's bankruptcy. It means poverty and is officially accepted in some areas. I have been sitting in the House since 1962 and I have heard about regional disparities ever since. They said it was a shame that in that area there prevailed an unemployment rate which was higher than in other areas, And that the government was doing its best to solve the issue of regional disparities, while that same government filled our ears with their propaganda that one of the first priorities in their social policy was to stamp out regional

disparities, Bill C-27 officially enshrines regional disparities by stating for example that in some area eight unemployment stamps will be needed before benefits can be collected, that in some other area, because of regional disparities that were supposed to be stamped out, but the government was incapable of stamping out, there must be twice the number of stamps or, 15 stamps, or 11 contributions before benefits can be paid out.

● (2130)

If during all those years the government have been repeating, and leading us or the Canadian people to believe it could solve the problem of manpower or employment in Canada on the one hand and regional disparities on the other, it seems to me that with six extra months before the legislation is passed, it might implement what it promised and has been incapable of doing since 1962 at least. Mr. Speaker, what struck me in one of the first clauses of the bill is the shared cost provision, or work sharing. Mr. Speaker, let us look now for instance at the fiscal policy as it applies to companies or small businesses, and especially small businesses. It must be recognized that in Canada, small and medium businesses do not partake in the fiscal policy which applies to big multinational corporations or monopolies. Once they have paid their taxes companies are smothered as we can see in my area, in the Quebec city district and elsewhere. It is the case of companies with 300, 400 or 500 employees such as Thor Mills in Granby, Acton Shoe in Acton Vale, as practically in the whole shoe industry in Canada, especially in Quebec, because, 60 percent of the shoes we wear and buy in Canada are imported.

For a number of years we have been promised in the House reforms in textiles as well as in shoe and in furniture industries. One is inclined to think that we have to wait until all our factories are closed for the government finally to realize the situation and to start sympathizing with those industries which built our country, especially the shoe industry, the oldest industry in Quebec, which is now on the brink of bankruptcy. What is the reason for that? This is due to the volume of imports and to a number of economic considerations which result from the administration of the Federal government: taxation, importation, unemployment rate, salary levels. Furthermore, the Federal government has become the major competitor of private enterprise in Canada, with the Unemployment Insurance Act, in collusion with the provincial governments and Social welfare.

Mr. Speaker, having smothered many companies as we realize now, Bill C-27 is going to entrust the civil servants from the Unemployment Insurance Commission and from Canadian Manpower Centres with the administration sooner or later of the labour force working for companies with that new concept of work sharing. To start off, this policy will be presented to us as a very progressive social policy, a very understanding policy, well within the reach of employers.

Mr. Speaker, we know very well that before long, not years but months, the civil servants will act as masters with the employers who will want to get contracts with Manpower and to benefit from the so-called work-sharing legislation.

[Mr. Rondeau.]

We are going to put employers at the service of the federal government. We are going to make them dependent upon the federal government, just as we have made employees, over the years, dependent so to speak upon the Unemployment Insurance Commission. We have realized over the years that unemployment insurance and social welfare have caused workers to loose their incentive for work and their initiative. I shall explain later. After a few years, we shall realize that business people too have lost their initiative as a result of a greater involvement of the government in the operation of their companies and with their employees, to the point that they may feel that the government is in charge. As a matter of fact, we already have indications of that in Quebec.

Certain people in Quebec are complaining that some companies are about to close their doors. Why? Because business has somewhat lost confidence in the provincial administration. Business people are afraid of it. Why?

Because when we have been through experiences like St. Jerome, employers come and tell them: "Why invest more and more if tomorrow the Quebec government is going to interfere with our business?" That is why many employers in Quebec are wondering what the future of their industry will be and stop investing, roll back and wait until the government offers to buy their business.

I personally know of 4 businessmen who reduced their staff and the number of jobs in their plant because they had lost confidence in the government regarding private initiative. Now, they want to get back the capital they have invested in their business, and the best way to do it is to tell the government: "We are no longer interested in producing, we are no longer interested in contributing to the economy of Quebec or Canada." Well, they are waiting for offers, and the government of Quebec, with its ever increasing unemployment rate, has to bow down to those businessmen and grant them tax deductions or any other deductions to keep them in the province. Mr. Speaker, this bill on unemployment is going to produce exactly the same economic attitude in Quebec as in the rest of Canada, and before long the employers will also become wards of the federal government. The majority of the unemployed, contrary to what is commonly said, because some claim that the unemployed are lazy—

Mr. Boulanger: Who said that?

Mr. Rondeau: Prosper, first of all. I have often heard government members say in the House that the unemployed are lazy. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Boulanger: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Order, please!

Mr. Rondeau: I should like to point out that the microphone of the hon. member for Mercier (Mr. Boulanger) does not work because he never uses it.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Order, please. The hon. member for Mercier on a point of order.

Mr. Rondeau: I thank you, Mr. Speaker, for giving me the floor.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Order, please!

Mr. Rondeau: I thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Order, please. Is the hon. member for Mercier rising on a point of order?

Mr. Boulanger: Indeed, Mr. Speaker, you heard like me the hon. member who has the floor make a statement which is misleading, shocking, and even worse. First, I never said in the House that the unemployed were lazy; that is a lie, and I ask the hon. member to withdraw.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Order please. That is a point of debate and not a point of order.

Mr. Rondeau: Mr. Speaker, thank you so much. How can I withdraw when I just accused the hon. member for Mercier (Mr. Boulanger) of being lazy. His microphone proves it, because it is rusty. The hon. member never speaks in the House. Mr. Speaker, then if you do not want your microphone to get rusty, you have to use it. Mr. Speaker, the jobless are often accused of being lazy. If they became so, it is because they are fed up with the present system, since the worker is penalized, and everybody knows it.

● (2140)

We reward people who insist on living off governments through all the measures we know of in this House, and it is easy, Mr. Speaker, to live off governments, it is very easy. One only has to own nothing, have nothing in one's name and in order to do that, to own nothing, Mr. Speaker, one only has to spend everything, waste and act accordingly. I know unemployed people who are being called lazy, and yet those unemployed people are always working. I know employers, Mr. Speaker, who are having difficulty finding employees when we have thousands of people unemployed in Quebec and the rest of Canada and at the same time those people who are being called lazy worked seven or eight months a year at high salaries, take back part of their taxes, draw unemployment insurance and above all, Mr. Speaker, find a way to get a job that will earn them money on the side.

The government looks at the statistics and finds consolation in the percentage—the government thinks in terms of percentages, makes sweeping statements, our ministers in this House make sweeping statements on percentages, they do not think that behind those percentages are human beings, heads of families, people who have bills to pay, houses to pay for, doctor's bills to pay, feed and clothe and educate their children, no, they think in terms of percentages and find consolation in them. Yet, I remember quite well when in 1962 I was elected to this House for the first time we criticized the Progressive Conservative government because, as I recall, the Progressive Conservative government of 1962 was the government that had given us the best unemployment record in Canada.

Mr. La Salle: And now it is worse!

Mr. Rondeau: But now I must agree with the hon. member for Joliette (Mr. La Salle) that the Liberals are twice as good as the Progressive Conservatives in terms of unemployment percentages in Canada.

An hon. Member: It is terrible.

Mr. Rondeau: Now we can no longer say that the Progressive Conservatives are the best organizers of unemployment. Mr. Speaker, I do not believe those charges that our unemployed are lazy because I know full well that tomorrow morning, that the day when we will have a social policy to find employment in Canada, that those unemployed who are accused of being lazy today will become first rate workers. I would like to make a distinction with the wrong attitude, the wrong principles of the economists of our friends opposite who preach full employment at the same time as science, technology and modernism. Mr. Speaker, when I hear those pseudo-intellectuals claiming that we could have a full employment policy in this country and those economists who are heading the departments of our honourable friends on the other side and who want, at the same time, press for the development of technology, progress and science, I wonder. I do not believe in full employment! I believe in progress, in science, in technology, in technique, automation and cybernetics. I believe in the kind of modernity we have in 1977. I still believe in the kind of modernity we will have in year 2000. But in 1977 we can no longer combine progress, technology, inventions and modernity with full employment.

One day, our friends on the other side will probably have to kick out all those economists who have led them into an economic utopia that makes them believe in two contradictory things at the same time. For while in our universities we are training intellectuals, skilled technicians and engineers, people who will enter our industries tomorrow and are going to lay off 300 workers while doubling the production of this industry, how could we have a full employment policy in Canada when overnight our engineers will be able to double our national production although they will reduce workers by half.

That is economically impossible, utopic, and foolish. The Social Crediters have always advocated in lieu of insured employment a guaranteed annual income not related to employment, but independent of employment. That leads me to the social considerations in our existing legislation. Here is how our governments consider social security now: if an individual has only one arm, he is entitled to the benefit of such social legislation; if he has only one eye, he is entitled to the benefit of some other regulation; if both legs, are missing, he is entitled to the benefit of another regulation; if he is a victim of an occupational injury, he is entitled to the benefit of some other regulations, of some other legislation—

Mr. Boulanger: What happens when he has no head?

Mr. Rondeau: Someone who is headless like the hon. member for Mercier becomes a Liberal member. Mr. Speaker, instead of considering the matter of security all by itself, the matter of individual security, governments set up files and nothing happens. They set up files where someone for instance who is living off his parents will get less from social assistance

than if he would live off society purely and simply. As for the handicapped resulting from an occupational injury, he is considered differently than the one whose handicap is not related to an occupational injury. So we have all kinds of schemes, so-called social legislation. The formula we put forward is that we consider social security according to the individual, not on the basis of two or three missing limbs, or a sort of physical disability. That is why our social security in Canada today is a real mess and sheer confusion. Our current unemployment insurance legislation, particularly Bill C-27, is a perfect picture of that confusion, a perfect Tower of Babel we are creating for unemployed Canadians when a guaranteed annual income would neatly solve that issue.

Mr. Speaker, a guaranteed annual income is too simple, not complex enough for our civil servants, because we will not need those gentlemen anymore to blame the needy people. They say to others how to organize their life. A guaranteed annual income would reduce the number of civil servants to the same level as those who get unemployment insurance or welfare benefits. Last week, in the *Journal de Montréal*, we could read that 40 per cent of Canadians today derive their income from various governments.

Mr. Speaker, there are more people living off the governments than there are people working and paying taxes in 1977. In fact, if 60 per cent of the population is not living off the governments, the number of people working in Canada is lower than the number living off the governments. It is not surprizing that many people have now lost the desire to work. They could not care less about the initiative that they had when they still believed in working to earn a living.

Mr. Speaker, we have come to a point in our society where someone who shows a taste for work and initiative and who wants to develop his country is nearly considered a mental case, an idiot, someone who does not have both feet on the ground. He is still 50 years behind everyone else because he believes he must work to earn a living. Have you ever seen such an idiot? This small group of idiots who still believe that they must work to earn a living, Mr. Speaker, is disgusted by all the socialistic approaches of the Liberal government.

Some hon. Members: That is right. That is right.

Mr. Rondeau: My friends of the New Democratic Party agree with us when we talk about social legislation; when we talk against the socialistic tendency—

An hon. Member: What is the difference?

Mr. Rondeau: True, Mr. Speaker, the Social Crediters are for social legislation, but they are not socialists.

An hon. Member: Thank goodness for that difference!

Mr. Rondeau: Our friends want to know what the difference is? To be for social legislation, Mr. Speaker, is to think of each individual as an individual, not according to what the government would like him to be, but according to his own needs. Mr. Speaker, the Social Crediters are for social legislation. Why? Because we want the individual to keep his initiative, we want him to keep his own money, we want him to keep the desire to become—and some will call this scandalous—to become rich if he wants to and if he can. But with our governments today, an individual cannot grow rich because he knows there is too much censorship, too many pickpockets and too many public servants. Mr. Speaker, with such a budget in Canada, with so many Crown corporations, we are going to take more than $10 billion in 1977-78 from Canadian taxpayers to maintain our bureaucracy. I believe it is time to do some clean-up work, to watch those who are still thinking in terms of initiative, in terms of work, who are still foolish enough, like me, to believe one must work to live, rather than giving in the 1977 way of thinking, whereby those who want to work for a living are stupid, because nowadays it is more interesting, more useful and more intelligent than wasting it all, spending it all before reaching 65, because if you have some income when you reach 65, the federal government will cut off your pension. If you have some income when you reach 65, the provincial government will cut off another bit of it.

If a widow who has just lost her husband has a property which yields some $1,000., they will cut off even more. At present, someone who had the foresight and judgment to buy a life insurance policy when he was still young in order to provide some security for his family, when he reaches the age of 60 or the retirement age, the federal government with its new legislation wants to "cut it off" even before his death. If he has anything left at the time of his death, succession duties will eat up the balance.

Mr. Speaker, with this kind of socialistic mentality in our present Canadian laws, we can only have people who are unfortunately disillusioned with work, who have lost the drive for profits, the desire to bring prosperity to their country, the drive to become a rich man or even capitalists. Unfortunately, in our present system it is just impossible. This is why, Mr. Speaker, on tactical grounds, because I agree with our friends the New Democrats and for other purposes and other reasons, I suggest that this government, if it really has solutions to offer for the problems of regional disparities, surely knows how to conceal them! Actually, it does not have any. We do not need a law to officially and openly sanction regional disparities in this country. If they have ideas or bills or solutions that can help solve the unemployment problem in Canada, my goodness, before amending the present law on unemployment insurance, they should present them to the House. When the problem of any unemployed worker is solved for some 10 to 15 weeks, we have not yet solved his occupational problem for the remainder of his life, Mr. Speaker. It would seem that the only policy the Liberals are capable of devising is just to think about the unemployed and about ways of generating them by the thousands, of making them into welfare recipients by the thousands and turning them into hordes of government dependents, Mr. Speaker.

● (2150)

Mr. Stuart Leggatt (New Westminster): Mr. Speaker, the thinking of the hon. member for Shefford (Mr. Rondeau) is

very difficult to follow. He speaks better than he sings, and he sings quite well.

I agree with the hon. member for Shefford—

[*English*]

—he does not know Karl Marx from Groucho Marx.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Rondeau: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): The hon. member for Shefford raises a point of order.

Mr. Rondeau: Mr. Speaker, I should like to make a correction to today's official report and tell hon. members of this House that the more I study Karl Marx, and I have all his books in my library, the more I tend to move away from his ideology.

[*English*]

Mr. Leggatt: The hon. member has obviously moved to another planet.

I rise basically to talk about the madness in this bill. There was a time when we looked at this, and someone suggested that we could regionalize the country into provinces. As I remember, it was a Tory motion at one point in this House which suggested that we could change the period of entitlement in a variety of regions based upon provincial boundaries. The only thing more stupid I could imagine could be to separate the country into 54 separate regions. We are now going to divide the country into 54 little districts.

Mr. Peters: Call it seats in the Senate.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): That is more than the number of states in the United States.

Mr. Leggatt: Nova Scotia has a 13.2 per cent unemployment rate. This bill would give the poor person in Nova Scotia who cannot find a job 42 weeks of benefits if he can put in 10 weeks of work. In the lower mainland of British Columbia where there is an 8.5 per cent rate, 10 weeks of work will give an individual nothing in terms of unemployment insurance benefits. It is just as tough to be poor in Vancouver as it is in Cape Breton, and the hon. member for Cape Breton-East Richmond (Mr. Hogan) would be the first to agree with that.

May I call it ten o'clock, Mr. Speaker?

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[*English*]

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 40 deemed to have been moved.

Adjournment Debate

URBAN AFFAIRS—ALLEGATION GOVERNMENT OWES TAXES TO MUNICIPALITY OF OTTAWA-CARLETON—GOVERNMENT ACTION

Mrs. Jean E. Pigott (Ottawa-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, since Confederation, Ottawa, as the capital of Canada, has been a focal point for the dreams of this country. Today the national capital region faces many problems and is being viewed by the rest of the country not as a symbol of the dreams of Canada but as a reflection of our insensitive and uncaring government.

There have been significant changes in the national capital region in recent years. Until the 1960's the federal government was virtually unopposed in the planning process in the capital area. With the growth of regional government in Ontario and Quebec in the 1970's, the federal government's massive relocation to Hull, and the growth of the city of Ottawa and the suburban townships, has come the need for a fresh approach by the government to the national capital region.

Unilateral planning in isolation is no longer appropriate for the senior government in the capital of Canada. Action taken by the federal government without discussions with provincial and municipal governments must be replaced by consultation among the planning partners.

Recently a special joint committee on the national capital region met to hear testimony about the structure and the future of our area. There is a strong need for co-ordinated planning in this area and for a forum where problems and goals can be discussed. I believe that the special joint committee should be reconstituted as a standing committee of the House of Commons with responsibility for planning and developing the national capital region. This standing committee should also be responsible for the operation of the National Capital Commission and help co-ordinate the affairs of government departments which operate in splended isolation in this city: Public Works, Urban Affairs, and the Department of Agriculture, to name just three.

● (2200)

Since three levels of government now operate in the capital area, as well as jurisdictions that cross provincial boundaries, the time has come to remove planning from an appointed body such as the NCC and return it to parliament and the people of Canada through a committee of the House of Commons. Another aspect of concern because of the NCC presence in the capital is the "revolving door" or musical chairs situation which we have seen in NCC senior management. There is a great need for more continuity than is available through this non-elected body. We should not have five chairmen and five general managers in the space of ten years, nor a board of directors that does not have any local input or local officials on it. This shows a lack of concern or care.

Planning in the national capital region should never lose sight of the fact that the communities on both sides of the Ottawa River have goals and needs both as part of the national capital and as cities in their own right. The federal government should no longer enact moves which lessen the right of municipalities to govern themselves.

One example of the need for a reformed method of governing and planning in the national capital region is the situation now caused by grants in lieu of taxes; this is a very real problem for Ottawa and a potential problem for Hull. It has been argued that Ottawa should not protest the fact that government grants are lower than business taxes because of such facilities as the National Arts Centre which, it is implied, would not exist if the federal government did not take a leading role in the national capital region. Does a statement of this sort explain to a resident of Gloucester why his property taxes are $990 this year while a citizen of Toronto pays $597? The $18 million in non-paid taxes facing Ottawa this year would purchase a great many tickets at the National Arts Centre—which was supposed to be a centennial gift to the nation.

It was in the early 1950's that a fire in the Library of Parliament prompted the government to give its first grants in lieu of taxes to the city of Ottawa in order to improve the water supply in the event of another fire. Do non-paid taxes have to bring the national capital region down in flames before the government considers this a "burning issue?"

The recently announced move of 15,000 public servants to Hull will leave four million square feet of office space vacant in Ottawa. Four million square feet of office space is almost 160 acres; it would take 100 small factories to cover four million square feet. As more and more office space in the national capital region becomes the responsibility of the private sector, officials must deal with the fact that businesses are reluctant to locate in an area where taxes are so much higher than the rest of the country. Non-paid taxes play a major role in causing these high charges, and reluctance of the NCC to have realistic ideas about iand leasing or sale of industrial land to prospective buyers causes a serious problem. Notice of this move was given in advance, but the accelerated growth of the Public Service and of government offices in Ottawa disguised the magnitude of government statements.

Relocation, coming as it does with a decrease in Public Service growth, could turn Ottawa into a "ghost town." I find the callous attitude of the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Buchanan) and the Minister of State for Urban Affairs (Mr. Ouellet) hard to understand. If they had to face 160 empty acres in their cities or constituencies would they not have emergency meetings and call for help? Even DREE would be involved if this happened in their constituencies.

There is no question that Ottawa and area business people must take an initiative to attract firms to fill up the four million square feet of office space vacated by the federal government in downtown Ottawa. In fact meetings are taking place in an effort to promote a stronger business life for the capital. A study was commissioned and plans formulated to build a convention centre for Ottawa.

However, in spite of the fact that Ottawa is the fourth largest metropolitan area in Canada and the second largest in Ontario, 40 per cent of the land in our area is controlled by a non-elected body, the National Capital Commission. With a presence of that magnitude in Ottawa, the federal government can deny neither the effect of its actions on the community nor its responsibility to take an active role in finding solutions. It is interesting there is no one to champion the city in the cabinet. Can you imagine any other large metropolitan area without someone caring?

What action could be taken in this regard? In the immediate future the demolition of temporary buildings could be accelerated giving more work to the construction industry at a critical time, and moving workers from these buildings into vacated space could alleviate some of the burden of empty office space. Secondly, space not needed immediately at Place du Portage could be mothballed for a period of time until Ottawa had time to adjust.

There are many problems which come under the umbrella of the National Capital Commission and they need the attention of this government if Ottawa is to be really national. There is the on-again off-again Rideau Centre; satellite cities and land appraisal at Carlsbad Springs; a convention centre to support the tourist industry; decentralization plans that should be clearly defined and a timetable established; rapid transit assistance should be provided in light of the energy crisis and, of course, grants in lieu of taxes. There is a great need for equity of treatment for the people of the national capital region. Mr. Speaker, the capital of Canada does not deserve an absentee landlord.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Order, please.

Mr. Jean-Robert Gauthier (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of State for Urban Affairs): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Ottawa-Carleton (Mrs. Pigott) talked about an uncaring government. Over the years governments have been careful in approaching the question of grants in lieu of taxes. Obviously the government cares.

The statistical figures in my hand show that in 1950 grants to the city of Ottawa in lieu of taxes on departmental properties amounted to $762,392. That figure has risen over the years, and in 1977 it reached the level of $26,428,000. The figures do not suggest the government is uncaring, and I do not accept the suggestion that the Conservative government of the late 1950's was uncaring. We operate under a national program. The federal program of grants in lieu of taxes is a national program which will require the expenditure of an estimated $111.5 million during the 1977-78 fiscal year. That program applies to all federal buildings across the country, to all areas where there are federal buildings, such as post offices. In all those cases the act applies.

Mr. Paproski: What about Ottawa-Vanier?

Mr. Gauthier (Ottawa-Vanier): We have only a few federal buildings in Ottawa-Vanier.

The alleged grant shortfall claimed by the city of Ottawa relates primarily to the non-payment of business taxes and certain Crown-owned properties on which no grants are paid. While it is true that some properties are excluded from grants by statute they consist, for the most part, of cultural properties

and park lands. These properties are of great benefit to the citizens of Ottawa and in many instances fill a need that the city might otherwise be called upon to meet. However, since the main thrust of the question raised by the hon. member for Ottawa-Carleton concerns business tax, I will address myself to that question.

Business tax is not a type of tax in lieu of which grants are authorized by the Municipal Grants Act. The payment of business taxes on federal departmental property would not only require legislative authority, but also the implicit or explicit assumption that the operation of a government is a "business." This would be very difficult to justify since departmental properties are primarily service-oriented and are not used for the purpose of deriving a gain or profit. However, most federal Crown corporations which do operate with a view to generating revenues sufficient to cover costs or make a profit currently do make their own grant payments in lieu of business taxes.

I am talking about CMHC, for example, for whose buildings my minister's department is responsible.

Mrs. Pigott: What about the buildings on Wellington Street?

Mr. Gauthier (Ottawa-Vanier): The general rationale underlying the imposition of the municipal business tax is that those who operate a business venture, with the expectation of a gain or profit by virtue of such operation, benefit from the local services, amenities, labour force, transportation facilities and purchasing power inherent in the municipality and should pay an amount over and above real property taxes for the privilege of being provided with many of the elements necessary for turning a profit.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Order, please. I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member but his allotted time has expired.

CONSUMER AFFAIRS—POSSIBILITY OF PROHIBITING USE OF ASBESTOS FIBRES IN PREPARATION OF FOOD AND BEVERAGES

Hon. Stanley Haidasz (Parkdale): Mr. Speaker, it is obvious to the distinguished members of this august assembly that we are living in a period of environmental disease. Increasing urbanization and industrialization, especially expending technology, have altered our environment to such an extent that humans, animals, and plants are being exposed to an ever-growing number of harmful pollutants.

Recently a medical scientist at the National Cancer Institute stated that cancer in the last quarter of this century can be considered as a disease whose cause and control are rooted in the technology of our society. A biochemist at McMaster University was quoted in a recent newspaper article as saying that environmental effects cause up to 90 per cent of cancers and that current efforts are directed to a cure, rather than elimination of causes. In view of these remarks and mounting evidence of new toxic substances poisoning the environment, a comprehensive investigation of environmental pollutants should be undertaken by our government in co-operation with university and industrial scientists without further delay.

The eradication of present harmful pollutants as well as the prevention of toxic substances in the future will not only contribute to the improvement of health but also reduce the cost of hospital and medical programs, in addition to saving many man-years in our industries.

The fight against environmental pollutants has been recently intensified in Canada by the establishment of a Department of the Environment as well as the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. The work done by these two federal departments is assisted by the Department of National Health and Welfare to protect people better and the environment against harmful substances. But there is still room for improvement.

● (2210)

This evening I wish to elaborate on the question I drected to the minister on June 29, in effect inquiring whether any steps have been taken to prohibit the use of asbestos in food, beverage and pharmaceutical production in Canada. It is now 50 years since it was first observed that inhalation of asbestos dust was a health hazard. During the past five decades much scientific information has accumulated to prove that asbestos causes a chronic and disabling lung disease called asbestosis, and worse, a lung and abdominal cancer called mesothelioma. Asbestos-associated diseases and deaths are increasing because of the inadequate control of the use of that mineral.

Asbestos is not one mineral, but about 30 hydrous silicates which share the characteristic of a fibrous texture and the ability to split up into minute fibres. It is the serpentine asbestos mineral, called, chrysotile, that accounts for 95 per cent of the world's asbestos consumption, and is the main variety mined and used in Canada. Canada produced 40 to 50 per cent of the world's asbestos of which 95 per cent is exported, leaving 80,000 tons per year for process in Canada.

Asbestos is used widely in the manufacture of approximately 3,000 products. The largest use is in asbestos cement products.

The second largest use is for floor tiles, followed by use in pipe coverings, paints, insulation, automobile brake-linings, clutch facings, and gaskets. Asbestos is also used as a filter medium in food, beverage and pharmaceutical industries, and also in the textiles industry to increase fire resistance of fabrics.

There is now a growing concern about the total amount of asbestos fibres reaching people through many different environmental pathways and from the thousands of products containing asbestos. The large number of products containing asbestos means that it exists in every home, factory and vehicle. Asbestos is found in our water, and also in some food, drug and beverage products both made in Canada and imported from many countries. This mineral has been found in talc products, even in some baby powders.

In view of the extent of the presence of asbestos in our environment, and especially the serious health hazard of asbestos fibres, it is urgent to tighten the mining and industrial

standards controlling this mineral. We must prevents as much as possible environmental contamination by asbestos, and completely prohibit the use of asbestos in the production of all food, beverage and pharmaceutical products. Steps should also be taken to stop the importation of foods, beverages, and drugs that contain asbestos fibres.

I wish to draw to Your Honour's attention a June 1977 "Canadian Consumer" article entitled "Test—Asbestos in Wine", identifying Canadian and imported wines that contained dangerous levels of asbestos fibres, and calling for the use of final membrane filters ensuring removal of any fibres from environmental sources.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Order, please.

Mr. Paul E. McRae (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, our health protection branch is one of the best in the world. Lately we have been severely criticized for going overboard with regard to saccharin. After a couple of months the criticism died because it was found that other studies confirmed the findings we had reached. Therefore our health protection branch is to be trusted.

We looked at the CAC article. We are, of course, dealing with ingestion of chrysotile asbestos. It appears this article was based on some German studies, which in turn were based on some earlier studies done by the health protection branch itself, which studies were not conclusive—they were not extensive enough. The health protection branch has carried out further studies on a larger sample and has fairly well demonstrated that this type is not carcinogenic. We have been involved in a much larger study which is going on in the United States. It will be much more conclusive and, of course, if this study should find that this form of asbestos is carcinogenic we shall have to take appropriate steps and do so rapidly.

It should be noted that the chrysotile type of asbestos is an ubiquitous product; it is found in nature, it is found in water. It has been used effectively as a filter in the past, but a study done by the health protection branch in 1973 revealed that the soft drink industry, breweries, and the food industry in general have almost completely abandoned the use of asbestos fibres in filtration processes. We shall look carefully at the American study and should it prove that the chrysotile type of asbestos is a carcinogenic agent we shall take the necessary steps.

FINANCE—TAXING OF BENEFITS FROM LIFE INSURANCE POLICIES—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. F. A. Philbrook (Halton): Mr. Speaker, the story goes that a cabinet Minister once said, "Now, gentlemen, I wish to tax your memory a bit". "Good Heavens", muttered a colleague, "why didn't we think of that before?" That is the impression many people have of government, that now, it will tax anything, that with the proposed life insurance tax it will go as far as reaching even into the grave for tax money.

Last Monday during the question period I asked the Minister of Finance (Mr. Macdonald) whether any significant measures were being taken to allay the concern of many life insurance policy holders, as well as those of the life insurance underwriters, with respect to the proposed tax on life insurance benefits contained in the March 31 budget.

[Mr. Haidasz.]

My purpose in bringing the matter to the attention of the minister was to convey to him, as the elected representative for Halton, the very real concern which exists among many of my constituents that this tax is unfair and unjust. I dare say, Mr. Speaker, that in view of the seriousness with which this issue is regarded in my riding, the minister's response was regarded as being quite unsatisfactory. I would like to take this opportunity, therefore, to spell out in greater detail the problems which this tax would present to life insurance policyholders, in the hope that this will give the parliamentary secretary a chance to offer a more complete response.

In brief outline, there are four main objections to the tax. First, the timing of the tax assessment is wrong. By levying the tax on death benefits, the government will be depriving people of money at a time when they already have so many other worries.

Second, disallowance of interest as a tax deduction on loans applied against one's insurance policy for purposes of producing income is wrong. A business loan is a business loan is a business loan, regardless of the circumstances of the transaction. If an individual can acquire a loan from his insurance company at cheaper rates than from other lending agencies, then so much the better. The loan should be accorded the same tax privilege as any other form of legitimate business borrowing.

Third, and similarly, the proposal to treat policy loans as policy "advances" and thereby tax the policy "gains" at the time of taking the loan is wrong. Such benefits derive from the advantage of purchasing an insurance policy in the first place. To levy a tax at the time the loan is needed becomes quite paradoxical.

Fourth, the rationale for applying the tax directly at the policyholder level is wrong. If it was assumed that assessing tax individually for each policy rather than applying a blanket 15 per cent on the insurers would reduce the cost to the policy holder, this ignores the fact that any proposed increase in corporation tax for the insurers will certainly negate the possibility of lower policy rates. As for anything else, would the company pass on any savings to the consumer?

In addition to those four points both the Carter taxation plan and the Benson white paper on taxation have rejected the concept of a death tax, as have almost all other countries in the world.

● (2220)

Let me give the House a few examples of correspondence that I have received, like most MP's recently. On the proposed policy gains tax at time of death, first:

> This is outrageous when one considers the purpose of life insurance and how it might have had to keep my family afloat if I had died—and when one considers that in the future it will be of supreme importance to my wife if I die first.

Second:

The proposal to tax policy gains at death is contrary to current legislative trends in Canada as well as the rest of the world . . . This concept was thoroughly discussed at the time of the Carter report and rejected.

Third:

Policy holders have paid premiums on whole life insurance in good faith since their policies were initiated, in the firm belief that the benefits would be honoured according to the contract. It seems inconceivable that politicians consider undermining life long investments by introducing legislation taxing such benefits . . . the concept is resented . . .

Fourth:

The tax at death suggestion would result in people being penalized for saving money through the purchase of permanent life insurance and would be an invitation to more people to rely on federal handouts in their old age.

On proposed disallowance of interest on policy loans as a tax deduction, first:

It has clearly been established that interest on policy loans used to invest in a business or income producing property are deductible. The legislation, in choosing to call a policy loan an "advance", ignores the fact that the policy loan meets the deductibility test.

Second:

. . . the interest on any loan I take on my life insurance where the purpose is to earn income should be deductible in the same way as any other interest which is incurred to earn income.

Third:

Curiously enough, by forcing people to borrow on their policies at the bank rather than directly from the insurance company, the proposal will end up foregoing more tax revenue because the bank rate of interest in generally higher than that applicable to a policy loan.

On the proposed tax on policy gain at the time of a policy loan, first:

It has been my personal experience that loans on my life insurance policies have been required at times of financial emergency, or, as recently, to take advantage of a business opportunity. It seems completely unreasonable to levy an income tax at a time—if I borrowed money on my home or on my investment portfolio there is no proposed tax.

Second:

. . . all the policies I have contain "loan clauses" and I have frequently borrowed, paid the interest, and repaid the loans. I emphasize that these are "loan clauses" and not policy advances and it is not right for the government to try to change this concept.

In conclusion, as these excerpts demonstrate, my constituents are well informed on this complex issue and have a clear understanding of its serious consequences. With this in mind, therefore, I would once again urge the minister to reconsider this tax proposal to see whether it is truly worth while and, if so, to endeavour to remove what would appear to be serious anomalies in its application. Unfortunately it has detracted badly from an otherwise useful, economically stimulating, free enterprise budget. Once again, Mr. Speaker, I find myself on the same side as my constituents in asking whether the minister will rescind this proposal for a tax on life insurance beneficiaries.

Mr. Bob Kaplan (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I should like to begin by thanking the hon. member for his commendation of the other provisions of the budget; it is good to know that he is with us in general on the thrust of the budget. What I should like to do with the proposals that he made in connection with insurance is to ask some very simple questions, questions which the government had to confront in deciding on the basic rules for taxation of insurance.

The basic question is this: when insurance is a form of investment, should it not bear some fair share of tax considering that all other forms of investment in our society bear some form of tax? I suppose you can argue it would be better if there were no taxes payable on investments at all. One could make that case. Once it is determined that taxation ought to apply, should it not apply on an equitable basis to all forms of investment?

Insurance is a special investment. It is a peculiar and unique type of investment. It is difficult to have general rules which apply to other investments and make them applicable to insurance, but the basic principle is unarguable. Insurance is an investment and, like any other, it ought to bear its fair share of tax. It is with that approach that the government looked at insurance and made recommendations to parliament. We are not proposing to tax the protection factor or the mortality factor. To the extent the insurance benefit represents a payment for risk, no tax is payable or proposed to be payable on that portion of the proceeds. To the extent it is an investment, the fundamental question is: why should it not bear tax on the same basis as any other form of investment does? I do not think there is a satisfactory answer to that question. That is the basis on which we proposed it.

After the tax reform of 1971 there was some pause in negotiations with the insurance industry and representatives of those concerned with insurance. It was decided that the insurance companies would pay a 15 per cent tax straight across the board on all the earnings of their investment portfolios. Why 15 per cent? In the case of those policy holders who are low income individuals and have no other source of income, 15 per cent is too high. In the case of those who own very large insurance policies and who are getting the benefit of a large

proportion of the income, 15 per cent is far too low. Taking it across the board, it was a kind of negotiation and consultation, and that was the figure which was arrived at then. Subsequently when we proceeded to allow $1,000 of tax free earnings on—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Order, please. The motion to adjourn the House is now deemed to have been adopted. Accordingly, this House stands adjourned until tomorrow at 11 a.m.

Motion agreed to and the House adjourned at 10.30 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Friday, July 8, 1977

The House met at 11 a.m.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

THE MINISTRY

PROPOSED RESIGNATION OF MINISTER OF ENERGY, MINES AND RESOURCES IN VIEW OF FAILURE TO ACCEPT PRINCIPLE OF MINISTERIAL RESPONSIBILITY—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Ray Hnatyshyn (Saskatoon-Biggar): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a motion of urgency under the provisions of Standing Order 43. My motion concerns the principle of ministerial responsibility upon which parliamentary government is based. Last week the Secretary of State (Mr. Roberts) used that principle to defend secrecy in government. This week we have had, first, the Minister of Supply and Services (Mr. Goyer) and then the Solicitor General (Mr. Fox) deny constitutional responsibility for actions committed by their officials. Yesterday the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Gillespie) who, under Section 70(1) of the Financial Administration Act, is responsible for approving the operating budget of AECL, denied responsibility for losses totalling $180 million over and above the original reported loss of $110 million. I therefore move, seconded by the hon. member for Okanagan Boundary (Mr. Whittaker):

That this House can no longer tolerate the government's flagrant undermining of the principle of ministerial responsibility and, hence, of our constitution and in defence of our parliamentary system requests that the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources do resign.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Presentation of such a motion requires the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

* * *

FINANCE

SUGGESTED COMMITTEE REVIEW OF INTERNATIONAL RESERVES—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Sinclair Stevens (York-Simcoe): Mr. Speaker, I rise under the provisions of Standing Order 43 to move a motion on a matter of urgent and pressing necessity. Whereas Department of Finance figures reveal that Canada's international reserves have fallen by $130 million from May 31 to June 30, and have dropped a total of $746 million since December 31, 1976, and whereas this is the second time in seven months the Bank of Canada has apparently had to spend massive amounts of our foreign holdings to offset a declining Canadian dollar, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Stanfield):

That this House ask the government to make a reference to the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs so that a full review of Canada's activities with respect to its international reserves and the falling dollar may be made.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Presentation of such a motion for debate requires the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: No.

* * *

AGRICULTURE

PROPOSED COMMITTEE STUDY OF MEANS OF IMPROVING CONDITIONS—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Gordon Towers (Red Deer): Mr. Speaker, under the provisions of Standing Order 43, I rise concerning serious problems within the jurisdiction of the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Whelan), which some hon. members have been aware of for some time and which were included in the 1976 report of the Auditor General. In view of the fact that these difficulties will continue to cause hardship for agricultural producers, and in view of the apparent inability of the Minister of Agriculture to efficiently perform his ministerial duties, either through incompetence or as a result of interference by the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) or the Liberal Party of Canada, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Edmonton Centre (Mr. Paproski):

That the Standing Committee on Agriculture be instructed to recommend to parliament ways and means to rectify this intolerable situation which will worsen unless immediate remedial action is taken.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Presentation of such a motion pursuant to Standing Order 43 can only be done with the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: No.

• (1110)

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[*English*]

ATOMIC ENERGY OF CANADA LIMITED

CONTRACT WITH ARGENTINA—INQUIRY WHETHER MINISTER REVIEWED TERMS OF RENEGOTIATED CONTRACT

Mr. Joe Clark (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources who was here a moment ago. Mr. Speaker, I see he has just returned. Was the minister looking for a document in the second official language?

My question to the minister relates to the announcement of the dismissal yesterday of Dr. Foster. The Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources took that portfolio at a time when he knew the government and people of Canada had been burned once in a negotiation for a nuclear contract with Argentina, and he undertook to have a renegotiation of that contract. I should like to ask the minister whether, when he was told of the terms of the renegotiated contract, he, personally, reviewed the terms of that renegotiated contract in detail and depth?

Hon. Alastair Gillespie (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member has looked at the summary of the contract prepared by the Auditor General and tabled before the Public Accounts Committee on April 19, the contract between AECL and CNEA, the Argentinian agency, he would know that there are a large number of clauses. It runs to many, many pages. Those particular clauses were negotiated, to the extent that there were numbers involved, on the aspect of the inflationary impact. They covered both the Canadian services, namely, goods, services and heavy water, and some Argentinian services. That contract was considered by the board of directors of AECL following its renegotiation, and accepted by them. On that basis the government accepted the renegotiation.

Mr. Clark: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Every day we hear different varieties and versions of the meaning of ministerial responsibility. The minister is now telling us that ministerial responsibility applies only to short, simple contracts, not to complex ones. I want to know if the minister himself, as the minister responsible who knew a costly mistake had been made in the first contract, took his own responsibilities seriously enough to examine personally all the terms, long though they were, of this new contract before allowing it to be proceeded with?

Mr. Gillespie: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member were to understand the relationship between Crown corporations and the responsibilities of ministers—

Mr. Hnatyshyn: We are learning fast.

Mr. Gillespie: —he would not put that kind of question. He would recognize that Crown corporations had been set up by parliament to deal, independent from ministerial or governmental interference, in matters of that kind.

[Mr. Speaker.]

CONTRACT WITH ARGENTINA—REASON FOR INCREASE IN LOSS ON RENEGOTIATED CONTRACT

Mr. Joe Clark (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, twice today the minister has refused to tell us if he exercised his clear ministerial responsibility, he having been given the warning that there had been serious mistakes made in the undertaking of the first contract. The minister has refused to tell us whether he, as the minister responsible through whom that corporation reports, did what he should have done as minister. I ask the minister how he could have been so certain on February 22, as the minister is reported to have said in *Hansard* in answer to my colleague from Kingston and the Islands, that the top limit of the loss in the renegotiated contract would be $40 million, when yesterday he admitted it was going to be in excess of $130 million? What changed between February and July? What was the minister doing personally to keep track of what had changed, and why we are faced with this serious loss, as he finally admitted yesterday?

Hon. Alastair Gillespie (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, I believe I discharged my responsibilities when I invited Mr. Ross Campbell to join the board, act as chairman of AECL and renegotiate that contract. When I heard it would be likely there would be losses—and this is all on the record if the hon. lady would care to read it—I believe I discharged my responsibility in bringing to AECL one of Canada's best negotiators. I believe that Mr. Ross Campbell, with his team, were very effective in reducing the exposure of the corporation to the kind of losses it otherwise would have sustained. I believe they were able to effect reductions of something like $70 million or $80 million.

I believe also I discharged my responsibility when I changed the board of directors and appointed a new board to examine the whole question of financial control. Quite clearly, this has been one of the great weaknesses of the corporation. It was made clear by the Auditor General. A large number of changes have been made in the corporation since the Auditor General made his report public. Indeed, some changes were made prior to that by myself as a result of the changes in the board and bringing in consultants to deal with it.

Information that I gave the House that I believed the exposure would be a top limit of $40 million was based on information that was given to me. It was the best information that the corporation then had. As a result of the teams we put in to deal with this question of financial management and control, the losses exposed to us were very much greater. That is why I acted with despatch and tabled the annual report yesterday, rather than wait for a couple more weeks, and made a statement just as soon as I could with a complete disclosure of the facts as I knew them.

Mr. Clark: Mr. Speaker, first we are told that ministerial responsibility applies only to short contracts. Now, we are told that ministerial responsibility extends only to bringing in Ross

Campbell to carry the can. What the House of Commons and the people of Canada have a right to know is what the minister did personally to monitor this procedure which he knew had caused serious problems and serious losses to Canada before. We do not want to hear about Mr. Campbell and other people. We want to hear about the man who is responsible to this parliament for reporting for that agency. We want to know what he did.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Paproski: Either say something or resign.

REASON FOR PROMOTION OF MR. CAMPBELL

Miss Flora MacDonald (Kingston and the Islands): Mr. Speaker, the minister has said that his sole responsibility in the $130 million loss was to appoint Mr. Ross Campbell to renegotiate a contract. Mr. Campbell's testimony to the Public Accounts Committee on January 25 of this year was that he had assured the Argentinian government that we, that is Mr. Campbell and Mr. Foster, acting together have the full authority of the Canadian government to proceed with the renegotiation, to sign it and to execute its terms. I wish to ask the minister why Mr. Campbell was promoted to the position of chairman and president of AECL when Dr. Foster was dismissed.

Hon. Alastair Gillespie (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, there are a couple of points I would like to make to the hon. lady. First, in her preamble, I think she misled the House. On the second point, it should be obvious to her that when a chief executive officer is removed from his duties, one has to appoint somebody else in his stead until a new chief executive officer can be located. Mr. Campbell has undertaken, on the basis of a recommendation of the board of directors to me, to take over on a temporary basis the chief executive officer's job in addition to his job as chairman of the board. A search committee has already been set up, chaired by one of the members of the board. I hope it will be successful in finding a man with the kind of breadth of managerial experience that is needed—I would expect somebody in the private sector at the present time—to take over that job at the earliest possible opportunity.

● (1120)

ARGENTINIAN CONTRACT—POSSIBILITY OF SANCTIONS AGAINST MR. CAMPBELL IN VIEW OF LOSS ON RENEGOTIATED CONTRACT

Miss Flora MacDonald (Kingston and the Islands): A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. In view of the fact that Ross Campbell has been Chairman of the Board of the AECL for some two years, that he was present throughout the whole renegotiation of the contract, that he has been reporting to the minister on a continuous basis as to what was going on with regard to the details of this contract, and that the loss has now escalated to a $130 million, I should like to ask the minister what sanctions are to be levied against Mr. Campbell who obviously misled him about the effectiveness of the renegotiation of this contract?

Hon. Alastair Gillespie (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): I have already made it clear to the House that I believe Mr. Ross Campbell is Canada's leading negotiator—

Some hon. Members: Oh!

Miss MacDonald: With a $130 million loss?

Mr. Gillespie: I believe he has demonstrated this. He has had a distinguished professional career—

Mr. Paproski: What about the rest of them?

Mr. Gillespie: Are you interested in the answer?

Mr. Paproski: Yes. We are interested in the truth.

Mr. Gillespie: Then why don't you listen to my voice instead of your own? If you people don't want an answer, if you are interested only in heckling, I am prepared to wait for a while. When you impugn the integrity of Mr. Ross Campbell as you seem to have done,—I am not sure whether it was advertent or inadvertent— you are making a grievous error and blackening the character of a very distinguished public servant. I hope you will withdraw the imputation you have just made.

ARGENTINIAN CONTRACT—REASON FOR DIFFERENTIATION IN TREATMENT BETWEEN MR. CAMPBELL AND DR. FOSTER

Miss Flora MacDonald (Kingston and the Islands): Would the minister give us some rationale as to the distinction he draws between Dr. John Foster and Mr. Ross Campbell?

Hon. Alastair Gillespie (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): I have given it on a number of occasions and I am surprised the hon. lady cannot see it. There is a difference between being chairman of the board of directors and having responsibility as president and chief executive officer for the corporation. If the hon. lady does not understand the distinction between having full accountability for the corporation and having responsibility as chairman of the board, I do not think I can help her.

ARGENTINIAN CONTRACT—DATE ON WHICH MINISTER LEARNED LOSS ON RENEGOTIATED CONTRACT WAS $130 MILLION

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Following the revelation that EACL stood to lose very large sums of money as a result of the original agreement with the power company of Argentina, the minister repeatedly told the House that as a result of the renegotiation of that contract the loss would be greatly reduced. He gave a figure of $25 million and on February 22 he said it would be $40 million. I should like to ask the minister specifically, at what time did he learn that the loss on the Argentinian nuclear reactor would be $130 million? Did he learn this prior to the signing of the renegotiated

agreement or did he get that information subsequent to the signing of the agreement?

Hon. Alastair Gillespie (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): I got it within the last couple of weeks.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): On February 2 of this year, as recorded at page 2638 of *Hansard*, when I asked the minister about the renegotiated agreement he said that already AECL with its partner Italimpianti had signed the agreement and that the Argentine government had approved, though there were still some details to be worked out and so on. Is the minister saying that he did not know what the terms of that agreement were, that although he knew that the previous agreement stood to lose AECL, it turns out now, $200 million, he did not know that the renegotiated agreement was going to cost the people of Canada $130 million? Was that agreement signed without that information being conveyed to the minister? Did the minister not ask what the loss would be in that renegotiated agreement? Surely that was his responsibility.

Mr. Gillespie: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I did ask, and that was the information I was given—that the range would be something between $23 million to $40 million. It was on that basis, when the previous estimate had been for more than $100 million, that I felt that a good deal had been made in the renegotiation by Mr. Campbell, and I so announced to the House.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): A final supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I do not want to distort in any way the minister's reply, but do I understand that he is telling me that prior to the signing of a renegotiated agreement he was given the information that the loss would be cut to somewhere between $23 million and $40 million, that now he finds that those who drafted that agreement and signed it have incurred a loss of $130 million, and that the man who carried on the negotiations is now being appointed president of AECL? Is that what the minister is telling the House?

Mr. Gillespie: Mr. Speaker, I am saying that the loss announced yesterday was a loss which was not known to me until the last couple of weeks, that at the time the renegotiated contract was signed the information I was given was the information I have just repeated in answering an earlier question. I also made it quite clear that there was a team of officers involved in the renegotiation and that the renegotiation dealt only with the numbers, based on the case that Canada had, which was that the world inflationary situation had changed and therefore we could expect the customer to renegotiate some of the arrangements.

Remember that that contract was written under and subject to Argentinian law, not Canadian law. It had to be renegotiated against the background of Argentinian law. There was a provision in Argentinian law, we argued, which gave Canada the right to renegotiate those particular terms which dealt with items beyond the control of the corporation, such as world inflation. It did not give Canada or the negotiators the right to renegotiate the language of the contract. Nor did it give Canada or the corporation the right to renegotiate any estimates that might have been made with respect to man hours, and so forth, in that contract. We were limited in our negotiation to the question of escalation of costs and those matters and I believe, as I have said, that the negotiators were very effective in getting that much better a deal.

ARGENTINIAN CONTRACT—SUGGESTION MINISTER RESIGN BECAUSE OF MISLEADING STATEMENTS OF LOSS ON RENEGOTIATED CONTRACT

Mr. Allan Lawrence (Northumberland-Durham): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In phrasing my supplementary question to the minister I should like to take his memory back, if I may, to several interchanges he and I had in this House and in the committee wherein it was suggested by me that even on the renegotiated contract price the loss to Canada was going to go to $120 million. That was a conservative approach by me, obviously, as it turned out. Does the minister remember his ridiculing of me in this House and in the committee, and by Mr. Ross Campbell, for even suggesting that figure, and does he remember undertaking that the loss on the renegotiated price in no event would go over $40 million? Bearing that in mind, does the minister not honestly feel that he should now hand in his resignation on the basis of that overt misleading of the members of this House?

● (1130)

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Alastair Gillespie (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member wants to make much of an alleged ridicule which I made of him. He seems to be placing it on a very personal basis. I should like to assure him that I have never entered into discussion with him with respect to the affairs of this corporation on a personal basis. I recognize his position as a member of parliament and as a chairman of the committee. I have done my best to provide him with all the information which has been available to me.

As soon as I had the Auditor General's report, I called up the hon. member and I said: "Mr. Lawrence, I hope you will agree that your committee will deal with this on an urgent basis." That has been the basis of my relationship with the committee ever since. I take absolutely no satisfaction in the situation as it exists. I am sure Your Honour can understand the position in which I have been put. I have tried to tell the House why this situation developed. I have tried to explain to the House the reason for the difference in the numbers, which was the lack of financial management and control information.

The corporation sent teams down to Argentina as part of the whole reorganization of the financial management and control structure of the corporation, to examine how that particular project was being managed. As a result of those kinds of initiatives, which have taken place since that agreement, the contract was finally approved in its renegotiated form. It has been as a result of those types of actions that these horrendous numbers have come to the attention of the directors and the

management of the corporation, and they have been relayed to me. I have tried to relay them to the House and to the people of Canada at the earliest possible opportunity.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lawrence: Mr. Speaker, my supplementary is simply this: has the minister submitted his resignation, bearing in mind the whole question of ministerial responsibility, and if not, why not?

Some hon. Members: Order.

RENEGOTIATED ARGENTINIAN CONTRACT—REASON FOR FAILURE OF MINISTER TO SUBMIT RESIGNATION

Mr. Walter Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, just a few moments ago the minister spoke about his attitude. Perhaps he will recall the House of Commons debate reported at page 3280 on February 22, 1977 when, in an answer to the hon. member for Kingston and the Islands, he said:

> I do not know what further information the hon. member wants. All I can tell her is that I think Mr. Campbell was able to negotiate a good deal for Canada.

Further on in the exchange the minister said:

> Any time the opposition can show me how they can save $75 million I would like to hear it.

Does the minister not feel, if there was ever an indication of his arrogance and cocksureness in these circumstances, that this is it? Does the minister not feel that he is following in a very bad tradition, the tradition of Stopforth, Higgitt, Cameron and Foster—all of whom are public servants being blamed for ministerial responsibility? When things are going well, the minister takes the credit. When they are bad, he is an innocent bystander.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Is there anything in this case which would compel the minister not to submit his resignation?

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Through the minister's irresponsibility and incompetence, the people of Canada are now carrying the financial can.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Alastair Gillespie (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, the House leader opposite has challenged me to explain why I might have used language which suggested that the opposition, if they could show me how to save $70 million or $80 million, should do so. I should like to remind them of the reason I said that. I think this was a very considerable accomplishment. They may not think $70 million or $80 million is important. I happen to think it is very important.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that the minister is dodging and ducking in a way which is not credible to anyone on either side of the House, including his own supporters, with respect to this matter. In fact the minister lost $95 million and was responsible for that loss. He had better face up to that because that is his responsibility. It was a loss in addition to any other loss.

The minister has seen fit to confirm today the person who is responsible for that kind of loss during that period and has increased his executive responsibilities. Is the minister not cognizant of what this means to the credibility of that corporation, to the credibility of the minister himself and to the credibility of the ministry? Will the minister not reconsider his position? Surely there is nothing about his office so precious to him as to undermine the credibility of the entire government in terms of its financial responsibility and its ministerial responsibility? Is his office so precious that his resignation cannot be honestly submitted in the best traditions of this parliament, when incompetency and unaccountability have been firmly established even in the minds of the most unbiased onlookers of the proceedings today?

ARGENTINIAN CONTRACT—OPPORTUNITY OF MINISTER OF FINANCE TO REVIEW INITIAL AND RENEGOTIATED CONTRACTS

Mr. Sinclair Stevens (York-Simcoe): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct my question to the Minister of Finance. It deals with the same line of questioning which has been put up to this point. In view of the fact that the Deputy Minister of Finance sits on the board of directors of Atomic Energy of Canada Limited and is also on the executive committee of that company, would the Minister of Finance indicate to what extent he had an opportunity to review the initial contract which was signed with Argentina and the renegotiated contract?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I have already indicated to the standing committee that I have not seen the initial contract. To my recollection, I have not seen the renegotiated one. At that particular time I ceased to be the minister of energy, mines and resources. The Deputy Minister of Finance represents the government on the corporation, but in no way does the Department of Finance exercise administrative responsibility over the corporation.

ARGENTINIAN CONTRACT—METHOD OF ACCOUNTING FOR LOSS ON RENEGOTIATED CONTRACT

Mr. Sinclair Stevens (York-Simcoe): Mr. Speaker, I direct my supplementary question to the Minister of Finance as well. In view of the deputy minister's role on the board, as described by the Minister of Finance, would he indicate if the extra $180 million loss referred to yesterday by the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources was included in his budget presentation of March 31? In short, is this $180 million an additional cash drain which is going to be found in this year?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources dealt

with that yesterday. He indicated several ways in which the funding of the cash requirements of the corporation in the current fiscal year would be met. The hon. member specifically used the words "cash drain" in relation to the $180 million. The hon. member may like to read the statement again, and he will see that it is to be a provision in the accounts against potential future liabilities, rather than actual cash drain at this point in time.

ARGENTINIAN CONTRACT—DATE WHEN MINISTER OF FINANCE LEARNED OF LOSS ON RENEGOTIATED CONTRACT

Mr. Sinclair Stevens (York-Simcoe): Mr. Speaker, my final supplementary is to the Minister of Finance. Would he indicate to the House when he first learned of the extent of the true loss in AECL?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago.

● (1140)

INVESTIGATION OF QUESTIONABLE PAYMENTS—MINISTER'S CO-OPERATION

Mr. Ray Hnatyshyn (Saskatoon-Biggar): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct my question to the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources. It is with respect to his role vis-à-vis AECL. Having regard to the fact that he has indicated that he feels no responsibility for this mess, I wonder if he could now give the House an assurance that there is not a limitless supply of money available to be lost by AECL, regardless of their activities, incompetence and indecision, and whether or not he is in fact co-operating with the authorities in connection with the investigation of other payments that may have been made. It was reported, for example, in the *Financial Post* of June 18 that the investigation would:

> . . . include a number of newly discovered suspect payments made by Atomic Energy of Canada, Ltd.

The article stated that:

> Among the transactions reportedly being examined by the RCMP is a duplicate $400,000 item for which there is said to be inadequate accounting.

What I am asking the minister is whether he is co-operating now with the RCMP officials and personally involving himself with the minister responsible, and whether he even knows about the particular investigations that are going on.

Hon. Alastair Gillespie (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): There is a very strange dichotomy on the other side. At one moment they are saying they want you to involve yourself deeply in some situation—as I understood the hon. member he wanted me to involve myself deeply with the RCMP—but if I were to do that or even try to interfere with the RCMP investigation, I would be the first to be attacked by the other side.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: The answer simply escapes any reasonable person. I do not understand what the minister is talking about. I simply ask the minister whether or not he is co-operating—the word is co-operating—with the RCMP in their investigation of newly discovered suspect payments by AECL. Is the minister denying now that there are any further payments that are under investigation, or is he now saying that this is the final loss we will suffer with respect to the past transactions of AECL? He can certainly answer that question.

Mr. Gillespie: Perhaps the hon. member would reread his first question. He will see then why the answer I gave him was the right answer.

On the second question, if he is asking me about the RCMP investigation into other payments that might have been made by the corporation, I am in no position to tell him. The RCMP have not come to me, they have not asked me for any information with respect to any payment. I know of none. I have no reason to believe that the RCMP would be looking at any other. It is for the RCMP to determine. I offered my full co-operation and AECL has offered its full co-operation to the RCMP.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: That is nonsense. Yesterday in the House the Solicitor General acknowledged there are investigations on an ongoing basis being made with respect to AECL operations in answer to a question from my colleague, the hon. member for Northumberland-Durham. I am asking the minister now if he will come clean and tell the House clearly and directly whether or not he will co-operate with the RCMP.

Mr. Lang: He just said so.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: What the minister said, with all due respect, is nonsense. I am simply asking—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The minister just answered the very question the hon. member is asking.

Some hon. Members: Sit down.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: The minister indicated that, personally, he has absolutely no knowledge with respect to that. I am asking whether he will conduct an investigation with the officials of AECL so that, in fact, he can assist them in co-operating with the RCMP in order to make sure that all illegal and suspect payments are brought to the attention of the RCMP.

Mr. Speaker: I am sure that if the hon. member reads the record he will see that that is the very language the minister used in answering him. His words were that he would co-operate and AECL would co-operate with the RCMP.

* * *

ROYAL CANADIAN MOUNTED POLICE

ALLEGED BREAK-IN AT INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION RESOURCE ASSOCIATION—EFFECT ON DECISION TO HOLD INQUIRY

Mr. Stuart Leggatt (New Westminster): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Solicitor General. Did the break-in at the International Education Resource Association on Cypress Street in Vancouver, on January 29 of this year play a

part in the Solicitor General's decision to call an inquiry into the matter—one of the reasons the Solicitor General gave was that L'Agence de Presse Libre break-in was not an isolated occurrence as he had previously thought—and could he advise further whether he is aware of any allegations that have been made surrounding that break-in?

Hon. Francis Fox (Solicitor General): The answer to the double barreled question in both cases is no, Mr. Speaker.

SOURCE OF ADDITIONAL INFORMATION OF UNAUTHORIZED ACTIVITIES WHICH LED TO ESTABLISHING INQUIRY

Mr. Stuart Leggatt (New Westminster): I apologize to the minister. I have written to him but he may not have received the letter, but I am sure the minister would be happy to look into that particular question. My supplementary question is as follows: In coming to his determination to hold an inquiry, did he obtain additional information which led him to that conclusion from his deputy minister, or was there additional information from the RCMP? In other words, what was the source of the information that led him to the conclusion that an inquiry was now appropriate, whereas before L'Agence de Presse Libre matter seemed to be an isolated occurrence? Was it from someone in his own department or was that information volunteered initially from the force itself?

Hon. Francis Fox (Solicitor General): I believe that I answered the question in detail in my statement to the House. There were matters which were brought to my attention and which seemed to be substantiated. This was substantiated after my initial statement in the House on the APLQ affair on June 17.

Mr. Stanfield: You are the world figure skating champion, Francis; free skating.

* * *

FARM CREDIT CORPORATION

INDICTMENT OF MANAGEMENT IN AUDIT BY SIBALD GROUP—GOVERNMENT ACTION

Mr. Perrin Beatty (Wellington-Grey-Dufferin-Waterloo): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Agriculture my question is for the Acting Minister of Agriculture. I gave him notice in the House publicly yesterday of the question I intended to ask. I want to pursue the question I asked yesterday about the Farm Credit Corporation, the $308 million agency of the federal government. Can the minister tell the House today what specific action has been taken as a result of the management audit that bluntly disclosed serious morale problems within the corporation, total lack of direction from senior management, moonlighting by corporation employees on government time, and bilingual training for employees working in areas where no second language is spoken?

Hon. Daniel J. MacDonald (Acting Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, the document referred to by the hon. member for Wellington-Grey-Dufferin-Waterloo is the report of a management audit conducted with respect to the Farm Credit Corporation during the winter of 1976-77. I would first state that it is unlikely that we would find many organizations in either the private or public sector that were willing to expose themselves in the manner in which the FCC has done. This was a study based on interviews with staff of the corporation at all levels, in addition to the clients of the corporation with which it deals on a regular basis.

An hon. Member: Save the speech and answer the question.

Mr. MacDonald (Cardigan): You asked for an answer and you are getting it.

Rather than criticize the Farm Credit Corporation by searching for selected excerpts from the report which are critical of the way it functioned at the time of the study, I believe we should acknowledge that the extensive self-examination which has taken place is a credit to the staff of the corporation and we should sincerely congratulate them for the action which they have taken to improve the corporation in all its facets and to better serve its clients in the Canadian farm community.

AWARDING OF CONSULTANTS' CONTRACT BY CHAIRMAN TO COMPANY OF WHICH HE IS DIRECTOR—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Perrin Beatty (Wellington-Grey-Dufferin-Waterloo): Mr. Speaker, the minister absolutely refused to answer the specific question I asked. He simply evaded it and gave a speech instead which was prepared by one of his officials.

I have a supplementary question. Because the minister obviously does not understand what is going on, my supplementary is for the Acting Prime Minister. In view of the fact that the Minister of Agriculture has confirmed this week that the chairman of the Farm Credit Corporation, Mr. B. Kristjanson, gave consulting contracts totalling $80,000 to the Manitoba Institute of Management, of which he was a director at the same time as he was chairman of the Farm Credit Corporation, and that the contract was awarded without tender, can the Acting Prime Minister tell the House whether the government is satisfied that the awarding of the contract was in no way in violation of the government's guidelines for public servants, particularly paragraphs 3, 7 and 8 which state that public servants are expected to arrange their private affairs in a manner that will prevent conflict of interests from arising and that public servants should hold no outside office or employment?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I presume that the minister is deemed to be cognizant of the law.

Hon. Daniel J. MacDonald (Acting Minister of Agriculture): With regard to the contract, the hon. gentleman referred to by the hon. member, namely, the chairman of the Farm Credit Corporation is a member of the board of the other organization, which is a non-profit organization, and I am not

talking of the Farm Credit Corporation but of the Manitoba Institute of Management, Inc. It was in no way unconstitutional or anything else, and there is no harm in this at all.

● (1150)

Mr. Beatty: Is the minister specifically aware of Privy Council Order in Council 1974-4065? Paragraph 7 reads:

Public servants should hold no outside office or employment that could place on them demands inconsistent with their official duties or call into question their capacity to perform those duties in an objective manner.

If so, how does he square that with the statement he just made?

Mr. MacDonald (Cardigan): Mr. Speaker, I have no trouble squaring that with the statement I have just made. I refer the hon. member back to January 26, 1977 when that question was placed on the order paper and answered in detail. If Mr. Speaker wants to give me time, I will read the question and the answer to the House.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Red Deer.

* * *

CANADIAN WHEAT BOARD

POSSIBILITY OF AMENDMENT OF ACT TO AVOID HARASSMENT OF PRODUCERS—MEASURES TO INCREASE SALES

Mr. Gordon Towers (Red Deer): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the minister in charge of the Canadian Wheat Board. In view of the increasing number of grain producers and elevator agents in Alberta who are being charged for petty violations of the Canadian Wheat Board Act, which are offences only because of bad legislation passed by parliament early in 1972, is the minister giving any consideration to having the Canadian Wheat Board Act scrutinized and amended by parliament so that harassment of producers and agents will not continue?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I will be glad to have a look at the question with the Canadian Wheat Board as to whether the rules as they now exist are working satisfactorily. I should think hon. members would not want to weaken the position of the Wheat Board and the quota regulations in their attempt to obtain equity between producers and their delivery opportunities as a result of enforcing those rules.

Mr. Towers: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the Canadian Wheat Board seems to be preoccupied with prosecuting producers for insignificant misdemeanours instead of going out and selling grain, and in view of the charge made by the premier of Alberta that Canada is being out-hustled in the sale of grain, would the minister tell us when we can see some action to correct these two matters?

Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, I hope the hon. member is not associating himself with the ridiculous suggestion that the Wheat Board is being out-hustled when our market share is increasing and when by the time this crop year ends we will have exported in total more grain than in any year but two in the history of our Canadian grain selling effort. We will have a very good year of selling indeed, and forward sales are in an extremely solid position.

* * *

FARM CREDIT CORPORATION

JUSTIFICATION FOR REMOVING EXECUTIVE POWER FROM CHAIRMAN—ALLEGATION OF MOONLIGHTING BY EMPLOYEES

Mr. Arnold Malone (Battle River): Mr. Speaker, my question is supplementary to the question put by the hon. member for Wellington-Grey-Dufferin-Waterloo, and I would like to direct it to the acting Minister of Agriculture. Since there are all the appearances of hanky-panky at the very top level of the Farm Credit Corporation, what is the justification for stripping chairman Baldur Kristjanson of all real executive power and giving operational authority to Murray McBride, a former Liberal member of parliament, who was appointed vice-chairman a little more than a year ago?

Hon. Daniel J. MacDonald (Minister of Veterans Affairs): Mr. Speaker, that question is noted.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Malone: Just so that the record is clear, would the minister confirm or deny the report that within the Farm Credit Corporation there is extensive moonlighting going on and that it is now going on in part on employee time? Would he confirm or deny that?

Mr. MacDonald (Cardigan): Mr. Speaker, I have no problem denying that report.

* * *

CANADIAN WHEAT BOARD

REASON FOR ESTABLISHING DIFFERENT DELIVERY QUOTAS IN CERTAIN AREAS AS COMPARED TO OTHER AREAS

Mr. Doug Neil (Moose Jaw): Mr. Speaker, my question is supplementary to the question asked by the hon. member for Red Deer, and it is addressed to the minister in charge of the Canadian Wheat Board. The minister spoke of equity of delivery as being one of the principles of the Wheat Board, and I am wondering if the minister can advise us as to the reason the quota in some blocks of the Canadian Wheat Board area is now 12 bushels per acre while in other blocks it is only nine bushels per acre. Is it the intention of the board to equalize the delivery quota?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, while the equity principle and the quota management system are very important, obviously the Wheat Board may from time to time have to move quotas ahead in order to obtain the kind

of grain required. This year the demand for a large volume of high protein wheat, for instance, has led the wheat board at different times to give a preference, at least in time of delivery, to those areas where high protein wheat is obtainable.

Mr. Neil: Mr. Speaker, I would like to find out from the minister if it is the intention of the Wheat Board to equalize the number of bushels per acre delivered. I think specifically of the Moose Jaw area where one farmer can deliver to Moose Jaw on a 12-bushel quota and one to Pasqua on only a nine-bushel quota. This is exactly the same kind of wheat grown side by side.

Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, in the last conversation I had with the Canadian Wheat Board about ten days ago it was indicated to me that the board's objective was essentially to equalize on the nine-bushel quota. Any move ahead of the nine-bushel quota would have been solely with the objective of obtaining the kind of grain required. I would want to re-check with the board, but I would not expect the board to be able to equalize on that basis in the course of this crop year.

Mr. Towers: And you say you haven't been out-hustled?

* * *

[*Translation*]

BILINGUALISM

SANCTIONS TO BE APPLIED TO EMPLOYEES REFUSING TO USE BOTH LANGUAGES—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Roch La Salle (Joliette): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the President of the Treasury Board. Yesterday during a press conference he gave in Ottawa, he urged the civil servants of the Montreal area to use both official languages. I would therefore like to ask the minister what kind of sanctions he intends to apply to this group?

[*English*]

Hon. Robert K. Andras (President of the Treasury Board): Mr. Speaker, the sanctions applicable to employees who do not fulfill the obligations of their functions are well known to the bargaining agents and members of the unions. They range from reprimand to suspension, and suspension can be for different periods of time. Finally, there is the possibility of dismissal if an offence—and I call them offences—is sustained or repeated over a period of time.

[*Translation*]

Mr. La Salle: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a supplementary question.

Since his predecessor, or the government, had promised to give a premium to civil servants who work in both languages, could the minister advise us how he can threaten to suspend these people while he, his predecessor and his government have totally refused to respect the commitments made a year and a half ago?

[*English*]

Mr. Andras: Mr. Speaker, that is not an accurate statement. The government did commit itself to the inauguration of the payment of compensation for the delivery of services in both official languages, with the details to be worked out within the government and then through consultation, particularly with the national joint council. The committee of the government, which has been reconfirmed by me on behalf of the government on several occasions, and again yesterday, was that such payment will be retroactive to November 1, 1976. One of the reasons for the delay in working out the details of this is the complexity of the issue itself which has been exacerbated because we have undertaken, as is publicly known, a comprehensive review of the implementation of the Official Languages Act, including that implementation that particularly affects the public service. The payment of compensation for bilingual services is related to many factors, which are the subject of this comprehensive review. It has been indicated that that review is close to completion, and when it is completed I will be in consultation with the bargaining agents and with the national joint council to work out the details of that compensation plan.

* * *

CONSUMER AFFAIRS

SUGAR—FAILURE OF RETAIL PRICE TO DECLINE IN PROPORTION TO DECLINE IN WHOLESALE PRICE—GOVERNMENT ACTION

Mr. John Rodriguez (Nickel Belt): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the acting Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs or, in his absence, the acting acting minister or perhaps to the Acting Prime Minister. In view of the fact that recently disclosed information shows that the wholesale price of sugar has declined significantly over the last few months and in view of the fact that the retail price of sugar has not declined at all in proportion to the decline in the wholesale price, can the Acting Prime Minister tell the House if he will instruct the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs to consider action under the Combines Investigation Act against the chain stores which are keeping up the price of sugar? If not, can he tell the House why he has not so instructed the department to undertake that kind of action?

• (1200)

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, perhaps I might be permitted to respond. I have been in conversation with the Anti-Inflation Board in this respect. They have monitored that situation and their conclusion was that the retail price change or the situation the hon. member referred to, was substantially confined to the Toronto market where previously the retail price of sugar had been used as a loss leader in retail food operations. The conclusion was that, throughout the country, the retail price had been tracking the wholesale price of sugar over a period of time. They are keeping the Toronto situation under close watch.

Oral Questions

POLYSAR

POSSIBILITY OF DISCIPLINARY ACTION AGAINST MANAGEMENT IN VIEW OF COMMITTEE REPORT

Mrs. Jean E. Pigott (Ottawa-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Finance as minister responsible for majority shareholdings in the Canadian Development Corporation which in turn is the owner of Polysar. In light of the report of the Public Accounts Committee tabled yesterday, can the minister inform the House whether, in view of the committee's request, disciplinary action has been taken against the management?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, it is my intention to bring the report of the Public Accounts Committee to the attention of the management of the Canadian Development Corporation, the parent company of Polysar, with the indication that I expect them to take the disciplinary action that the facts warrant.

Mrs. Pigott: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. For the information of the minister I understand Mr. John Silver of the public relations department of Polysar says such action has been taken but he would not disclose the details. Would the minister undertake to report to the House on this as soon as possible?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Speaker, I would be quite happy to report to the House or a committee.

* * *

NATIONAL DEFENCE

PURCHASE OF LAND FOR DEFENCE RESEARCH CENTRE AT WINNIPEG—REQUEST FOR REPORT

Mr. Dan McKenzie (Winnipeg South Centre): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of National Defence. Can the minister inform the House if there are any new developments on the purchase by the Department of National Defence of parcels of land in the city of Winnipeg for the location of a defence research centre and has any deadline been established for the commencement of construction?

Hon. Barney Danson (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, I cannot give an updated report at this time. Negotiations for land are still taking place. I thought they had been completed but I understand they have not. I have asked for an update on the situation by next Monday.

DEFENCE RESEARCH CENTRE AT WINNIPEG—POSSIBILITY OF TRADE-OFF BY LOSING AIR COMMAND

Mr. Dan McKenzie (Winnipeg South Centre): A supplementary question. May I ask the minister if he is under any pressure or is he giving consideration to moving air command headquarters from Winnipeg to Ottawa? Is there to be a trade-off, that is, to get the defence research centre we lose air command headquarters or are we to lose both establishments?

[Mr. MacDonald (Rosedale).]

Hon. Barney Danson (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, there is no question of trade-off or losing air command. Air command is well established in Winnipeg and is doing a first-rate job there with excellent people who are happy in that great city.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

TV AND RADIO BROADCASTING OF PROCEEDINGS OF THE HOUSE AND ITS COMMITTEES

Fourth report of Special Committee on TV and Radio Broadcasting of Proceedings of the House and its Committees—Mr. Speaker.

[*Editor's Note: For text of above report, see today's Votes and Proceedings.*]

Mr. Hnatyshyn: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order as a result of incidents that occurred during question period today and on previous occasions. At the outset, I want to say to Your Honour that I do not, of course, challenge your rulings and interpretations placed upon what transpired in this House, but I think it is important to seek clarification.

On Wednesday, as reported at page 7367 of *Hansard,* I responded to a statement made by the Solicitor General and made what I considered to be an accurate and appropriate point, that I believed the rejection of my request concerning the tabling and printing of material in *Hansard* had been refused because of consent not being forthcoming from the government benches. Your Honour indicated—I take it, to correct a statement I had made in the course of my presentation—that in your hearing there were cries of "No" from both sides of the House. That is the essence of it, although it is reported as one intervention.

Today I was involved in questioning the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources on what I think is a most important duty of a member of parliament, the scrutiny of public expenditures. I will review the questions as they are reported in *Hansard*, because I do not want to do a disservice to anyone in this House. The purpose of my questions was quite clear in my own mind. I wanted to determine whether, in the case of this minister, we had a situation of culpability by virtue of gullibility, or whether there was some perspective on the part of the minister with respect to the responsibility of government, represented by the minister responsible for AECL, to involve himself in the activities of AECL.

The point I am making is that the questions I raised today were directed to finding out the extent of the minister's involvement. In the first question I asked, generally, whether he was personally involved in co-operating with the RCMP to determine whether there were fresh instances of wrongful payments by AECL. He answered that he would co-operate and he was involving himself. I recall that. The second part of

my question was more specific. I asked whether the minister would become involved by asking senior officials of AECL to report to him on these matters, and to find out whether they are co-operating. Your Honour suggested to me that, in effect, I was asking the same question and that the minister had already answered it. I understand the rules are that the minister need not reply.

My submission to Your Honour is that I have asked different questions respecting a very important matter. The minister should have the right to respond, if he desires to do so, by giving the same answer; he has to stand on his record, or he can sit in his place, as he did during the course of questioning, and not answer at all. I should like clarification on whether I can ask these different, specific questions, although they are generally related. Your Honour's interpretation of the minister's answer is part of the decision on whether I could ask another question. That is the point of order. Your Honour seemed to be interpreting the fact that he had given an answer as co-operation. I suggest my question was something quite different.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member raises two points which he says are not differences with the ruling I have given. If not, I do not know what they are. He will have noticed that today I permitted repetition and quite generous extension of some of the restrictions that might have been imposed on the question period. For example, a series of questions was directed to the minister on whether he should resign. That question can, in most circumstances, be set aside as being argumentative in the first place. The question seemed to me to have a serious tone, however, and I permitted repetition of the question by two other members. I think that was a rather extraordinary extension, but the circumstances were extraordinary.

As the hon. member will realize, I do not like to use technical rules in the question period to interrupt questioning on a very important subject. The hon. member put a question and a supplementary. During the answer to the supplementary, the minister said he wanted to make it clear that he would co-operate and that AECL would co-operate. He used those very words. The purpose of the hon. member's second question was specifically to ask the minister, not what he had said in his first answer but whether he and AECL would co-operate in the investigation; and that is what the minister answered.

The hon. member used the same language in the third question. I think it is incumbent upon the Chair to make an interpretation, if there is a rule, as there is. This also gets into part of the point of order: since there is a rule which says that questions which have been answered cannot be asked again, the Chair must enforce that rule. If, as the hon. member is advocating, that ought not to be the case, it would require a change in our procedure. The hon. member is advocating that that ought not to be the case, and that hon. members ought to be permitted to repeat questions when they are not satisfied with the answers, and the minister should simply be allowed to refuse to answer or to stand on his record. That is not the practice of the House. As long as the practice of the House remains the way it is, when I hear repetition of a question that has just been answered I have to rule it out of order.

Regarding the incident of the statement of the Solicitor General on Wednesday, I intervened because the hon. member is entitled to deal with representations for which he is responsible with respect to responding to a statement by any minister at any time or, in using his privileges, to speak or to put questions to the House. But when the hon. member indicated, as he did that day, that consent came only from one side of the House, he involved the Chair and made a reflection on the ability of the Chair to make a judgment. That was an incorrect reference to the situation and to the decision I had made. I therefore intervened in the circumstances. But this happens rarely.

* * *

● (1210)

TRANSPORT

TABLING OF REPORT OF COMMISSION OF INQUIRY INTO BILINGUAL AIR TRAFFIC SERVICE IN QUEBEC

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I should like, under Standing Order 41(2), to table, in both official languages, copies of the interim report of the commission of inquiry into bilingual air traffic service in Quebec.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have tabled the interim report of the commission of inquiry into bilingual air traffic service in the province of Quebec. I am equally pleased with the recommendations contained in this report, which have the full support of this government. It is a most significant document. Its recommendations and their subsequent implementation are a significant step toward resolving the issue of bilingual air communications in Quebec without jeopardizing air safety. The commission's report states as follows:

> The evidence on record leads to the conclusion that operational efficiency will not be affected at the three locations where the introduction of bilingualism is recommended.

The commission also notes that to its knowledge—

> There has never been an accident or incident in the province of Quebec that could in any way be said to be related to the use of the two official languages in air traffic control.

The commission's mandate is to examine the safety-related aspects of expanding bilingual air to ground communications in Quebec. It is obvious that the recommendations contained in this interim report are the result of thorough and lengthy examination of all the implications. It is the commission's recommendation, and the intention of this government, to immediately authorize air to ground communications for aircraft flying under visual flight rules at St. Hubert airport. In this aspect it is significant that the commission refers to an earlier study which found as follows:

> The St. Hubert airport is one of the busiest general aviation airports in Canada and its operation is considered to be outstanding. The introduction of the French language, at the request of the pilots, will not degrade the safety of the operation and, in fact, is expected to enhance it because of the improved comprehension of pilot-controller communications.

The commission also recommends, as the first stage in implementing bilingual air to ground communications in the Montreal area, that controllers be authorized to communicate in both official languages with VFR flights passing through the Mirabel control zone on their way to other destinations. This will mean a considerable saving in fuel and flight time, eliminating the need to fly around the control zone. We plan to implement this recommendation by October 1. Thirdly, the commission recommends that bilingual air to ground communications be provided to VFR flights entering what is known as the Montreal terminal radar service area, which overlays the Mirabel, Dorval, St. Hubert and part of the St. Jean control zones, up to altitudes of 9,500 feet.

We expect to introduce bilingual air traffic services in this area by January 1, 1978, when the additional controllers required to provide the service will have completed their training.

[*Translation*]

I would like to congratulate the commission on the work that it is doing, and on its continuing efforts to ensure that concerns for air safety are thoroughly investigated and that appropriate action or precautions are taken. In addition to safety concerns which have always been the government's main consideration, I am also pleased to report, Mr. Speaker, that the commission concludes that these recommendations will not significantly increase costs. The commission has upheld the view of this government that it is possible to ensure that air traffic control services are provided in both official languages in the province of Quebec without jeopardizing air safety. This is in keeping with the government's policy and objectives for bilingualism.

I am confident that this interim report and government action arising from it will be satisfactory to all concerned. The co-operation we have received from Canadian aviation groups and associations on this whole matter has been most useful and greatly appreciated.

[*English*]

As a result of the recommendations tabled here today, and of the government's intention to act upon them promptly, we have taken another important step toward removing a serious, divisive factor which has extended far beyond the field of aviation and has threatened national unity. I am, therefore, confident that these recommendations by the commission will receive the full support of all members of this House. I should add, Mr. Speaker, that consultations with interested organizations concerning the report began this morning, and should some of them wish to make a formal statement for the attention of the House I will be pleased to table it, for the record, at some future time.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Joe Clark (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, first of all, I want to congratulate the Minister of Transport (Mr. Lang) for his French. I see here further evidence of the efficiency of the bilingualism policy in Saskatoon, as well as in High River, Alberta.

[Mr. Lang.]

[*English*]

Sir, it is now more than a year since this commission of inquiry was established by the government to bail the Minister of Transport out of the confusion and division he had created over this whole question. Now, after 12 months of detailed deliberations by the commissioners, we have an interim report which, frankly, does not move the situation very far forward. At least I suggest the minister exaggerates when he calls the recommendations of the report "a significant step toward resolving the issue of bilingual air communications".

Mr. Blais: Hear, hear!

Mr. Clark: I am pleased to see the Postmaster General applauding my observation that it is an exaggeration to so describe the report. The recommendation in support of bilingual VFR traffic at St-Hubert simply confirms what, in fact, has been operating practice for much of the private traffic at that airport during recent months. It merely confirms a recommendation made to the then minister of transport in March, 1975, by Project Bilcom, the study carried out at that time by the ministry in co-operation with CALPA and CATCA. The same study, Project Bilcom, also recommended, more than two years ago, in favour of bilingual advisory services. That recommendation, too, has now been confirmed by the commission.

Beyond that, sir, this interim report does not appear to contain much in the way of findings, particularly in respect of the major questions of commercial traffic at Dorval and Mirabel. I say it does not appear to be so because the minister has tabled a complicated, extensive document. I appreciate his courtesy in making it available to us some two hours before its presentation in the House. We may have further comments to make on it later. I made it clear when the commission was established that we in my party would accept the unanimous findings of the three commissioners. We are certainly prepared to support the unanimous recommendations contained in this report.

[*Translation*]

Apart from this, I can only hope that the commission will speed up its subsequent studies on the matters which are still pending, and particularly on the wide problem of communications as far as instrument flight rules are concerned.

I am very conscious of the technicality of several points but I am also aware—as I am sure hon. members on both sides of the House are—of the symbolic importance of all this matter for many Canadians, and therefore of the necessity to solve this problem in a fair and equitable manner as soon as technical conditions permit.

[*English*]

Mr. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby): Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my colleagues I welcome the report and the statement the minister has made. I will not quibble about whether it confirms what we knew in the past. It has already been indicated that this has been a serious and divisive issue in Canadian politics. I am delighted with the conclusions that have been reached by the commission. I am delighted with the

recommendations, and we look forward to their speedy implementation. I am for once, happy, to say I am in complete agreement with the government.

● (1220)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Armand Caouette (Villeneuve): Mr. Speaker, we are pleased to see the Minister of Transport (Mr. Lang) table the interim report of the commission of inquiry into bilingual air traffic service in Quebec.

First, I should like to thank the minister for having had the courtesy to table the report in both official languages. He did not try, as his colleague the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Gillespie) did yesterday, to table a report only in English under the pretext that waiting for the translated version would have delayed tabling the document. Mr. Speaker, I wish to inform the ministers, that this is the last time we allow unilingual documents to be tabled, even in French. If the ministers are in such a hurry to table their documents, let them speed up the translation. We will not allow a single unilingual report to be tabled, and I do not want to have to say it again. If they need that to learn what elementary courtesy is all about, we will show them.

Mr. Speaker, to come back to the report tabled today, I am sure all hon. members who believe in Canadian unity are pleased with its findings. Indeed, the report recognizes that bilingualism is no threat to air safety in Quebec.

One can read the following statement in the same report: there has never been an accident or incident in the province of Quebec that could in any way be said to be related to the use of the two official languages in air traffic control. Mr. Speaker, that gives the lie to the racists and alarmists who, through terror and duplicity, have tried to crush the legitimate expectations of French-speaking pilots and controllers. Mr. Speaker, the report goes on to say that it is safer for everybody to have all pilots in the air functioning in a language they comprehend, capable of fully understanding instructions addressed to them, and able to give clear and accurate reports of essential flight information.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, this sentence admirably sums up our position concerning bilingualism in air traffic control; we are happy to see that the commission in its interim report states identical principles as those we, in our party, have sustained for quite a long time.

* * *

[*English*]

REPRESENTATION AND ELECTORAL DISTRICTS READJUSTMENT ACT (ONTARIO)

MEASURE RESPECTING READJUSTMENT OF ONTARIO ELECTORAL DISTRICTS

Hon. Robert K. Andras (President of the Treasury Board) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-60, to readjust the representation of Ontario in the House of Commons and to readjust the electoral districts in Ontario.

Mr. Peters: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre is not able to be here today. However, he wanted it brought to the attention of the House, and I agree with him, that this bill is not being introduced by the responsible minister. We do not want to block the bill, but we do want to bring to Your Honour's attention the past practice with regard to reasonable doubt and other considerations not being within the purview of the minister's responsibility. In this case the bill should be in the name of the President of the Privy Council rather than that of the President of the Treasury Board. I want to make that notation with respect to the introduction of this bill.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre did raise that point at an earlier date and the Chair has been made aware of it. We have attempted to give it some study. There is no indication, in our review, that it is a point of such sufficient gravity that it should prevent the introduction of the bill. However, it does raise some rather interesting long-range problems on the question of ministerial responsibility. The point is well noted. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Caouette (Villeneuve): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Villeneuve (Mr. Caouette), on a point of order.

Mr. Caouette (Villeneuve): Mr. Speaker, as a member from Quebec I feel obliged today to refuse that the bill be read for the first time now. If I may, I should like to say why I object.

First, the bill infringes upon the privileges of hon. members from the province of Quebec who are less numerous than those from Ontario who will be even more numerous, without Quebec getting an equitable adjustment. In my opinion, all Quebec members in this House should rise against the introduction of this bill which infringes upon their privileges and we say if Ontario has one more seat, let Quebec have one more as well.

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I was prepared to permit the hon. member a brief point of order to indicate to the Chair his intention to take a position with respect to the bill. If it had gone on any longer, I would have considered it to be a speech on the motion itself. It is extraordinary to have a motion for first reading opposed. Therefore, I intended to allow the hon. member some latitude in order to indicate his position to the House. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Caouette (Villeneuve): No.

Mr. Speaker: May I record that as being carried on division?

Motion agreed to, bill read the first time and ordered to be printed.

Mr. Gauthier (Ottawa-Vanier): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I draw Your Honour's attention to some remarks made last night by myself in response to a question on the "late show" brought forward by the hon. member for Ottawa-Carleton.

[*Translation*]

As you can see, the French translation, at page 7459 of *Hansard* does not reflect the spirit of what I said in English, at least of some terms I used in my speech. I admit that it is difficult to translate technical terms and I would like to draw your attention, Mr. Speaker, to the fact that "commercial taxes" and "business taxes" are not necessarily synonymous. With your permission, I would like to get in touch with the officials of the reporting service or the Bureau for Translation and ask them to correct at least six words which substantially alter the meaning of the speech I made in English last night.

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker: The point raises a consideration with respect to the translators. With technical answers of this sort, often there is some advance preparation of the answer. In the circumstances, it is most helpful. Perhaps it does not occur to hon. members, and I speak of members on both side of the House, that where the translation of technical language is concerned members might want to give consideration to providing in advance a text in both official languages, if in fact an answer has been prepared, in order to assist in the translation of the technical language. That is a consideration that members may wish to keep in mind.

* * *

TRANSPORT

PRESENTATION OF PETITION RESPECTING PASSENGER TRAIN SERVICE

Mr. John Rodriguez (Nickel Belt): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present a petition on behalf of some 3,000 Capreol area residents expressing their objection to the "Preferred plan for western transcontinental passenger train service" by the Canadian Transport Commission. The plan will, if implemented, mean a very substantial loss of jobs and services not only in the Capreol area but throughout northern Ontario. The petitioners call on parliament to provide for further studies of the social and economic impact on northern Ontario of the implementation of this preferred plan, and to provide assurances that people in the Capreol area will not find their livelihood threatened by the reduction of passenger train service.

[Mr. Caouette (Villeneuve).]

• (1230)

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

Mr. Ross Milne (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Communications): The following questions will be answered today: Nos. 2,651 to 2,716, inclusive.

[*Text*]

EMPLOYEES BY DEPARTMENTS AND CATEGORIES

Question No. 2,651—**Mr. Orlikow:**

On April 30 (a) 1976 (b) 1974, how many persons were employed by each department at the AI-7 level?

Hon. Robert K. Andras (President of the Treasury Board): The number of persons employed at the AI-7 level on April 30 (a) 1976 (b) 1974 by each department follows: AI-7: Department or Agency: MOT, (a) 1976, 81; (b) 1974, 51.

---

(1) SOURCE: Master Output Support File, Supply and Services Canada, April 30, 1974 and April 30, 1976 conditions.

Footnotes to Questions 2,651-2,716

(1) SOURCE: Master Output Support File, Supply and Services Canada, April 30, 1974 and April 30, 1976 conditions.

(2) SOURCE: Senior Executive and Equivalent, Information Sub-System, Treasury Board Secretariat, March 31, 1974 and March 31, 1976 conditions.

(3) SOURCE: Justice Department, April 30, 1974 and April 30, 1976 conditions.

(4) AV is presumed to be AU, Auditing.

(5) VT is presumed to be UT, University Teaching.

(6) IS-7 non-existent level.

(7) FS-6 non-existent level.

(8) Data are collected quarterly and therefore they are not available for April 30 (a) 1976 (b) 1974 and instead March 31 (a) 1976 (b) 1974 data has been substituted.

Department or Agency Codes: AGR, Agriculture Canada; AIB, Anti-Inflation Board; ARC, Public Archives; AUD, Auditor General's Office; BGC, Board of Grain Commissioners; BPA, Bureau of Pensions Advocates; CAE, Revenue Canada, Customs and Excise; CCA, Consumer and Corporate Affairs; CDC, Canadian Dairy Commission; CEO, Chief Electoral Officer; CGC, Canadian Grain Commission; CGE, Canadian Government Grain Elevators; CIC, Canadian Intergovernmental Conference Secretariat; CLR, Canada Labour Relations Board; COL, Commissioner of Official Languages; COM, Department of Communications; CPC, Canadian Pension Commission; CSM, Metric Commission; CTC, Canadian Transport Commission; DND, National Defence Department; DOE, Environment Canada; DPW, Public Works Department; DSS, Supply and Services Canada; DVA, Veterans Affairs Department; DVL, Veterans Land Administration; EMR, Energy, Mines and Resources; ENR, National Energy

Board; ESR, Energy Supplies Allocation Board; EXC, Federal Court of Canada; EXT, External Affairs Department; FIN, Finance Department; FIR, Foreign Investment Review Agency; FPR, Federal-Provincial Relations Office; GGS, Governor General; HER, Heritage Canada; IAB, Immigration Appeal Board; IAN, Department of Indian and Northern Affairs; IDA, Canadian International Development Agency; IJC, International Joint Commission; INC, Information Canada; INS, Insurance Department; ITC, Industry, Trade and Commerce; JUS, Justice Department; LAB, Labour Canada; LFB, Canadian Livestock Feed Board; LRC, Law Reform Commission; MID, Manpower and Immigration; MOT; Transport Canada; MST, Ministry of State for Science and Technology; NCC, National Capital Commission; NHW, Health and Welfare Canada; NLI, National Library; NMC, National Museums of Canada; NPB, National Parole Board; OPM, Prime Minister's Office; PCO, Privy Council Office; PEB, Pension Review Board; PEN, Canadian Penitentiary Service; POD, Post Office Department; PSC, Public Service Commission; RCM, Royal Canadian Mounted Police; REA, Prairie Farm Rehabilitation Administration; REE, Department of Regional Economic Expansion; RTC, Canadian Radio-television and Telecommunications Commission, RTP, Restrictive Trade Practices Commission; SEC, Secretary of State Department; SOL, Ministry of Solicitor General; STC, Statistics Canada; SUC, Supreme Court of Canada; TAR, Tariff Board; TAX, Revenue Canada, Taxation; TBD, Treasury Board Secretariat; TCB, Textile and Clothing Board; TXB, Tax Review Board; UAH, Ministry of State for Urban Affairs; UIC, Unemployment Insurance Commission; WVB, War Veterans Allowance Board.

Question No. 2,652—**Mr. Orlikow:**

On April 30 (a) 1976 (b) 1974, how many persons were employed by each department at the SX-4 level?

Hon. Robert K. Andras (President of the Treasury Board): Data are collected quarterly and therefore they are not available for April 30 (a) 1976 (b) 1974 and instead March 31 (a) 1976 (b) 1974 data has been substituted. The number of persons employed at the SX-4 level on March 31 (a) 1976 (b) 1974 by each department follows:

SX-4[8]

Department or Agency	(a) 1976	(b) 1974
AUD	1	1
DOE		1
FIN	3	3
FPR	1	
ITC	1	1
MOT	2	2
PCO		2
REE	1	
TBD		1

[2] SOURCE: Senior Executive and Equivalent, Information Sub-System, Treasury Board Secretariat, March 31, 1974 and March 31, 1976 conditions.

[8] Data are collected quarterly and therefore they are not available for April 30(a) 1976 (b) 1974 and instead March 31 (a) 1976 (b) 1974 data has been substituted.

NOTE: See also Footnotes 1 to 8 and appendix attached to Question No. 2,651 answered this day.

Question No. 2,653—**Mr. Orlikow:**

On April 30 (a) 1976 (b) 1974, how many persons were employed by each department at the SX-3 level?

Hon. Robert K. Andras (President of the Treasury Board): Data are collected quarterly and therefore they are not available for April 30 (a) 1976 (b) 1974 and instead March 31 (a) 1976 (b) 1974 data has been substituted. The number of persons employed at the SX-3 level on March 31 (a) 1976 (b) 1974 by each department follows:

SX-3[8]

Department or Agency	(a) 1976	(b) 1974
AGR	5	3
CAE	2	3
CCA	3	3
COL	1	1
COM	5	4
DND	4	5
DOE	8	9
DPW	6	5
DSS	5	5
DVA	1	2
EMR	3	5
EXT	1	1
FIN	7	2
FIR	1	
FPR	1	
IAN	6	6
IDA	3	2
INC	1	1
INS	1	1
ITC	7	6
LAB	3	2
MID	8	7
MOT	12	7
MST	4	3
NHW	9	6
PCO	5	2
POD	4	3
PSC	3	5
REA		1
REE	5	5
RTC	1	
SEC	3	2
SOL	1	1
STC	4	5
TAX	3	3

Order Paper Questions

Department or Agency	(a) 1976	(b) 1974
TBD	14	8
UAH		2
UIC	5	4

---

(2) SOURCE: Senior Excecutive and Equivalent, Information Sub-System, Treasury Board Secretariat, March 31, 1974 and March 31, 1976 conditions.

(8) Data are collected quarterly and therefore they are not available for April 30 (a) 1976 (b) 1974 and instead March 31 (a) 1976 (b) 1974 data has been substituted.

NOTE: See also Footnotes 1 to 8 and appendix attached to Question No. 2,651 answered this day.

Question No. 2,654—**Mr. Orlikow:**

On April 30 (a) 1976 (b) 1974, how many persons were employed by each department at the SX-2 level?

Hon. Robert K. Andras (President of the Treasury Board): Data are collected quarterly and therefore they are not available for April 30 (a) 1976 (b) 1974 and instead March 31 (a) 1976 (b) 1974 data has been substituted. The number of persons employed at the SX-2 level on March 31 (a) 1976 (b) 1974 by each department follows:

SX-2(8)

Department or Agency	(a) 1976	(b) 1974
AGR	5	6
ARC	1	1
AUD	6	3
CAE	8	5
CCA	8	6
CEO	1	1
CIC		1
CLR	1	1
COM	7	3
CTC	4	4
DND	3	4
DOE	26	9
DPW	17	13
DSS	19	14
DVA	4	5
EMR	19	15
ENR	4	2
EXT	2	3
FIN	15	14
FIR	2	
FPR	2	
IAN	11	7
IDA	2	2
IJC	2	1
INC	1	1
INS	1	
ITC	25	21
LAB	5	3
MID	16	9
MOT	20	7
MST	7	3
NHW	13	13
NMC	3	
NPB	1	
PCO	5	7
PEN	3	2
POD	7	7
PSC	6	3
REA		2
REE	19	8
RTC	2	2
SEC	5	1
SOL	3	3
STC	11	13
TAR	1	
TAX	12	5
TBD	32	12
UAH	4	3
UIC	8	4

---

(2) SOURCE: Senior Executive and Equivalent, Information Sub-System, Treasury Board Secretariat, March 31, 1974 and March 31, 1976 conditions.

(8) Data are collected quarterly and therefore they are not available for April 30 (a) 1976 (b) 1974 and instead March 31 (a) 1976 (b) 1974 data has been substituted.

NOTE: See also Footnotes 1 to 8 and appendix attached to Question No. 2,651 answered this day.

Question No. 2,665—**Mr. Orlikow:**

On April 30 (a) 1976 (b) 1974, how many persons were employed by each department at the SX-1 level?

Hon. Robert K. Andras (President of the Treasury Board): Data are collected quarterly and therefore they are not available for April 30 (a) 1976 (b) 1974 and instead March 31 (a) 1976 (b) 1974 data has been substituted. The number of persons employed at the SX-1 level on March 31 (a) 1976 (b) 1974 by each department follows:

SX-1(8)

Department or Agency	(a) 1976	(b) 1974
AGR	10	8
AIB	1	
ARC	1	
AUD	8	1
BGC		1
CAE	12	16
CCA	19	14
CDC	1	1

Department or Agency	(a) 1976	(b) 1974
CEO	2	
COL	2	2
COM	17	16
CTC	10	6
DND	16	15
DOE	29	28
DPW	21	22
DSS	34	33
DVA	8	8
EMR	6	3
ENR	3	1
ESR	2	
EXT	4	5
FIN	6	7
FIR	3	
FPR	2	
GGS		1
IAN	40	28
IDA	20	13
IJC		1
INC	4	5
ITC	39	33
LAB	5	4
MID	31	25
MOT	42	49
MST	11	9
NCC	4	5
NHW	32	27
NMC	1	1
NPB		1
PCO	11	14
PEN	7	3
POD	24	17
PSC	15	12
REE	11	14
RTC	3	3
SEC	14	13
SOL	6	5
STC	11	9
SUC	1	1
TAX	16	15
TBD	41	44
TCB		1
UAH	10	8
UIC	16	14

[2] SOURCE: Senior Executive and Equivalent, Information Sub-System, Treasury Board Secretariat. March 31, 1974 and March 31, 1976 conditions.

[8] Data are collected quarterly and therefore they are not available for April 30 (a) 1976 (b) 1974 and instead March 31 (a) 1976 (b) 1974 data has been substituted.

NOTE: See also Footnotes 1 to 8 and appendix attached to Question No. 2,651 answered this day.

Question No. 2,656—**Mr. Orlikow:**

On April 30 (a) 1976 (b) 1974, how many persons were employed by each department at the ES-4 level?

Hon. Robert K. Andras (President of the Treasury Board): The number of persons employed at the ES-4 level on April 30 (a) 1976 (b) 1974 by each department follows:

ES-4

Department or Agency	(a) 1976	(b) 1974
AGR	12	9
BGC		1
CCA	10	8
CDC	1	
CGC	1	
COM	3	5
CTC	11	7
DOE	20	9
DSS	2	
EMR	20	6
ENR	8	4
FIN	32	29
FIR	2	
FPR	1	
IAN	7	5
IDA	1	2
INC		1
ITC	14	10
LAB	2	3
MID	19	13
MOT	8	5
NHW	12	11
PCO	3	
POD	1	2
PSC	1	1
REA	1	
REE	11	13
SEC	4	2
SOL	3	1
STC	57	43
TAR	1	
TAX	1	1
TBD	15	4
TCB		1
UAH	12	6

[1] SOURCE: Master Output Support File, Supply and Services Canada, April 30, 1974 and April 30, 1976 conditions.

NOTE: See also Footnotes 1 to 8 and appendix attached to Question No. 2,651 answered this day.

Question No. 2,657—**Mr. Orlikow:**

On April 30 (a) 1976 (b) 1974, how many persons were employed by each department at the ES-3 level?

Order Paper Questions

Hon. Robert K. Andras (President of the Treasury Board): The number of persons employed at the ES-3 level on April 30 (a) 1976 (b) 1974 1974 by each department follows:

ES-3

Department or Agency	(a) 1976	(b) 1974
AGR	30	23
AIB	1	
CAE	1	
CCA	9	10
CDC	1	1
CGC	2	
CLR		1
COL	1	
COM	8	6
CTC	16	5
DND	1	1
DOE	46	30
DPW	1	
DSS	5	3
EMR	17	20
ENR	16	9
ESR	1	
FIN	28	21
FIR	5	
IAN	22	7
IDA	4	2
ITC	11	15
LAB	9	10
LFB	1	1
MID	23	23
MOT	26	14
MCC	1	
NHW	49	22
PCO	3	
POD	5	3
REA	2	
REE	32	33
RTC	2	1
SEC	4	2
SOL	2	
STC	144	105
TAR	7	7
TAX	3	
TBD	5	10
UAH	10	9
UIC	5	2

---

(1) SOURCE: Master Output Support File, Supply and Services Canada, April 30, 1974 and April 30, 1976 conditions.

NOTE: See also Footnotes 1 to 8 and appendix attached to Question No. 2,651 answered this day.

[Mr. Orlikow.]

Question No. 2,658—**Mr. Orlikow:**

On April 30 (a) 1976 (b) 1974, how many persons were employed by each department at the ES-2 level?

Hon. Robert K. Andras (President of the Treasury Board): The number of persons employed at the ES-2 level on April 30 (a) 1976 (b) 1974 by each department follows:

ES-2

Department or Agency	(a) 1976	(b) 1974
AGR	70	41
AIB	3	
BGC		2
CAE	3	
CCA	21	9
CDC	1	1
COM	25	20
CTC	41	30
DOE	69	56
DPW	3	1
DSS	2	4
EMR	48	38
ENR	16	14
ESR	4	
EXT	3	2
FIN	82	67
FIR	10	
FPR	1	
IAN	41	31
IDA	6	3
ITC	26	28
LAB	20	18
LFB	1	
MID	61	46
MOT	43	32
MST	2	
NCC	2	2
NHW	55	40
NPB	1	1
PCO	1	
PEN	2	1
POD	9	5
PSC	1	1
RCM	1	
REA	1	
REE	37	16
RTC	5	4
SEC	9	1
SOL	9	3
STC	254	209
TAX	2	1
TBD	28	10
UAH	7	9
UIC	19	5

(1) SOURCE: Master Output Support File, Supply and Services Canada, April 30, 1974 and April 30, 1976 conditions.

NOTE: See also Footnotes 1 to 8 and appendix attached to Question No. 2,651 answered this day.

Question No. 2,659—**Mr. Orlikow:**

On April 30 (a) 1976 (b) 1974, how many persons were employed by each department at the AG-6 level?

Hon. Robert K. Andras (President of the Treasury Board): The number of persons employed at the AG-6 level on April 30 (a) 1976 (b) 1974 by each department follows: AG-6: Department or Agency: AGR (a) 1976: 7, (b) 1974: 6.

---

(1) SOURCE: Master Output Support File, Supply and Services Canada, April 30, 1974 and April 30, 1976 conditions.

NOTE: See also Footnotes 1 to 8 and appendix attached to Question No. 2,651 answered this day.

Question No. 2,660—**Mr. Orlikow:**

On April 30 (a) 1976 (b) 1974, how many persons were employed by each department at the TI-8 level?

Hon. Robert K. Andras (President of the Treasury Board): The number of persons employed at the TI-8 level on April 30(a) 1976 (b) 1974 by each department follows:

TI-8

Department or Agency	(a) 1976	(b) 1974
CTC	1	1
DND	3	2
MOT	12	11

---

(1) SOURCE: Master Output Support File, Supply and Services Canada, April 30, 1974 and April 30, 1976 conditions.

NOTE: See also Footnotes 1 to 8 and appendix attached to Question No. 2,651 answered this day.

Question No. 2,661—**Mr. Orlikow:**

On April 30 (a) 1976 (b) 1974, how many persons were employed by each department at the GT-8 level?

Hon. Robert K. Andras (President of the Treasury Board): The number of persons employed at the GT-8 level on April 30 (a) 1976 (b) 1974 by each department follows:

GT-8

Department or Agency	(a) 1976	(b) 1974
DND	2	1
DOE	2	2
DSS	3	
EXT	1	
IAN	3	2
INC		3
ITC	1	
NMC	4	2

---

(1) SOURCE: Master Output Support File, Supply and Services Canada, April 30, 1974 and April 30, 1976 conditions.

NOTE: See also Footnotes 1 to 8 and appendix attached to Question No. 2,651 answered this day.

Question No. 2,662—**Mr. Orlikow:**

On April 30 (a) 1976 (b) 1974, how many persons were employed by each department at the GT-7 level?

Hon. Robert K. Andras (President of the Treasury Board): The number of persons employed at the GT-7 level on April 30 (a) 1976 (b) 1974 by each department follows:

GT-7

Department or Agency	(a) 1976	(b) 1974
ARC	1	
DND	1	1
DOE	2	1
DPW	3	1
DSS	8	
EMR	1	1
EXT		1
IAN	12	3
INC		5
MID		1
MOT	11	5
NHW	2	1
NMC	11	5
SEC	1	1
UIC	1	

---

(1) SOURCE: Master Output Support File, Supply and Services Canada, April 30, 1974 and April 30, 1976 conditions.

NOTE: See also Footnotes 1 to 8 and appendix attached to Question No. 2,651 answered this day.

Question No. 2,663—**Mr. Orlikow:**

On April 30 (a) 1976 (b) 1974, how many persons were employed by each department at the IS-7 level?

Hon. Robert K. Andras (President of the Treasury Board): The number of persons employed at the IS-7 level on April 30 (a) 1976 (b) 1974 by each department follows:

IS-7

Department or Agency	(a) 1976	(b) 1974[6]
CCA	1	
DPW	1	

Order Paper Questions

Department or Agency	(a) 1976	(b) 1974
DSS	1	
FIN	1	
ITC	1	
LAB	1	
NMC	1	
PSC	1	
SEC	1	
STC	1	
TAX	1	
TBD	1	
UAH	1	
UIC	1	

---

(1) SOURCE: Master Output Support File, Supply and Services Canada, April 30, 1974 and April 30, 1976 conditions.

(6) IS-7, Non-Existent Level.

NOTE: See also Footnotes 1 to 8 and appendix attached to Question No. 2,651 answered this day.

● (0000)

Question No. 2,664—**Mr. Orlikow:**

On April 30 (a) 1976 (b) 1974, how many persons were employed by each department at the IS-6 level?

Hon. Robert K. Andras (President of the Treasury Board): The number of persons employed at the IS-6 level on April 30 (a) 1976 (b) 1974 by each department follows:

IS-6

Department or Agency	(a) 1976	(b) 1974
AGR	2	
CAE	2	
CCA	2	1
DOE	1	
DSS	1	1
DVA	1	
EMR	2	1
EXT	2	
GGS	1	
IAN	2	1
IDA	1	1
ITC	3	1
JUS	1	
LAB	1	
MID	5	
MOT	3	
NHW	4	1
NMC	1	
PCO	1	
PEN	1	
POD	1	2
REE	1	
SEC		1
SOL	1	
STC	2	1
TBD		1
UAH		1
UIC		1

---

(1) SOURCE: Master Output Support File, Supply and Services Canada, April 30, 1974 and April 30, 1976 conditions.

NOTE: See also Footnotes 1 to 8 and appendix attached to Question No. 2,651 answered this day.

Question No. 2,665—**Mr. Orlikow:**

On April 30 (a) 1976 (b) 1974, how many persons were employed by each department at the FS-6 level?

Hon. Robert K. Andras (President of the Treasury Board): (7) FS-6, Non-Existent Level.

NOTE: See also Footnotes 1 to 8 and appendix attached to Question No. 2,651 answered this day.

Question No. 2,666—**Mr. Orlikow:**

On April 30 (a) 1976 (b) 1974, how many persons were employed by each department at the FS-5 level?

Hon. Robert K. Andras (President of the Treasury Board): The number of persons employed at the FS-5 level on April 30 (a) 1976 (b) 1974 by each department follows: FS-5: Department or Agency: EXT (a) 1976: 17, (b) 1974: 9.

---

(1) SOURCE: Master Output Support File, Supply and Services Canada. April 30, 1974 and April 30, 1976 conditions.

NOTE: See also Footnotes 1 to 8 and appendix attached to Question No. 2,651 answered this day.

Question No. 2,667—**Mr. Orlikow:**

On April 30 (a) 1976 (b) 1974, how many persons were employed by each department at the FS-4 level?

Hon. Robert K. Andras (President of the Treasury Board): The number of persons employed at the FS-4 level on April 30 (a) 1976 (b) 1974 by each department follows:

FS-4

Department or Agency	(a) 1976	(b) 1974
EXT	43	43
ITC	20	12

(1) SOURCE: Master Output Support File, Supply and Services Canada, April 30, 1974 and April 30, 1976 conditions.

NOTE: See also Footnotes 1 to 8 and appendix attached to Question No. 2,651 answered this day.

Question No. 2,668—**Mr. Orlikow:**

On April 30 (a) 1976 (b) 1974, how many persons were employed by each department at the FS-3 level?

Hon. Robert K. Andras (President of the Treasury Board): The number of persons employed at the FS-3 level on April 30 (a) 1976 (b) 1974 by each department follows:

FS-3

Department or Agency	(a) 1976	(b) 1974
EXT	135	136
ITC	68	61
MID	23	14

---

(1) SOURCE: Master Output Support File, Supply and Services Canada, April 30, 1974 and April 30, 1976 conditions.

NOTE: See also Footnotes 1 to 8 and appendix attached to Question No. 2,651 answered this day.

Question No. 2,669—**Mr. Orlikow:**

On April 30 (a) 1976 (b) 1974, how many persons were employed by each department at the FS-2 level?

Hon. Robert K. Andras (President of the Treasury Board): The number of persons employed at the FS-2 level on April 30 (a) 1976 (b) 1974 by each department follows:

FS-2

Department or Agency	(a) 1976	(b) 1974
EXT	189	178
ITC	114	85
MID	73	86

---

(1) SOURCE: Master Output Support File, Supply and Services Canada, April 30, 1974 and April 30, 1976 conditions.

NOTE: See also Footnotes 1 to 8 and appendix attached to Question No. 2,651 answered this day.

Question No. 2,670—**Mr. Orlikow:**

On April 30 (a) 1976 (b) 1974, how many persons were employed by each department at the FI-7 level?

Hon. Robert K. Andras (President of the Treasury Board): The number of persons employed at the FI-7 level on April 30 (a) 1976 (b) 1974 by each department follows:

FI-7

Department or Agency	(a) 1976	(b) 1974
AGR	1	1
CAE	1	1
CCA	1	
COM		1
DND	2	1
DOE	2	1
DPW	1	1
DSS	11	7
EMR	1	1
FIN	1	1
IAN	3	4
IDA	1	1
ITC	3	4
MID	1	
MOT	6	3
NHW	3	4
NMC	1	
POD	3	3
PSC	1	
RCM	1	1
RTC	1	
SEC	2	
TAX		2
TBD	19	18
UAH	1	1
UIC	1	

---

(1) SOURCE: Master Output Support File, Supply and Services Canada, April 30, 1974 and April 30, 1976 conditions.

NOTE: See also Footnotes 1 to 8 and appendix attached to Question No. 2,651 answered this day.

Question No. 2,671—**Mr. Orlikow:**

On April 30 (a) 1976 (b) 1974, how many persons were employed by each department at the FI-6 level?

Hon. Robert K. Andras (President of the Treasury Board): The number of persons emloyed at the FI-6 level on April 30 (a) 1976 (b) 1974 by each department follows:

FI-6

Department or Agency	(a) 1976	(b) 1974
AGR	2	
CAE	2	1
CCA	1	1
COM	1	
CPC	1	1
CTC	2	2
DND	8	3
DOE	4	3
DPW	4	4
DSS	24	27
DVA	4	2
EMR	1	1

Order Paper Questions

Department or Agency	(a) 1976	(b) 1974
EXT	1	1
FIN		1
IAN	6	2
IDA		1
INC		1
ITC	2	2
MID	4	
MOT	12	11
NCC	1	1
NHW	5	6
PEN	3	
POD	5	5
REE	1	1
RTC		1
SEC	1	
SOL	1	
TBD	15	18
UIC	2	2

---

(1) SOURCE: Master Output Support File, Supply and Services Canada, April 30, 1974 and April 30, 1976 conditions.

NOTE: See also Footnotes 1 to 8 and appendix attached to Question No. 2,651 answered this day.

Question No. 2,672—**Mr. Orlikow:**

On April 30 (a) 1976 (b) 1974, how many persons were employed by each department at the WP-7 level?

Hon. Robert K. Andras (President of the Treasury Board): The number of persons employed at the WP-7 level on April 30 (a) 1976 (b) 1974 by each department follows:

WP-7

Department or Agency	(a) 1976	(b) 1974
AGR		1
DVA	1	1
IAN	7	12
NHW	2	3
NPB	7	
PEN	4	2
PSC		2
SOL	2	

---

(1) SOURCE: Master Output Support File, Supply and Services Canada, April 30, 1974 and April 30, 1976 conditions.

NOTE: See also Footnotes 1 to 8 and appendix attached to Question No. 2,651 answered this day.

Question No. 2,673—**Mr. Orlikow:**

On April 30 (a) 1976 (b) 1974, how many persons were employed by each department at the WP-6 level?

[Mr. Andras.]

Hon. Robert K. Andras (President of the Treasury Board): The number of persons employed at the WP-6 level on April 30 (a) 1976 (b) 1974 by each department follows:

WP-6

Department or Agency	(a) 1976	(b) 1974
DVA	4	3
IAN	3	5
NPB	11	4
PEN	3	4

---

(1) SOURCE: Master Output Support File, Supply and Services Canada, April 30, 1974 and April 30, 1976 conditions.

NOTE: See also Footnotes 1 to 8 and appendix attached to Question No. 2,651 answered this day.

Question No. 2,674—**Mr. Orlikow:**

On April 30 (a) 1976 (b) 1974, how many persons were employed by each department at the SI-7 level?

Hon. Robert K. Andras (President of the Treasury Board): The number of persons employed at the SI-7 level on April 30 (a) 1976 (b) 1974 by each department follows:

SI-7

Department or Agency	(a) 1976	(b) 1974
ARC	1	1
DOE	1	1
DVL		1
ENR		1
FIR	1	
IAN	1	1
LAB		6
MID	1	
MOT	1	3
RTC	2	2
STC	10	8

---

(1) SOURCE: Master Output Support File, Supply and Services Canada, April 30, 1974 and April 30, 1976 conditions.

NOTE: See also Footnotes 1 to 8 and appendix attached to Question No. 2,651 answered this day.

Question No. 2,675—**Mr. Orlikow:**

On April 30 (a) 1976 (b) 1974, how many persons were employed by each department at the CO-4 level?

Hon. Robert K. Andras (President of the Treasury Board): The number of persons employed at the CO-4 level on April 30 (a) 1976 (b) 1974 by each department follows:

CO-4

Department or Agency	(a) 1976	(b) 1974
AGR	1	2
CAE	1	1
COM	1	1
DND	3	
DPW	2	1
DSS	15	14
EMR	2	2
IAN	1	1
IDA		1
ITC	1	1
LAB	1	1
MID	1	1
MOT	2	2
NHW	1	1
PSC	1	1
REE	1	1
STC	2	4
TAX	8	7
TBD	1	1
UAH	1	
UIC	1	1

(1) SOURCE: Master Output Support File, Supply and Services Canada, April 30, 1974 and April 30, 1976 conditions.

NOTE: See also Footnotes 1 to 8 and appendix attached to Question No. 2,651 answered this day.

Question No. 2,676—**Mr. Orlikow:**

On April 30 (a) 1976 (b) 1974, how many persons were employed by each department at the CO-3 level?

Hon. Robert K. Andras (President of the Treasury Board): The number of persons employed at the CO-3 level on April 30 (a) 1976 (b) 1974 by each department follows:

CO-3

Department or Agency	(a) 1976	(b) 1974
AGR	3	2
AIB	2	
CCA	17	4
COM	6	4
CSM	4	
DND	1	
DOE	5	2
DSS	2	
EMR	2	1
FIN	1	
FIR	13	
IAN	22	15
INS	12	12
ITC	167	139
MID	1	
MOT	1	
PSC		1
REA	8	3
REE	120	40
RTC	5	4

(1) SOURCE: Master Output Support File, Supply and Services Canada, April 30, 1974 and April 30, 1976 conditions.

NOTE: See also Footnotes 1 to 8 and appendix attached to Question No. 2,651 answered this day.

Question No. 2,677—**Mr. Orlikow:**

On April 30 (a) 1976 (b) 1974, how many persons were employed by each department at the CO-2 level?

Hon. Robert K. Andras (President of the Treasury Board): The number of persons employed at the CO-2 level on April 30 (a) 1976 (b) 1974 by each department follows:

CO-2

Department or Agency	(a) 1976	(b) 1974
AGR	10	
CCA	36	16
COM		3
CSM	22	
DOE	5	6
DPW	1	
DSS	2	1
FIN		1
FIR	13	
IAN	68	44
INS	39	20
ITC	408	436
JUS	1	1
MID	1	
MOT	1	
REA	6	8
REE	97	68
RTC	9	6
TBD	1	3
UAH		1

(1) SOURCE: Master Output Support File, Supply and Services Canada, April 30, 1974 and April 30, 1976 conditions.

NOTE: See also Footnotes 1 to 8 and appendix attached to Question No. 2,651 answered this day.

Question No. 2,678—**Mr. Orlikow:**

On April 30 (a) 1976 (b) 1974, how many persons were employed by each department at the AS-8 level?

Hon. Robert K. Andras (President of the Treasury Board): The number of persons employed at the AS-8 level on April 30 (a) 1976 (b) 1974 by each department follows:

AS-8

Department or Agency	(a) 1976	(b) 1974
AGR	2	1
ARC	1	2
CAE	2	
CCA		1
CLR	1	
COL	8	
COM	2	3
CTC	1	2
DND	11	9
DOE	10	5
DPW	36	28
DSS	23	23
EMR	2	1
ENR	1	1
EXT	6	5
FIN	1	1
GGS	2	1
IAN	3	1
ITC	2	1
JUS	2	2
LAB	3	1
MID	8	5
MOT	14	4
MST	1	1
NCC	1	1
NHW	4	2
NMC	1	1
OPM	1	
PCO		1
PEN	10	3
POD	4	5
PSC	5	3
REE		1
RTC	3	3
SEC	3	
SOL	3	
STC	1	
TAX	2	
TBD	32	21
UIC	2	

---

(1) SOURCE: Master Output Support File, Supply and Services Canada. April 30, 1974 and April 30, 1976 conditions.

NOTE: See also Footnotes 1 to 8 and appendix attached to Question No. 2,651 answered this day.

Question No. 2,679—**Mr. Orlikow:**

On April 30 (a) 1976 (b) 1974, how many persons were employed by each department at the AS-7 level?

[Mr. Andras.]

Hon. Robert K. Andras (President of the Treasury Board): The number of persons employed at the AS-7 level on April 30 (a) 1976 (b) 1974 by each department follows:

AS-7

Department or Agency	(a) 1976	(b) 1974
AGR	2	2
ARC	4	1
CAE	3	2
CCA		1
CIC		1
CLR		1
COL	7	6
COM	6	2
CTC	2	2
DND	22	17
DOE	16	14
DPW	29	28
DSS	15	10
DVA	3	3
DVL	1	1
EMR	1	
ENR	1	1
EXC	1	1
EXT	2	2
FIN	1	1
IAB	1	1
IAN	12	12
IJC	1	1
INS	1	
ITC	1	1
LAB	1	
MID	14	16
MOT	31	17
MST	12	11
NHW	8	7
NMC	1	
PCO	1	1
PEN	4	2
POD	10	13
PSC	7	1
REA	2	1
REE	3	1
SEC	4	4
SOL	1	
STC	1	
TAX	4	4
TBD	51	34
UAH		1
UIC	5	6

---

(1) SOURCE: Master Output Support File, Supply and Services Canada. April 30, 1974 and April 30, 1976 conditions.

NOTE: See also Footnotes 1 to 8 and appendix attached to Question No. 2,651 answered this day.

Question No. 2,680—**Mr. Orlikow:**

On April 30 (a) 1976 (b) 1974, how many persons were employed by each department at the CS-5 level?

Hon. Robert K. Andras (President of the Treasury Board): The number of persons employed at the CS-5 level on April 30 (a) 1976 (b) 1974 by each department follows:

CS-5

Department or Agency	(a) 1976	(b) 1974
AGR	1	2
CAE	1	1
COM	1	1
DND	3	
DPW	2	1
DSS	15	14
EMR	2	2
IAN	1	1
IDA		1
ITC	1	1
LAB	1	1
MID	1	1
MOT	2	2
NHW	1	1
PSC	1	1
REE	1	1
STC	2	4
TAX	8	7
TBA	1	1
UAH	1	
UIC	1	1

---

(1) SOURCE: Master Output Support File, Supply and Services Canada. April 30, 1974 and April 30, 1976 conditions.

NOTE: See also Footnotes 1 to 8 and appendix attached to Question No. 2,651 answered this day.

Question No. 2,681—**Mr. Orlikow:**

On April 30 (a) 1976 (b) 1974, how many persons were employed by each department at the TR-6 level?

Hon. Robert K. Andras (President of the Treasury Board): The number of persons employed at the TR-6 level on April 30 (a) 1976 (b) 1974 by each department follows: Department or Agency: SEC. (a) 1976: 4. (b) 1974: 2.

---

(1) SOURCE: Master Output Support File, Supply and Services Canada. April 30, 1974 and April 30, 1976 conditions.

NOTE: See also Footnotes 1 to 8 and appendix attached to Question No. 2,651 answered this day.

Question No. 2,682—**Mr. Orlikow:**

On April 30 (a) 1976 (b) 1974, how many persons were employed by each department at the TR-5 level?

Hon. Robert K. Andras (President of the Treasury Board): The number of persons employed at the TR-5 level on April 30 (a) 1976 (b) 1974 by each department follows:

TR-5

Department or Agency	(a) 1976	(b) 1974
PCO	1	
SEC	16	9

---

(1) SOURCE: Master Output Support File, Supply and Services Canada. April 30, 1974 and April 30, 1976 conditions.

NOTE: See also Footnotes 1 to 8 and appendix attached to Question No. 2,651 answered this day.

Question No. 2,683—**Mr. Orlikow:**

On April 30 (a) 1976 (b) 1974, how many persons were employed by each department at the TR-4 level?

Hon. Robert K. Andras (President of the Treasury Board): The number of persons employed at the TR-4 level on April 30 (a) 1976 (b) 1974 by each department follows:

TR-4

Department or Agency	(a) 1976	(b) 1974
PSC	1	
SEC	78	60

---

(1) SOURCE: Master Output Support File, Supply and Services Canada. April 30, 1974 and April 30, 1976 conditions.

NOTE: See also Footnotes 1 to 8 and appendix attached to Question No. 2,651 answered this day.

Question No. 2,684—**Mr. Orlikow:**

On April 30 (a) 1976 (b) 1974, how many persons were employed by each department at the ES-5 level?

Hon. Robert K. Andras (President of the Treasury Board): The number of persons employed at the ES-5 level on April 30 (a) 1976 (b) 1974 by each department follows:

ES-5

Department or Agency	(a) 1976	(b) 1974
AGR	5	5
CCA	4	2
COM	2	2
CTC	2	1
DOE	4	5
EMR	3	3
ENR		1
FIN	2	2
IAN		1
ITC	3	4
MID	2	4

Department or Agency	(a) 1976	(b) 1974
MOT	2	3
MST	1	2
NHW	2	2
REA	1	
REE	2	4
SEC		1
SOL	1	
STC	28	35
TAR		1
TBD	1	3

(1) SOURCE: Master Output Support File, Supply and Services Canada, April 30, 1974 and April 30, 1976 conditions.

NOTE: See also Footnotes 1 to 8 and appendix attached to Question No. 2,651 answered this day.

Question No. 2,685—**Mr. Orlikow:**

On April 30 (a) 1976 (b) 1974, how many persons were employed by each department at the AC-3 level?

Hon. Robert K. Andras (President of the Treasury Board): The number of persons employed at the AC-3 level on April 30 (a) 1976 (b) 1974 by each department follows:

AC-3

Department or Agency	(a) 1976	(b) 1974
INS	5	5
UIC	1	2

(1) SOURCE: Master Output Support File, Supply and Services Canada, April 30, 1974 and April 30, 1976 conditions.

NOTE: See also Footnotes 1 to 8 and appendix attached to Question No. 2,651 answered this day.

Question No. 2,686—**Mr. Orlikow:**

On April 30 (a) 1976 (b) 1974, how many persons were employed by each department at the AC-2 level?

Hon. Robert K. Andras (President of the Treasury Board): The number of persons employed at the AC-2 level on April 30 (a) 1976 (b) 1974 by each department follows:

AC-2

Department or Agency	(a) 1976	(b) 1974
INS	5	2
UIC	1	

(1) SOURCE: Master Output Support File, Supply and Services Canada, April 30, 1974 and April 30, 1976 conditions.

NOTE: See also Footnotes 1 to 8 and appendix attached to Question No. 2,651 answered this day.

Question No. 2,687—**Mr. Orlikow:**

On April 30 (a) 1976 (b) 1974, how many persons were employed by each department at the PS-5 level?

Hon. Robert K. Andras (President of the Treasury Board): The number of persons employed at the PS-5 level on April 30 (a) 1976 (b) 1974 by each department follows:

PS-5

Department or Agency	(a) 1976	(b) 1974
PEN	1	
PSC	1	2

(1) SOURCE: Master Output Support File, Supply and Services Canada, April 30, 1974 and April 30, 1976 conditions.

NOTE: See also Footnotes 1 to 8 and appendix attached to Question No. 2,651 answered this day.

Question No. 2,688—**Mr. Orlikow:**

On April 30 (a) 1976 (b) 1974, how many persons were employed by each department at the LS-6 level?

Hon. Robert K. Andras (President of the Treasury Board): The number of persons employed at the LS-6 level on April 30 (a) 1976 (b) 1974 by each department follows:

LS-6

Department or Agency	(a) 1976	(b) 1974
AGR		1
DOE	1	1
NLI	3	2

(1) SOURCE: Master Output Support File, Supply and Services Canada, April 30, 1974 and April 30, 1976 conditions.

NOTE: See also Footnotes 1 to 8 and appendix attached to Question No. 2,651 answered this day.

Question No. 2,689—**Mr. Orlikow:**

On April 30 (a) 1976 (b) 1974, how many persons were employed by each department at the HR-5 level?

Hon. Robert K. Andras (President of the Treasury Board): The number of persons employed at the HR-5 level on April 30 (a) 1976 (b) 1974 by each department follows:

HR-5

Department or Agency	(a) 1976	(b) 1974
ARC	1	1
DND	1	1

Department or Agency	(a) 1976	(b) 1974
IAN	1	1
NMC	3	5

---

(1) SOURCE: Master Output Support File, Supply and Services Canada, April 30, 1974 and April 30, 1976 conditions.

NOTE: See also Footnotes 1 to 8 and appendix attached to Question No. 2,651 answered this day.

Question No. 2,690—**Mr. Orlikow:**

On April 30 (a) 1976 (b) 1974, how many persons were employed by each department at the AV-7 level?

Hon. Robert K. Andras (President of the Treasury Board): The AV group is presumed to be the AU group, Auditing. The number of persons employed at the AU-7 level on April 30 (a) 1976 (b) 1974 by each department follows: AV-7(4): Department or Agency: TAX (a) 1976: 8, (b) 1974: 7.

---

(1) SOURCE: Master Output Support File, Supply and Services Canada, April 30, 1974 and April 30, 1976 conditions.

(4) AV is presumed to be AU, Auditing.

NOTE: See also Footnotes 1 to 8 and appendix attached to Question No. 2,651 answered this day.

● (0000)

Question No. 2,691—**Mr. Orlikow:**

On April 30 (a) 1976 (b) 1974, how many persons were employed by each department at the AV-6 level?

Hon. Robert K. Andras (President of the Treasury Board): The AV group is presumed to be the AU group, Auditing. The number of persons employed at the AU-6 level on April 30 (a) 1976 (b) 1974 by each department follows:

AV-6(4)

Department or Agency	(a) 1976	(b) 1974
AUD	4	3
CAE		2
DSS	7	5
TAX	18	24

---

(1) SOURCE: Master Output Support File, Supply and Services Canada, April 30, 1974 and April 30, 1976 conditions.

(4) AV is presumed to be AU, Auditing.

NOTE: See also Footnotes 1 to 8 and appendix attached to Question No. 2,651 answered this day.

Question No. 2,692—**Mr. Orlikow:**

On April 30 (a) 1976 (b) 1974, how many persons were employed by each department at the AV-5 level?

Hon. Robert K. Andras (President of the Treasury Board): The AV group is presumed to be the AU group, Auditing. The number of persons employed at the AU-5 level on April 30 (a) 1976 (b) 1974 by each department follows:

AV-5(4)

Department or Agency	(a) 1976	(b) 1974
AUD	1	
CAE	12	14
DSS	9	5
ENR	1	1
FIN		2
TAX	86	62
TBD		1

---

(1) SOURCE: Master Output Support File, Supply and Services Canada, April 30, 1974 and April 30, 1976 conditions.

(4) AV is presumed to be AU, Auditing.

NOTE: See also Footnotes 1 to 8 and appendix attached to Question No. 2,651 answered this day.

Question No. 2,693—**Mr. Orlikow:**

On April 30 (a) 1976 (b) 1974, how many persons were employed by each department at the AR-8 level?

Hon. Robert K. Andras (President of the Treasury Board): The number of persons employed at the AR-8 level on April 30 (a) 1976 (b) 1974 by each department follows:

AR-8

Department or Agency	(a) 1976	(b) 1974
DND	1	1
DPW	2	3
IAN	1	
NCC	2	2
NHW	1	1

---

(1) SOURCE: Master Output Support File, Supply and Services Canada, April 30, 1974 and April 30, 1976 conditions.

NOTE: See also Footnotes 1 to 8 and appendix attached to Question No. 2,651 answered this day.

Question No. 2,694—**Mr. Orlikow:**

On April 30 (a) 1976 (b) 1974, how many persons were employed by each department at the AR-7 level?

Hon. Robert K. Andras (President of the Treasury Board): The number of persons employed at the AR-7 level on April 30 (a) 1976 (b) 1974 by each department follows:

AR-7

Department or Agency	(a) 1976	(b) 1974
DND	1	1
DPW	12	9

Department or Agency	(a) 1976	(b) 1974
IAN	5	3
MOT	1	2

(1) SOURCE: Master Output Support File, Supply and Services Canada, April 30, 1974 and April 30, 1976 conditions.

NOTE: See also Footnotes 1 to 8 and appendix attached to Question No. 2,651 answered this day.

Question No. 2,695—**Mr. Orlikow:**

On April 30 (a) 1976 (b) 1974, how many persons were employed by each department at the AR-6 level?

Hon. Robert K. Andras (President of the Treasury Board): The number of persons employed at the AR-6 level on April 30 (a) 1976 (b) 1974 by each department follows:

AR-6

Department or Agency	(a) 1976	(b) 1974
DND	2	2
DPW	25	18
IAN	7	5
IDA	1	
MOT	4	4
NCC	6	5
NHW	2	2
REE		1

(1) SOURCE: Master Output Support File, Supply and Services Canada, April 30, 1974 and April 30, 1976 conditions.

NOTE: See also Footnotes 1 to 8 and appendix attached to Question No. 2,651 answered this day.

Question No. 2,696—**Mr. Orlikow:**

On April 30 (a) 1976 (b) 1974, how many persons were employed by each department at the AR-5 level?

Hon. Robert K. Andras (President of the Treasury Board): The number of persons employed at the AR-5 level on April 30 (a) 1976 (b) 1974 by each department follows:

AR-5

Departement or Agency	(a) 1976	(b) 1974
DND	5	4
DOE	1	1
DPW	32	19
DVA		1
IAN	22	10
IDA		1
MOT	11	12
NCC	6	4
NHW	1	
PEN	1	
REE		3

(1) SOURCE: Master Output Support File, Supply and Services Canada, April 30, 1974 and April 30, 1976 conditions.

NOTE: See also Footnotes 1 to 8 and appendix attached to Question No. 2,651 answered this day.

Question No. 2,697—**Mr. Orlikow:**

On April 30 (a) 1976 (b) 1974, how many persons were employed by each department at the CH-6 level?

Hon. Robert K. Andras (President of the Treasury Board): The number of persons employed at the CH-6 level on April 30 (a) 1976 (b) 1974 by each department follows:

CH-6

Department of Agency	(a) 1976	(b) 1974
ITC		1
NHW	1	1

(1) SOURCE: Master Output Support File, Supply and Services Canada, April 30, 1974 and April 30, 1976 conditions.

NOTE: See also Footnotes 1 to 8 and appendix attached to Question No. 2,651 answered this day.

Question No. 2,698—**Mr. Orlikow:**

On April 30 (a) 1976 (b) 1974, how many persons were employed by each department at the CH-5 level?

Hon. Robert K. Andras (President of the Treasury Board): The number of persons employed at the CH-5 level on April 30 (a) 1976 (b) 1974 by each department follows:

CH-5

Department or Agency	(a) 1976	(b) 1974
DOE	3	3
EMR	1	3
NHW	2	2

(1) SOURCE: Master Output Support File, Supply and Services Canada, April 30, 1974 and April 30, 1976 conditions.

NOTE: See also Footnotes 1 to 8 and appendix attached to Question No. 2,651 answered this day.

Question No. 2,699—**Mr. Orlikow:**

On April 30 (a) 1976 (b) 1974, how many persons were employed by each department at the VS-6 level?

Hon. Robert K. Andras (President of the Treasury Board): The number of persons employed at the VS-6 level on April 30 (a) 1976 (b) 1974 by each department follows:

VS-6

Department or Agency	(a) 1976	(b) 1974
AGR	1	3
NHW	1	2

---

(1) SOURCE: Master Output Support File, Supply and Services Canada, April 30, 1974 and April 30, 1976 conditions.

NOTE: See also Footnotes 1 to 8 and appendix attached to Question No. 2,651 answered this day.

Question No. 2,700—**Mr. Orlikow:**

On April 30 (a) 1976 (b) 1974, how many persons were employed by each department at the VS-5 level?

Hon. Robert K. Andras (President of the Treasury Board): The number of persons employed at the VS-5 level on April 30 (a) 1976 (b) 1974 by each department follows:

VS-5

Department or Agency	(a) 1976	(b) 1974
AGR	13	10
NHW	6	6

---

(1) SOURCE: Master Output Support File, Supply and Services Canada, April 30, 1974 and April 30, 1976 conditions.

NOTE: See also Footnotes 1 to 8 and appendix attached to Question No. 2,651 answered this day.

Question No. 2,701—**Mr. Orlikow:**

On April 30 (a) 1976 (b) 1974, how many persons were employed by each department at the VT-7 level?

Hon. Robert K. Andras (President of the Treasury Board): The VT group is presumed to be the UT group, University Teaching. The number of persons employed at the UT-7 level on April 30 (a) 1976 (b) 1974 by each department follows: VT-7(5): Department or Agency: DND (a) 1976: 3, (b) 1974: 1.

---

(1) SOURCE: Master Output Support File, Supply and Services Canada, April 30, 1974 and April 30, 1976 conditions.

(5) VT is presumed to be UT, University Teaching.

NOTE: See also Footnotes 1 to 8 and appendix attached to Question No. 2,651 answered this day.

Question No. 2,702—**Mr. Orlikow:**

On April 30 (a) 1976 (b) 1974, how many persons were employed by each department at the VT-6 level?

Hon. Robert K. Andras (President of the Treasury Board): The VT group is presumed to be the UT group, University Teaching. The number of persons employed at the UT-6 level on April 30 (a) 1976 (b) 1974 by each department follows. VT-6(5): Department or Agency: DND (a) 1976: 1, (b) 1974: 1.

---

(1) SOURCE: Master Output Support File, Supply and Services Canada, April 30, 1974 and April 30, 1976 conditions.

(5) VT is presumed to be UT, University Teaching.

NOTE: See also Footnotes 1 to 8 and appendix attached to Question No. 2,651 answered this day.

Question No. 2,703—**Mr. Orlikow:**

On April 30 (a) 1976 (b) 1974, how many persons were employed by each department at the VT-5 level?

Hon. Robert K. Andras (President of the Treasury Board): The VT group is presumed to be the UT group, University Teaching. The number of persons employed at the UT-5 level on April 30 (a) 1976 (b) 1974 by each department follows: VT-5(5): Department or Agency: DND (a) 1976: 1. (b) 1974: 1.

---

(1) SOURCE: Master Output Support File, Supply and Services Canada, April 30, 1974 and April 30, 1976 conditions.

(5) VT is presumed to be UT, University Teaching.

NOTE: See also Footnotes 1 to 8 and appendix attached to Question No. 2,651 answered this day.

Question No. 2,704—**Mr. Orlikow:**

On April 30 (a) 1976 (b) 1974, how many persons were employed by each department at the VT-4 level?

Hon. Robert K. Andras (President of the Treasury Board): The VT group is presumed to be the UT group, University Teaching. The number of persons employed at the UT-4 level on April 30 (a) 1976 (b) 1974 by each department follows. VT-4(5): Department or Agency: DND. (a) 1976: 50. (b) 1974: 36.

---

(1) SOURCE: Master Output Support File, Supply and Services Canada, April 30, 1974 and April 30, 1976 conditions.

(5) VT is presumed to be UT, University Teaching.

NOTE: See also Footnotes 1 to 8 and appendix attached to Question No. 2,651 answered this day.

Question No. 2,705—**Mr. Orlikow:**

On April 30 (a) 1976 (b) 1974, how many persons were employed by each department at the VT-3 level?

Hon. Robert K. Andras (President of the Treasury Board): The VT group is presumed to be the UT group, University Teaching. The number of persons employed at the UT-3 level on April 30 (a) 1976 (b) 1974 by each department follows. VT-3(5): Department or Agency: DND. (a) 1976: 54. (b) 1974: 44.

---

(1) SOURCE: Master Output Support File, Supply and Services Canada, April 30, 1974 and April 30, 1976 conditions.

(5) VT is presumed to be UT, University Teaching.

Order Paper Questions

NOTE: See also Footnotes 1 to 8 and appendix attached to Question No. 2,651 answered this day.

Question No. 2,706—**Mr. Orlikow:**

On April 30 (a) 1976 (b) 1974, how many persons were employed by each department at the PG-6 level?

Hon. Robert K. Andras (President of the Treasury Board): The number of persons employed at the PG-6 level on April 30 (a) 1976 (b) 1974 by each department follows:

PG-6

Department or Agency	(a) 1976	(b) 1974
AGR	1	
DND	6	5
DOE	1	1
DPW	1	
DSS	83	80
IAN		6
MOT	1	1
PEN	1	1
POD	1	
PSC		1
TBD	2	

---

(1) SOURCE: Master Output Support File, Supply and Services Canada, April 30, 1974 and April 30, 1976 conditions.

NOTE: See also Footnotes 1 to 8 and appendix attached to Question No. 2,651 answered this day.

Question No. 2,707—**Mr. Orlikow:**

On April 30 (a) 1976 (b) 1974, how many persons were employed by each department at the Chief Statistician 1(CST) level?

Hon. Robert K. Andras (President of the Treasury Board): The number of persons employed at the Chief Statistician 1 (CST) level on April 30 (a) 1976 (b) 1974 by each department follows:

MA CST-1

Department or Agency	(a) 1976	(b) 1974
DSS	3	2
ENR	1	2
STC	2	
UAH	1	

---

(1) SOURCE: Master Output Support File, Supply and Services Canada, April 30, 1974 and April 30, 1976 conditions.

NOTE: See also Footnotes 1 to 8 and appendix attached to Question No. 2,651 answered this day.

[Mr. Andras.]

Question No. 2,708—**Mr. Orlikow:**

On April 30 (a) 1976 (b) 1974, how many persons were employed by each department at the Senior Statistician (SRS) level?

Hon. Robert K. Andras (President of the Treasury Board): The number of persons employed at the Senior Statistician (SRS) level on April 30 (a) 1976 (b) 1974 by each department follows. MA SRS-1: Department or Agency: DSS (a) 1976: —, (b) 1974: 1.

---

(1) SOURCE: Master Output Support File, Supply and Services Canada, April 30, 1974 and April 30, 1976 conditions.

NOTE: See also Footnotes 1 to 8 and appendix attached to Question No. 2,651 answered this day.

Question No. 2,709—**Mr. Orlikow:**

On April 30 (a) 1976 (b) 1974, how many persons were employed by each department at the PE-7 level?

Hon. Robert K. Andras (President of the Treasury Board): The number of persons employed at the PE-7 level on April 30 (a) 1976 (b) 1974 by each department follows:

PE-7

Department or Agency	(a) 1976	(b) 1974
AGR	2	2
AUD	1	
CCA		1
DND	2	1
DPW	1	2
DSS	5	2
EMR		1
FIN	3	1
IAN	1	
IJC		1
INC		1
ITC	1	
JUS	1	1
LAB	1	1
MOT	4	3
NHW	2	3
NPB	1	
PCO	1	1
PEN	1	1
POD	4	4
PSC	17	20
REE	1	1
RTC	1	2
SEC	3	1
SOL		1
STC	1	
TAX	4	4
TBD	15	10
UAH		1
UIC	1	

(1) SOURCE: Master Output Support File, Supply and Services Canada, April 30, 1974 and April 30, 1976 conditions.

NOTE: See also Footnotes 1 to 8 and appendix attached to Question No. 2,651 answered this day.

Question No. 2,710—**Mr. Orlikow:**

On April 30 (a) 1976 (b) 1974, how many persons were employed by each department at the PE-6 level?

Hon. Robert K. Andras (President of the Treasury Board): The number of persons employed at the PE-6 level on April 30 (a) 1976 (b) 1974 by each department follows:

PE-6

Department or Agency	(a) 1976	(b) 1974
AGR	4	3
AIB	1	
ARC	1	1
CAE	2	3
CCA	2	
COM	1	1
CTC	1	1
DND	7	6
DOE	4	4
DPW	6	5
DSS	9	13
DVA	6	4
EMR	1	1
EXT	1	3
FIN	1	2
IAN	6	6
IDA	2	1
INC		1
ITC	2	1
JUS	1	1
MID	5	4
MOT	10	6
MST		1
NCC	1	1
NHW	5	4
NMC	1	
PCO	1	
PEN	7	
POD	5	9
PSC	45	27
REE	2	
SEC	1	2
SOL	2	
STC	2	6
TAX	2	1
TBD	22	28
UIC	3	1

(1) SOURCE: Master Output Support File, Supply and Services Canada. April 30, 1974 and April 30, 1976 conditions.

NOTE: See also Footnotes 1 to 8 and appendix attached to Question No. 2,651 answered this day.

Question No. 2,711—**Mr. Orlikow:**

On April 30 (a) 1976 (b) 1974, how many persons were employed by each department at the PE-5 level?

Hon. Robert K. Andras (President of the Treasury Board): The number of persons employed at the PE-5 level on April 30 (a) 1976 (b) 1974 by each department follows:

PE-5

Department or Agency	(a) 1976	(b) 1974
AGR	6	5
ARC	1	1
AUD	1	
CAE	8	5
CCA	2	2
CEO		1
COM	2	2
CPC		1
CTC	2	2
DND	10	5
DOE	10	8
DPW	4	8
DSS	9	6
DVA	6	7
EMR	4	7
ENR	1	1
EXT	4	3
FIN	2	1
FIR	1	
IAN	11	9
IDA	2	1
ITC	1	3
JUS	2	1
LAB	1	2
MID	4	7
MOT	20	19
NCC	1	2
NHW	8	6
NMC	1	
NPB	1	
PCO	1	1
PEN	2	8
POD	18	12
PSC	54	57
RCM	1	
REA	1	1
REE	1	3
RTC	2	1
SEC		2
SOL		2
STC	2	2

Department or Agency	(a) 1976	(b) 1974
TAX	12	10
TBD	23	20
UAH	1	1
UIC	9	8

(1) SOURCE: Master Output Support File, Supply and Services Canada. April 30, 1974 and April 30, 1976 conditions.

NOTE: See also Footnotes 1 to 8 and appendix attached to Question No. 2,651 answered this day.

Question No. 2,712—**Mr. Orlikow:**

On April 30 (a) 1976 (b) 1974, how many persons were employed by each department at the LA-3 level?

Hon. Robert K. Andras (President of the Treasury Board): The number of persons employed at the LA-3 level on April 30 (a) 1976 (b) 1974 by each department follows:

LA-3

Department or Agency	(a) 1976	(b) 1974
CTC	1	1
ENR	1	1
JUS(3)	32	31
RTC	1	1

(1) SOURCE: Master Ouptput Support File, Supply and Services Canada. April 30, 1974 and April 30, 1976 conditions.

(3) SOURCE: Justice Department.

NOTE: See also Footnotes 1 to 8 and appendix attached to Question No. 2,651 answered this day.

Question No. 2,713—**Mr. Orlikow:**

On April 30 (a) 1976 (b) 1974, how many persons were employed by each department at the LA-2 level?

Hon. Robert K. Andras (President of the Treasury Board): The number of persons employed at the LA-2 level on April 30 (a) 1976 (b) 1974 by each department follows:

LA-2

Department or Agency	(a) 1976	(b) 1974
BPA	19	20
CTC	6	5
ENR	2	1
EXT	2	1
IAN	2	4
JUS(3)	253	212
NHW	1	1
NPB	1	1
RTC	2	1

(1) SOURCE: Master Output Support File, Supply and Services Canada. April 30, 1974 and April 30, 1976 conditions.

(3) SOURCE: Justice Department.

NOTE: See also Foonotes 1 to 8 and appendix attached to Question No. 2,651 answered this day.

Question No. 2,714—**Mr. Orlikow:**

On April 30 (a) 1976 (b) 1974, how many persons were employed by each department at the AO-EPS-3 level?

Hon. Robert K. Andras (President of the Treasury Board): The number of persons employed at the AO-EPS-3 level on April 30 (a) 1976 (b) 1974 by each department follows: AO EPS-3: Department or Agency: MOT. (a) 1976: 2. (b) 1974: 1.

(1) SOURCE: Master Output Support File, Supply and Services Canada, April 30, 1974 and April 30, 1976 conditions.

NOTE: See also Footnotes 1 to 8 and appendix attached to Question No. 2,651 answered this day.

Question No. 2,715—**Mr. Orlikow:**

On April 30 (a) 1976 (b) 1974, how many persons were employed by each department at the Statistician 5 (STA) level?

Hon. Robert K. Andras (President of the Treasury Board): The number of persons employed at the Statistician 5 (STA) level on April 30 (a) 1976 (b) 1974 by each department follows:

MA STA-5

Department or Agency	(a) 1976	(b) 1974
DOE	1	
DSS	5	1
ENR		3
MOT	1	
POD	4	
STC	14	6
UAH	1	

(1) SOURCE: Master Output Support File, Supply and Services Canada, April 30, 1974 and April 30, 1976 conditions.

NOTE: See also Footnotes 1 to 8 and appendix attached to Question No. 2,651 answered this day.

Question No. 2,716—**Mr. Orlikow:**

On April 30 (a) 1976 (b) 1974, how many persons were employed by each department at the Chief Statistician 2 (CST) level?

Hon. Robert K. Andras (President of the Treasury Board): The number of persons employed at the Chief Statistician 2 (CST) level on April 30 (a) 1976 9b) 1974 by each department follows:

MA CST-2

Department or Agency	(a) 1976	(b) 1974
DSS		1
ENR		1
STC	1	1

(1) SOURCE: Master Output Support File, Supply and Services Canada. April 30, 1974 and April 30, 1976 conditions.

NOTE: See also Footnotes 1 to 8 and appendix attached to Question No. 2,651 answered this day.

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker: Shall the remaining questions be allowed to stand?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*Translation*]

CANADA PENSION PLAN

AMENDMENT TO EXTEND DEFINITIONS

Hon. Marc Lalonde (Minister of National Health and Welfare) moved that Bill C-49, to amend the Canada Pension Plan, be read the third time and do pass.

He said: Mr. Speaker, in speaking to Bill C-49, I want to thank all hon. members who participated in the debate on second reading and in the discussions of the Standing Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs.

As I have noted on several occasions, the two major amendments contained in Bill C-49, represent a historical change to the CPP, one of Canada's largest social security programs, by taking a major step towards recognizing the work of a spouse in the home.

The provision to split CPP pension credits on marriage dissolution will provide protection for the spouse who works in the home when it is most needed. The special child-rearing drop-out will protect the CPP benefits earned by persons who leave the labour force to raise young children. These amendments go a long way towards the objectives of providing recognition and financial security under the CPP for spouses who work at home while retaining the compulsory, contributory, earnings related characteristics of the CPP. I must remind the House that these amendments have been approved, indeed proposed, by the Canada Pension Plan Advisory Committee and the Advisory Council on the Status of Women. Moreover, the proposals, except the second one, have been endorsed by the provinces. The second proposal has been approved by nine

of the provinces, the only exception being the Ontario government.

In the deliberations of the committee a week or so ago, a question was raised as to whether the special CPP child-rearing drop-out would maintain equity between groups of beneficiaries. It was suggested that the provision would constitute a subsidy to parents who are relatively well off financially since only in these families could the mother, or father, afford to drop out of the labour force to raise young children. However, it is not at all that clear-cut, since so many factors determine whether or not a person leaves the labour force to raise young children. For example, single mothers who are unable to find work would benefit from this provision, as would parents of large families where the cost of providing alternative care for the children prevents the mother from returning to paid employment.

Other factors which enter into the decision of whether to work in or outside of the home are job opportunities, availability of day care facilities, career aspirations, personal convictions as to the preferred method of child-rearing and so on. As you can see, Mr. Speaker, it is not possible to identify any specific group of contributors who would benefit from the special child-rearing drop-out provision. Consequently, it cannot be said that the provision would lead to subsidies for any particular income class.

[*English*]

Another question raised in committee related to the provision of the CPP coverage for family workers. Under the current provisions, a spouse who is employed by his or her spouse in a family business cannot contribute to the CPP. Some members suggested that income splitting between the two spouses should be permitted in these situations so as to allow both spouses to contribute to the CPP.

First, I should note that this matter relates to part I of the CPP which falls under the jurisdiction of the Minister of National Revenue. Since the Department of National Revenue was assigned the responsibility for collecting CPP contributions, the provisions in the CPP which deal with coverage and contributions were of necessity tied to the Income Tax Act. Under that act, where one spouse is working for the other in an unincorporated family business, all the income is declared by one spouse and only one spouse contributes to the CPP. This, as hon. members know, is necessary under a system of progressive tax rates to prevent such couples from dividing income to pay less income tax; otherwise these couples would enjoy a very special advantage over other married couples, as well as single persons.

Similarly, to allow both spouses working in an unincorporated family business to contribute to the CPP would be to confer a very special advantage to a very specific group of persons. As well, it could be viewed as tantamount to permitting voluntary CPP contributions for a particular group of persons since there would likely be a strong element of personal discretion involved in "assigning" earnings to each of the two spouses. Such a provision would also be considered as inequitable vis-à-vis all one-wage-earner couples where the

wage earner is not in a position to divide his or her earnings with the other spouse. In fact, such a measure could be viewed as unfair by all couples where the incomes of the two spouses differ significantly.

[*Translation*]

However, I must emphasize that the proposed provision to split CPP pension credits on marriage dissolution is intended to recognize marriage as an economic as well as a social partnership towards which both spouses contribute whether they work together in a family business, whether they have separate jobs or whether one spouse works at home while the other works in paid employment. This provision would ensure that each spouse retains a fair share of joint assets towards which they both contributed during marriage.

[*English*]

Another point raised during discussion was the question of voluntary contributions for spouses at home. This matter was studied extensively by the Advisory Council on the Status of Women and by the CPP advisory committee at my request a few years ago. I have tabled the reports provided by these bodies. The subject has also been studied by members of the committee on national health and welfare. I am sure members will have given their attention to those two reports.

Miss MacDonald: They don't impress me.

Mr. Lalonde: Both reports have recommended against such a proposal. I should like to take a minute or so to go into this matter, since I know it is of interest to hon. members. There is one solution which appears to be attractive at first sight. Indeed, one wonders why it should not be applied. It is only when the subject is studied more carefully that one finds many drawbacks and difficulties attached to such a proposal. The present objective basis for determining the extent of a contributor's coverage under the plan—namely, his earnings—could not be applied to the voluntary participant, so alternate criteria would have to be developed for the housewife. If a limit were to be applied to a housewife's contributions, how would this be defined: in terms of an absolute amount, a percentage of her husband's earnings, or some other factor? Also, how would the employer's share be determined in this case; and who would pay it?

● (1240)

In addition, major changes would have to be made to the more attractive provisions that arise from the compulsory features of the plan. If this were not done, and if voluntary contributors were allowed to determine the extent of their participation, they could, for literally a few cents a year, generate full orphans' benefits and surviving spouse pensions equal to about 40 per cent of maximum levels after three years' contributions; become eligible for disability pensions equal to about 30 per cent of maximum levels after five years' contribution; and at retirement they would become eligible for 10 per cent retirement pensions.

The most important considerations, however, are issues involving basic social equity, the future operation of the Canada Pension Plan, and private insurance and pension plans. These issues may be summarized as follows: first, if housewives are allowed to participate in the Canada Pension Plan on a voluntary basis, this option would tend to favour wives in families having the willingness and financial ability to participate. Wives in lower income families would have an extremely limited capacity to take advantage of such an opportunity.

Second, can the needs of wives at home be considered separate and apart from those of other individuals who undergo long periods of no earnings because of unemployment, ill health, extended education and other reasons?

Third, if housewives with no earnings are permitted to contribute to the Canada Pension Plan on a voluntary basis, should any provision for voluntary participation be extended to housewives with part-time earnings, and other part-time and low income workers?

Fourth, if an opportunity were extended to some, or all, wage earners to supplement their Canada Pension Plan coverage on a voluntary basis, a situation would be created whereby wage earners could transfer their coverage under private pension plans to the Canada Pension Plan. The differences in funding arrangements between the Canada Pension Plan and private plans would provide a substantial incentive for many to make such transfers. If this were done on a large scale, it could seriously undermine the position of private pension plans.

Fifth, actuarial reports which the government has tabled in parliament from time to time indicate that the financial provisions of the Canada Pension Plan will have to be reviewed at some future date. If such a future review should lead to an increase in contribution rates, would volunteer participants be allowed to reduce or withdraw their participation? If this were permitted, the increased costs of the pension credits accumulated by the volunteer participants would be passed on to the participants who are required to contribute to the plan on a compulsory basis.

The equity of such an arrangement could be the subject of serious criticism if the bulk of volunteer participants came from higher income families, and if large numbers of compulsory participants were comprised of low wage earners. These consequences could be avoided if volunteer participants, once allowed to participate, were required to maintain their participation or, if allowed to reduce or withdraw their participation, were required to accept a reduction in the value of their accumulated pension credits. Such alternatives, however, would likely be considered as acts of bad faith on the part of the government.

Voluntary coverage for housewives is an alternative which might appear attractive on the surface, and I must say that I, like many others, was very attracted by the subject before studying it. However, it does raise some very difficult issues for which answers are not readily apparent. This is why I asked two independent advisory bodies, like the Advisory Council on the Status of Women and the Canada Pension Plan Advisory Committee, to study the matter extensively and to produce a report, which as I have said before I have made public. Both reports rejected the notion and concept of volun-

tary contributions to the Canada Pension Plan and, in effect, every provincial minister around the table with whom we discussed the matter rejected this approach to amending the Canada Pension Plan at the present time.

I remember that the former member for Vancouver-Kingsway, a very remarkable woman, made a great contribution in this House to the cause of women and social equity. She studied the question extensively herself, and during the last few meetings that we had while she was sitting in the House—this is reported in the debates of the parliamentary committee studying the matter at the time—she indicated, having examined the matter extensively for several years, that she had come to the conclusion that the Canada Pension Plan was probably not the proper vehicle to achieve such a purpose. I think it is a tribute to the sense of fairness, perceptiveness and knowledge of this eminent lady that she herself had come to that particular conclusion.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, may I recall to the House that the Canada Pension Plan Act requires that the endorsation of provinces with at least two-thirds the population be obtained to amend the act. We have been able to obtain the endorsement of all the provinces to the first major proposal contained in this bill, and the province of Quebec is amending its plan in a parallel way to the proposals contained in this bill. As a matter of fact, the second proposal is one which was initiated at the beginning by the province of Quebec and endorsed by all other provinces except Ontario.

In view of the difficulties we have had with the provinces and between the provinces in arriving at a consensus on the amendments before us, one can imagine the almost insurmountable difficulties that would arise in the sense that there would be no support at all from provincial governments for an amendment dealing with the voluntary contribution of spouses at home at the present time. It would appear that the Advisory Council on the Status of Women was very concerned about this particular issue and is continuing to examine it further to ascertain what are the most appropriate solutions to the type of questions raised in terms of social equity and justice, and also in terms of ensuring equity and fairness particularly to women in society. They have come to the conclusion, after having studied the matter quite independently and objectively, that this technique of voluntary contribution was not the appropriate one to achieve this particular purpose.

These are the comments that I wanted to make, Mr. Speaker, as we consider third reading of this bill. May I thank hon. members both in committee and in the House on second reading for having supported the bill, and I thank all opposition parties for endorsing the provisions contained in the bill.

[*Translation*]

I also want to thank hon. members for the constructive suggestions advanced in committee related to rectifying errors in a person's contributory period. My department will explore, in cooperation with the Department of National Revenue, the alternative ways in which CPP contributors could be informed of their right to receive statements of their contributory records.

In conclusion, I might note that Bill C-49 also contains a few smaller amendments which will enhance the operations of the CPP and provide fairer treatment of contributors under the plan. I am thinking here, in particular, of the provision to pay retroactive CPP retirement pensions to contributors under age 70 and the removal of the current limitations on benefits payable to orphans and to dependent children of disabled CPP contributors. Mr. Speaker, I thank hon. members for their considerate attention and I hope the bill will be supported by all parties.

[*English*]

Miss Flora MacDonald (Kingston and the Islands): Mr. Speaker, this bill has been before the House and the committee for a relatively short period of time. Therefore, I welcome this opportunity to take part in a debate concerning its provisions. I am particularly pleased to hear the remarks of the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Lalonde) and to follow him in the comments I wish to make. As he has said, Bill C-49, an act to amend the Canada Pension Plan, appears to have the approval of all parties in this House, albeit, as I am sure he will recognize, with some reluctance regarding certain of its provisions. However, I cannot let this occasion pass without registering my deep and abiding anger at this government that once again we are faced with legislation in this House which discriminates against the rights of a certain group of Canadian citizens, namely, women who work in the home.

● (1250)

The minister can sit there and shake his head, indicating that he does not agree with that statement, but I should like to tell him that that is the result of this bill. I recognize the benefits of the bill. I recognize that in a limited fashion it reduces certain inequities, but let me say to the minister that it is a bitter disappointment to those of us whose expectations were raised last fall as we listened to the words of the Speech from the Throne. Those words were misleading, and I remind him what was said at that time:

> You will be asked to consider amendments to the Canada Pension Plan which would further recognize the value of the contribution made to the family and society by both marriage partners, in the event that one remains at home to raise children while their partner works outside the home.

Many of us understood from those words that in amending the provisions of the Canada Pension Plan the government would implement a very fundamental and heretofore totally neglected principle, namely, that women, no matter where they work, are contributors to society and their rights as individuals to contribute to and benefit from the Canada Pension Plan, as indeed from all comprehensive social programs, would be guaranteed under law. Whatever else this bill accomplishes, it does not address itself to that principle. That is what was indicated in the Speech from the Throne.

First of all, I want to make it very clear why I refer to women when dealing with the rights of those who work in the home. I have looked at the most recent statistics and I know they indicate that some 10,000 males list housework as their

major occupation, but over 4½ million Canadian women are classified in this category, which is about one-fifth of our total population. While I recognize the contribution of the 10,000 males in this regard, the reality of the situation is that 99.8 per cent of the persons who work in the home are women. My major concern is for this group of people in our society. When the Canada Pension Plan was introduced back in 1964, it set out to provide benefits for contributors. The words of the act read as follows:

—establish a comprehensive program of old age pensions and supplementary benefits in Canada payable to and in respect of contributors.

The key word is "contributors". One particular group of Canadians, women who work in the home and who contribute to the social and economic well being of this country, are not contributors to the Canada Pension Plan, nor are they permitted to be contributors to that plan. They are excluded from that opportunity. We have just heard the Minister of National Health and Welfare say that they are excluded from that opportunity. I ask the minister, is this what he calls social justice in this country? Just recently this House passed a human rights bill. With the following noble words the human rights bill was introduced:

Every individual should have an equal opportunity with other individuals to make for himself or herself the life that he or she is able and wishes to have, consistent with his or her duties and obligations as a member of society, without being hindered in or prevented from doing so by discriminatory practices based on race, national or ethnic origin, colour, religion, age, sex or marital status—

I contend that women who work in the home do not have, in the words of the human rights bill, an equal opportunity with other individuals to make for themselves the life that they are able and wish to have, when they are denied the opportunity to contribute to the Canada Pension Plan.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Miss MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, I will call it one o'clock.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Order, please. It being one o'clock, I do now leave the chair until two o'clock later this day.

At one o'clock the House took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 2 p.m.

Miss MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, at the time of the luncheon adjournment I had been trying to impress upon the minister that women who work in the home do not have, within the terms of the human rights bill, an equal opportunity with other individuals to make for themselves the life that they are able and wish to have, when such persons are denied the opportunity to contribute to the Canada Pension Plan. I contend very strongly that housewives should have this right. It is a principle that should be respected as a right of an individual in our society—a right that is basic to that particular individual and not because the person is attached to another member of our society as some sort of chattel or appendage.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Paproski: Lalonde, you male chauvinist.

Miss MacDonald: She should have the right to contribute, as do all other productive members of society. But at present she is denied that right. Faced with Bill C-49, I have to ask myself whether the intent of the Canada Pension Plan does not, indeed, abuse the principle stated in the human rights bill. Perhaps I go a little too far when I say that the way in which the Canada Pension Plan presently operates violates human rights, but this could be settled definitively if some woman who works in the home would challenge it in the courts. I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, it is my intention to encourage such a woman who does work in the home to take her case to contribute to the Canada Pension Plan to the courts and have it decided in that way.

I would like to say to the minister that in his remarks before the luncheon adjournment I feel that he misrepresented very seriously the position of the former hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway in her support of the purpose and the principle that I have been stating.

Mr. McGrath: Shame on you.

Miss MacDonald: In consideration of this bill during second reading and in committee, there were two matters that struck me. The first was the matter of voluntary contributions to the Canada Pension Plan by persons working in the home. That subject was raised during debate on second reading, it was raised in committee, and it was dealt with here by the minister, with lack of sensitivity. I know that he said he found the proposal to be attractive on the surface, but that is the whole problem. The minister looks at this in a superficial way. He passed it off—would not deal with it himself—to the Advisory Council on the Status of Women.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Paproski: Just listen—écoutez.

Mr. McGrath: How are you going to defend this on the hustings?

Miss MacDonald: The minister referred the matter, since he could not come to grips with it himself, to the Advisory Council on the Status of Women and, as he stated, for certain reasons they rejected it. I must say that I have read their report and I am deeply disappointed in their findings. I have not been persuaded by any of their arguments. The reasons and objections they set out—as were the ones that the minister put forward this morning—had to do with the mechanics of making voluntary contributions operative, rather than with the justice of the case.

Mr. McGrath: It is an elitist report.

Miss MacDonald: I know, as well, that during the committee hearings a departmental officer, a bureaucrat, rejected the proposal. She intoned that the persons likely to contribute voluntarily are only those who can afford to, and that the payments may become prohibitive, particularly for low income families. What I would like to know is, on what basis, on what data, did that bureaucrat make her judgment? How does she or anyone else, including the minister, know what any group of persons would do if given a choice? How did that bureaucrat know, and how does the minister know, that some woman presently in a low income bracket, whose work is in the home, if given the opportunity would not choose to put her few dollars into a pension plan with the expectation that her later years would be financially more secure? What right has any bureaucrat to dismiss arbitrarily or, indeed, what right has the government and the minister to pre-empt the right of choice of hundreds of thousands of Canadians who are making as vital a contribution to this society as do women who work in the home? What right has the minister to pre-empt that choice?

• (1410)

Mr. McGrath: None, and they make a bigger contribution than most.

Miss MacDonald: I realize that there may be difficulties in implementing such voluntary contributions. I am not denying that. Certainly inequities may arise, but difficulties and inequities should not stop us; rather, they should challenge us to get on with facing up to this question. Surely it is not beyond our capability to redress inequities should they arise. Ways can be found. This bill is an example of measures introduced to correct shortcomings of previous legislation. However, as we have seen so often, it falls far short of what it should be, because the government takes the easy way out. Rarely do we see substantive legislation which comes to grips directly with the existing structures of our society, even though principles to change such structures are reiterated time and again, as they were in last year's throne speech.

The minister, his department and his advisers are so bent on finding obstacles to measures which would accomplish a basic change that they fail to address themselves to the principles they themselves enunciate. There is always difficulty in implementing programs which would achieve the delicate balance of justice for society's members. But to accomplish something you must have the will to accomplish it, and what is evident in this series of housekeeping measures—measures which merely tinker with the structures we now have in place—is that this government lacks the political will to tackle a basic change. As a result of the assumption that it is too difficult to implement measures to make substantive changes which would allow for the equitable distribution of benefits, and because the government will not come to grips with this question, one-fifth of our population, or 4.5 million women who work in the home, are denied the opportunity of participating in a pension plan which the rest of society is accorded as its right because of the contribution it makes to the productivity of this country.

Mr. McGrath: To the eternal shame of the minister.

Canada Pension Plan

Miss MacDonald: I would like to remind the minister that doing housework is contributing to the productivity of the country. Recent studies commissioned by Statistics Canada were undertaken by economists at Queen's University. They were finished in May. Those studies estimate the value of housework to be in the vicinity of $60 billion, or over one-third of our gross national product. That is the value placed on work in the home. I do not mean to imply in my remakrs that because they do not have an opportunity to contribute to the Canada Pension Plan, women in the home are completely denied benefits under the program. Oh, yes, housewives do get payments. They get survivor benefits. But given the current payments under the plan, survivor benefits for a woman who has chosen to work in the home amount to $109 per month maximum. For her counterpart who has chosen to enter the so-called work force the pension would be $173 per month maximum, fully one-third more.

Let me assure the House that that difference of $66 a month is very important to the recipient. But even more important than the amount is the fact that the homemaker is denied the right to choose to be in the higher benefit range. That is the point I want the minister to recognize, to realize, because this is not the first time the Minister of National Health and Welfare who is also responsible for the status of women, has denied rights to a particular group of women.

Mr. McGrath: He should resign that responsibility forthwith.

Miss MacDonald: Just to take the minister's mind back, in the legislation establishing the spouse's allowance we have the demeaning situation where the older spouse, generally the male, has to give his written consent before the younger spouse, the woman, can collect the spouse's allowance. Has the minister any idea of how degrading and demeaning this is to women? Does he have any idea what it means to women to be relegated to that second-class status? When will he come to a recognition that certain principles which reflect the self-worth of an individual are important because of what they mean in terms of human dignity and not merely in dollar terms?

A second point about this bill which concerns me greatly is the drop-out provision and its long-term financial implications. Questions have already been raised as to its actuarial soundness. They were raised by the hon. member for Hamilton West (Mr. Alexander), and I certainly share my colleague's reservations. But an equally important and overriding consideration is the potential for conflict this provision could cause among groups of women. Tensions could be created as a result of preferential treatment for different groups. The woman who drops out of the work force to raise children will have her Canada Pension Plan payments subsidized during those years. The woman who cannot afford to drop out of the work force for an extended period to raise children is denied such a beneficial subsidy.

However, the woman who chooses to work at home and raise children receives no benefits at all as an individual. She is not even given the right to participate in the plan. This is why I

contend that there is a certain insidious discrimination here which makes one group in particular seemingly inferior to others in that rights and benefits are denied them. Knowing that their contribution to the gross national product of this country is indeed significant—as I have stated, $60 billion is the figure which has been attached to it—we can only conclude that housewives are not inferior in contributing to our society, but only in receiving its benefits.

I acknowledge that Bill C-49 would make certain beneficial changes to the Canada Pension Plan, but it will not result in eliminating the major inequity in the plan—its major shortcoming—that of denying to certain individuals the right to contribute to the plan. Until the government faces up to that problem, until it summons enough courage to do so, we will continue to have in this country measures such as this bill which belittle the contribution of women who work in the home.

• (1420)

Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North): Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on this subject largely because my colleague, the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles), had to be away from the House for very important reasons. It is not often that happens.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Orlikow: Had he been here, he would certainly have spoken on this bill, as he has spoken on every question relating to pensions that has come up for more than a quarter of a century. We in the New Democratic Party naturally support the basic principles of the Canada Pension Plan. We look upon it as the only pension plan in this country which provides that a person who works is not penalized if and when he or she changes jobs or is laid off, as is the case with private pension plans. In virtually every industrial pension plan the worker who is laid off or who changes jobs suffers a very sharp penalty. He usually gets back only the money he put in, and very often without any interest it may have earned, and almost always does not get the matching contribution which the employer could have been paying into the plan.

The Canada Pension Plan is the only one in Canada that is universal and where the benefits are indexed. That is tremendously important. In recent years the cost of living has increased by 6 per cent to 10 per cent. A person who retires in 1977 may find, if it is not indexed, that by 1982 or 1987 his pension is not sufficient for his needs. Many people have pensions associated with their work, and until about a year ago they had reason to believe they could live their retirement in comparative comfort. The cost of living has gone up so rapidly, however, that if the amount of pension is fixed they often find they cannot even afford to continue living in the house that may have been their home for about 30 years.

A great campaign is being waged at the present time to convince the public that indexed pension plans such as the plan for the federal public service would bankrupt the country. In my opinion, this view is being put about by the insurance companies. We do not believe it is true. We believe this country can afford to index pension plans, as has been done in Germany and Sweden where retiring workers draw something between 60 and 65 per cent of the best five years' earnings as pension. They are indexed either to the cost of living or to the average increase in industrial wages. This party proposed plans such as the Canada Pension Plan long before it was introduced, and of course we support any improvements the government can be persuaded to bring forward.

I have to say, on my own behalf, however, and as the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre said on second reading debate, that while the changes are headed in the right direction, they are of small importance. They will not greatly improve the benefits presently received by people who qualify. The amendments do not recognize the role of the spouse working in the home, nor do they provide any recognition or financial security for the spouse. The minister said he had looked at this question with a good deal of sympathy. He reminded us that the former member for Vancouver-Kingsway, Mrs. MacInnis, always advocated this and said that in her later years he had come to doubt her position.

I am not very impressed with what the minister had to say about the Advisory Committee on the Canada Pension Plan. Mrs. June Menzies, vice-president of the Anti-Inflation Board, was formerly a member of the Advisory Council on the Status of Women and was very vocal and active in matters relating to improvements in the status of women. That was all right as long as she did not have any authority. She said all the right things as long as she was just in an advisory position. But when she went to the Anti-Inflation Board, government policy and directives suddenly had a great deal to do with her decisions on improving the status of women.

At the Health Sciences Centre in Winnipeg a committee was established to look into discrimination against women employees. Management and the union were represented on this committee, which reported that women workers were being paid less per hour than men for doing exactly the same work. It recommended that the jobs be reclassified and the pay for women workers be increased. Union and management negotiated and reached an agreement which brought women much closer to pay equality with men than before. Where the increase in pay for the women was more than it was for the men, however, the Anti-Inflation Board rejected it. The union appealed to the board—after Mrs. Menzies became a member—and the board awarded the women an increase of 25 per cent or less than the union and management agreed upon.

In light of that decision, I do not have much faith in Mrs. Menzies or in the minister's belief in protecting the status of women. These organizations are composed almost exclusively of good Liberals who will not do anything to disturb the wishes of the government. When it comes to a choice of whom will they satisfy, the government or the women we are supposed to represent, I believe—as I think the evidence will prove—that 95 per cent of the time they will come down on the side of the government. So I do not pay too much attention to the

supposed views and studies of organizations such as the minister mentioned.

● (1430)

The bill, as we see it, does two things. It provides, in the event of a marriage breakdown, where the marriage has lasted three years or more, that the combined assets of the couple can be split between the parties 50-50. We think it is a good move and support it. The bill also makes a slight change with respect to women contributors. It provides that if a person has been a contributor but stays home a few years to raise children, provided the children are not over the age of seven those years can be dropped from the number of years involved in the calculation of personal retirement benefits—in this case they would usually be payable to a woman—at age 65.

I said earlier these two changes are small in their effect. Because the bill does nothing for women who do not work after marriage but devote their time to bringing up children, it is not overly significant. All our pension legislation, with the exception of the old age security pension legislation, provides for payments to women only in as far as a woman has been married to a man who qualified for a pension under legislation providing for veterans' pensions, CNR pensions, public service pensions or the Canada Pension Plan. There is no provision for paying benefits to women who stay at home, raise children and look after the household. This bill does not recognize their contribution. We think it is wrong. The rationale behind this shortcoming is that the Canada Pension Plan is an employment-related pension plan. We think the minister's statement given earlier today is based on too narrow, too restrictive and too legalistic thinking.

Let me repeat what the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre suggested on second reading of this bill. The hon. member suggested we should provide that every person between the ages which apply in the Canada Pension Plan, namely, the 47-year period between the ages of 18 and 65, who is not employed and not contributing to the Canada Pension Plan should get a certain percentage of credit toward a supplement to his old age security pension, a certain percentage for each year he is not a CPP contributor. Although a specific percentage perhaps is not too important at this time, my colleague suggested that in principle we should think about a 2 per cent per year contribution up to a maximum of 40 years. That would allow a woman to get about 80 per cent of what the Canada Pension Plan pays to those who contributed. If we were to do that, when the couple retires the husband could look forward to receiving the Canada Pension Plan benefits to which he contributed, and old age security, and the wife could look forward to the old age security payment and about 80 per cent of the Canada Pension Plan.

We are going to support the bill, but think the minister needs some new advisers who will be a good deal more innovative and adventuresome in their thinking than his present advisers.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Order, please. I must advise hon. members that if the Chair recognizes the minister, he will automatically close debate on the bill. Is this agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Hon. Marc Lalonde (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, I thank hon. members for the contributions made on behalf of their own parties on this subject. I think all in this House recognize the important contributions housewives make to society. The Statistics Canada study on the subject was designed to show the major contribution which housewives doing voluntary or unpaid work in the home make to our gross national product.

We must stress one point. The Canada Pension Plan has nothing to do with meritorious or non-meritorious work. It is related to the salaries and wages people are paid. The plan operates on the basis of the actual wages or salaries paid, not on the quality or type of work done. The legislation does not give people the right to contribute to the Canada Pension Plan. It creates the obligation to contribute to the Canada Pension Plan. People have no choice except to pay a certain amount of their salary, as determined by law, into the Canada Pension Plan fund.

The hon. member for Kingston and the Islands (Miss MacDonald) raised certain arguments concerning the right to contribute to the plan, but never concentrated on the other aspect of the argument, namely, what is the real nature of the plan? I suggest that aspect should be examined carefully. The hon. member also mentioned the spouse's allowance. I stress that this question relates to whichever spouse is the older. The reason for written consent is that the person who has a direct and full right to an old age security pension could see his or her pension reduced by the amount paid by way of spouse's allowance. It is normal, in such circumstances, for the spouse over age 65 to give written consent for a possible reduction of the pension to which that spouse would otherwise be entitled.

I regret that the hon. member for Winnipeg North (Mr. Orlikow) should have expressed his unfavourable views about the Advisory Council on the Status of Women. My only comment would be this: if he cannot trust the independent advice of such a body, I wonder if he would even trust the advice of provincial governments of his own political persuasion. As I said this morning, not a single provincial government is willing to propose or support the principle of voluntary contributions with regard to spouses at home. The government of Ontario so far has opposed even the relatively small proposed change with regard to spouses who stay home to look after children. One cannot doubt what their reaction would be to the kinds of proposals and ideas expressed this afternoon. The question of remuneration of spouses at home and their rights to contribute to various schemes raises certain difficulties. The question has been studied extensively by various bodies. Perhaps the question cannot be resolved aptly by use of the Canada Pension Plan, but it may require some other mechanism for its solution.

I repeat, the Canada Pension Plan is an earnings-related program and has nothing to do with the kind of work a person does. Having said that, I thank the House for having considered this bill, and its promise to support it.

[*Translation*]

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

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Is the House prepared to adopt the said motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion agreed and bill read the third time and passed.

* * *

[*English*]

EMPLOYMENT AND IMMIGRATION REORGANIZATION ACT

MEASURE TO ESTABLISH DEPARTMENT OF EMPLOYMENT AND IMMIGRATION, ETC.

The House resumed, from Thursday, July 7, consideration of the motion of Mr. Cullen that Bill C-27, to establish the Department of Employment and Immigration, the Canada Employment and Immigration Commission and the Canada Employment and Immigration Advisory Council, to amend the Unemployment Insurance Act, 1971, and to amend certain other statutes in consequence thereof, be read the third time and do pass; and the amendment thereto of Mr. Peters.

● (1440)

Mr. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby): Mr. Speaker, I rise in this debate to support the motion moved by my colleague, the hon. member for Timiskaming (Mr. Peters). He correctly pointed out that instead of attacking the unemployed in Canada, as this legislation does in a very discriminatory and unfair way, the government should be bringing forward measures to create job opportunities for Canadians. We find this a totally convincing example of the insensitive nature of this government.

In speaking to the motion for a six months' hoist, not only do we say that jobs ought to be created instead of attacking the unemployed, but we can provide, in the example I am going to give, very specific information about how, within the government's own operations right now, it should be providing significant increases in employment for Canadians. In so doing, I want to address myself to the concerns of the automotive industry, that sector of the Canadian economy which employs over 100,000 Canadians. That sector has been virtually ignored by this government since 1965. Since I came here in 1968 there have been three ministers of industry, trade and commerce. They have not made the effort they ought to have made to create more jobs for Canadians by improving that agreement.

I remind the House that that agreement came into being in 1965 as a result of continuing balance of payments problems that existed between Canada and the United States. We were losing billions of dollars cumulatively, hundreds of millions of dollars annually, in trade with the United States in the automotive sector. Ironically, the proposal of the Canadian government at that time was to set up what became subsequently for the Americans their DISC program. We were going to establish that in 1965 as a way of extricating ourselves from this serious problem. Understandably, the Americans objected. A series of negotiations took place. The result was the Canada-U.S. automotive agreement of 1965.

I want to quote from clause 1 of the agreement. I notice the Minister of Finance (Mr. Macdonald) is in the chamber. This matter ought to concern him. Clause 1 of that agreement is very relevant to the kind of concerns that we now have in this House—namely, jobs. It states that the purpose of the agreement was for each country "to participate on a fair and equitable basis in the expanding total market of the two countries". We were supposed to get real and substantial benefits. As a result of this agreement, the Americans have tariff-free access to the Canadian market. One of the consequences of this was supposed to have been a substantial reduction in the price of cars to Canadian consumers. I will get to that in a few minutes. Another major consequence was supposed to be a real increase in employment opportunities for men and women in Canada. That, too, was to follow from the agreement.

That pact has been in existence for more than the nine years that I have been here as a member of parliament. After being elected to this place, representing an automotive constituency I spent some time looking at the pact. I made some criticisms to the then minister of industry, trade and commerce, the hon. Jean-Luc Pepin, who interestingly enough has taken on other errand-boy tasks for the government. I pointed out to his successor, now the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Gillespie), and the present minister some very serious problems in the implementation of the auto pact as it affects the Canadian economy, the Canadian consumer and the Canadian worker.

All of this has been documented by a study, not by the NDP research staff, some trade union in Canada or some source whose credentials the government might question, but by a special task force from within the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce. What have we learned? That study was tabled in the House about a week ago. It points out that there are serious problems in the parts sector of the Canadian industry, in investment patterns, in research and development, and last but not least it singled out very serious injustices being done to Canadian consumers who are paying millions of dollars a year, cumulatively, more for cars than they ought to be paying.

I want to deal with some of these points in series. First, employment, which is our paramount concern in this House right now, at least on the opposition side and certainly for Canadians whether they live on the east coast, on the prairies

or in the west. What has happened in this industry which now employs in excess of 100,000 Canadians and could be employing 20,000 to 25,000 more if we were getting what we should be getting out of the agreement? Between 1964 and 1973, according to the government's own figures, production in Canada in this industry increased by 77 per cent. During the same period, jobs increased by only 30 per cent. Production went up considerably. Employment did not go up nearly as rapidly.

There is one obvious explanation for a good part of this gap. There was a rationalization of the production lines on the Canadian side of the industry. For example, instead of producing 13 or 14 models on the assembly line in my home town of Oshawa, this was reduced to two, three or four lines. That increased efficiency considerably. It meant we could produce more, not only in Oshawa, Oakville, Windsor and other automotive assembly plant locations in southern Ontario, but also in Ste. Therese, Quebec. We could produce more cars, in a more simplified fashion, at lower cost.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Where was your Monza made?

Mr. Broadbent: My Monza is a good Canadian-made car, made in that fine province of Quebec. Although improved efficiency of the Canadian operation accounts for part of the gap which exists between a 77 per cent increase in production and only a 30 per cent in employment, it cannot account for all of it. There have to be other reasons. I note, in passing, that during the same period, U.S. production increased by only 10 per cent while employment went up by 13 per cent. Whereas in Canada production increased at a much higher rate than the level of job creation, in the United States it was the opposite: the U.S. had a lower increase in production but a higher increase in jobs. It is jobs that ought to concern us. The minister responsible must find out why, on a comparative basis, more new jobs exist in relation to increases in production in the United States than in Canada.

I want to turn to the parts sector, which in one sense is the essence of this industry. Since 1964 we have experienced a net deficit in trade with the United States of $16 billion—not thousands, or millions, but billions of dollars in trade and automotive parts.

● (1450)

In 1975, Canadian consumers used some 12 per cent of all the north American automobile parts manufactured on this continent, but we produced only some 7 per cent of them. So we are producing about 5 per cent less than we are consuming. The reason is that since 1965, 80 per cent of the investment in the parts industry in North America has occurred on the American side. The point is, investment is what creates jobs, and as long as they are getting 80 per cent and we are getting only 14 per cent, the Americans are getting the jobs, not us.

The idea behind the pact was that both countries were to share, on an equitable basis, in future growth in the industry. I emphasize that this has not taken place in the parts sector. The American plants have the growth; the Canadians have not. If we had been getting our share of investment, it would have meant thousands of additional jobs for Canadians in Windsor, in St. Thomas, in London, in Oakville, in Kitchener, in Ste. Thérèse, Québec, in St. Catharines, in Oshawa, and elsewhere. Thousands of additional jobs would exist if the government had been doing what it ought to have been doing in the past ten years, that is, monitoring the effects of this pact in a serious way. But it has neglected to do this.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Broadbent: The other aspect of the agreement which concerns us all comes under the label of "three p's"—prices, products and productivity. I am glad the Minister of Finance is here. One of the arguments he trots out time and time again to justify the controls program he brought in is that Canadian productivity has never been as high as that of our American friends. It is interesting that we have never brought down a sector by sector breakdown of this suggestion. I suspect I know why. It is because if he did, the figures would not support his case.

We have them now for the automobile sector, however. Look at the products structure of the industry. I think this is scandalous in terms of what the pact was supposed to do for the Canadian consumer. Ninety per cent of Canadian families own automobiles, and 100 per cent of those families are being gypped under this pact because they are paying too much for their cars. What are the figures? This is the first time they have been available to us. I intend to compare the profits of the Big Four auto makers in Canada with the profits they make in the United States. The period is from 1971 to 1975. Let us start with a small company, General Motors, that pygmy among corporations. Their return on capital investment in the United States in this period was 8.9 per cent. In Canada, it was 11.1 per cent. Ford made 5.1 per cent in the United States, but in Canada it was making 12.7 per cent. Chrysler was making 1 per cent in the United States, but 6.2 per cent in Canada. American Motors made 4 per cent in the U.S., but 8.2 per cent in Canada. In every case, the Big Four in the auto business were almost doubling their profit margins on operations in Canada compared with what they were making in the United States. That situation is, surely, scandalous.

Related to this is the issue of productivity which I have just mentioned. The minister and his colleagues frequently sound gleeful as they point out that Canadian workers are less productive than are our American friends. The reality is just the opposite. They are more productive. Let me put on record, for the benefit of the Minister of Finance, comparative productivity figures as between Canadian and United States workers in the automotive industry. In 1967, two years after the pact came into being, Canadian workers were only 95 per cent as productive as Americans. But from 1965 on the picture changed completely. In 1968 the Canadian figure was 117 per cent. In 1969 it was 129 per cent. In 1970 it was 131 per cent. In 1971 it was 128 per cent. In 1972 it was 115 per cent. In

1973, the last year for which we have figures, it was 110 per cent. The picture is clear: Canadian workers are producing more than the Americans in terms of unit hours worked.

Despite this, the automobile industry, as I have pointed out, is making almost double the rate of profit in Canada as it is making in the United States. Does the improved productivity north of the border find a reflection in cheaper cars for Canadians? If we accept the conventional argument which the Minister of Finance used to make, the conclusion ought to be that Canadians should be paying perhaps $200 less per car than our American neighbours. What is the reality? The reality is, as every Canadian knows, that we are paying anywhere from $300 to $2,000 more for a car made in Canada and sold, say, in Toronto, than is paid for the same car sold in Buffalo, New York.

This is another scandal in terms of the economic consequences of the auto pact. People who work in automobile communities know very well what the situation is. As cars come down the assembly line, you see two red Chevy Impalas coming down the line. One has a sticker on it saying it is being sent to Saskatoon. The other, an identical car, is being sent to Buffalo, New York. For some reason, the price tag on the car going to Saskatoon is several hundred dollars higher than that attached to the car which is being sent to the United States—and I am allowing for the difference in tax. There is no justification for this situation. If any sort of logical economic reasoning were applied, Canadians would be getting their cars cheaper than their American friends. Instead, they are paying hundreds of dollars more. This has got to change.

The other point I want to make relates directly to jobs in research and development. Right now, not only in North America but around the world, billions of dollars are being spent on research and development, particularly in order to develop more efficient engines which consume less fuel. This is a long overdue development. As I say, billions of dollars are going into research and development, directly affecting job creation. Some $2 billion is being spent currently by the Big Four in the United States. How much is being spent in Canada? Virtually nothing. The report which was sent out by the minister's own department tells us—these are not the precise words—that virtually nothing is being spent on research in Canada. The fact of the matter is that Canada has become almost entirely a nation of automotive assemblers as far as this industry is concerned. We carry out practically no research. I wish to quote from the minister's own report:

> An important consequence of this concentration of development effort is that the U.S. has experienced most of the direct benefits which flow from this form of activity.

● (1500)

Not only do Americans gain the primary jobs when companies are hiring men and women scientists for research and development work in the industry, but the spin-off benefits of the work done, which have an impact on many sectors of the economy, accrue to the United States, not to Canada. So again this means a significant loss of potential jobs.

[Mr. Broadbent.]

I come immediately to make some recommendations regarding what can be done to improve the situation and ensure that Canadians, particularly in the context of employment, get some benefit from the auto pact. First of all, in order to protect the parts industry, which has been losing billions of dollars annually in terms of trade deficit, major modification of the pact is required. We have to change one of the safeguards in the pact, which is probably the best approach, to ensure that a certain percentage of cars produced on the Canadian side of the border are constructed of Canadian parts. Or if the parts industry in Canada is to grow at the rate it ought, we should ensure that a certain percentage of the parts used in cars made on either side of the border comes specifically from Canada. What we need is some protective mechanism to ensure that the parts industry remains viable.

This is important in regard to jobs to be provided in the early future as well as for the future of the industry itself. If we do not protect the parts industry and it continues to dwindle in size, then ten years down the road the United States will have us over an economic barrel. If all that we have are assembly plant operations, the Americans will say it is too bad, we should scrap the pact. They will say "All that you Canadians have are assembly plant operations; the essence of the industry is located in the United States, which is where the parts are, so we have you just where we want you". I do not have what I regard as an empty-headed, anti-American bias, and I am not saying that the Americans will inevitably say that. But I am saying that in terms of Canadian interests we must not create a situation in Canada where, if we do become involved in hard-headed bargaining in the years ahead regarding the future of the industry, we could find ourselves without any parts sector.

We must also make it a provision of the pact that a certain percentage of the annual investment in research and development on the part of the big four is spent on the Canadian side of the border. So far as consumers are concerned—I see the Minister of Finance is in the Chamber—the Government of Canada should be saying to the big four, either next week or at the end of the month, that, with the 1978 model year, prices to Canadian consumers of Canadian produced cars must not be one cent higher than the price charged for the same cars in the United States. It is time that the Canadian government had enough gumption to call in the directors of the big four in Canada and to tell them it is time to put up or shut up. For ten years they have been promising a reduction in price. It is time that we got it, and it should begin with the 1978 model year.

In view of the cumulative deficits which are being experienced in automotive trade between Canada and the United States, we are now almost back to the situation we were in prior to the pact coming into force in 1965. Last year we had a net deficit of over $1 billion. In terms of our balance of trade figures, impact on the Canadian dollar, and loss of jobs, we need a more comprehensive and systematic review of the pact as a whole. There have been some positive benefits from the pact, and anyone who denies it would be crazy; but there are also a number of severe liabilities in it for Canada,

and if it is to continue there must be a systematic and comprehensive revision of the pact in Canada's interests.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Charles-Eugène Dionne (Kamouraska): Mr. Speaker, the unemployment situation in Canada in general, and in my area in particular, affects the people concerned so severely that I consider it my duty to speak again at this stage of the debate in view of the numerous representations which have been made to the Manpower and Immigration Committee by various representative organizations, many of which have pointed out the serious consequences of the legislation we are now debating.

It is inconceivable that Bill C-27 might be adopted without major amendments to its various clauses. I support without hesitation the proposal to postpone the passage of this bill and refer it for further study so that we may eventually come out with effective legislation which will improve the distressing unemployment situation prevailing at present. Unemployed workers are said to be living off the backs of those who are fortunate enough to have a remunerative job. As far as I am concerned, those who live at the expense of workers in our society are rather those who exploit them. Unemployed people are entitled to benefits; they are not a present from the government. They are also entitled to objective and honest information.

● (1510)

There is no reason why the unemployed should be penalized for the least omission. There is a penalty when the employee quits his job on his own, even though he has been exploited and has suffered inhuman working conditions. They will not further inquire, they only take the employer's statement. There is a penalty when the unemployed do not actively seek a job, even if there is not one available and if 30 per cent of the labour force is idle. As I said before, I believe, rules on searching for employment seem to have been inspired by an old Burmese saying that there is no gold in every rock but there is no harm in looking for it. So the officials say look for a job even if there is not one. Can you imagine! There must be something wrong with the legislation if civil servants feel compelled to issue such instructions to the unemployed.

And just to give you an idea of the situation, I am going to point out evidence of searches for non existent jobs. We know that for some time now senior officials of the commission have most probably given directives to their employees. They will not tell us about it but we can read between lines that claimants are expected to scout around for a job. I do not object to officials of the commission suggesting to the unemployed means of securing a job. However, let us not exaggerate. We have to consider the various factors involved. First, the local unemployment rate, second, the number of industries likely to require labour, third, the time of the year, as it may affect workers in forestry, agriculture, fishery, and other seasonal industries, finally, and this is a very important factor, the working and wage conditions prevailing at the places to which a worker is directed, the cost of moving, and the expected duration of employment: all these aspects must be checked over by people who are well aware of the working conditions prevailing in the place suggested to the applicant. We are well aware that as a result of these guidelines the unemployed had to seek jobs in an area where manpower did not have an available job. I wonder what is the use of those centres. Yet, they are supposed to provide whatever information is available. With thousands of job vacancies on file which cannot be filled by the unemployed, with the people in the area coming to see them fairly regularly to see if they have anything interesting to offer them, why then force a man who is without a job and without income, except for unemployment insurance benefits, to spend money on taxis to scout around for a job in neighbouring villages, 15, 20 or 25 miles away from home. For him to look around in his own community is not good enough. He is told: You limit your availability to your own area. But if within a radius of 25, 30 or 50 miles, covered by manpower districts, jobs cannot be found, why require the unemployed to spend what little money he gets from unemployment benefits to remain entitled to them?

Those bureaucratic requirements do not solve the problem of unemployment but rather help to exhaust the patience of the employers who have too many workers, and that of the jobless who cannot find work. I know a lot of employers back home. Some of them have written a special letter to be given the fellow when he shows up. They just date the letter and sign their names to it. They say: We have no work. Yet, the commission forces the fellow to go to the office. Then we are told: The commission does not oblige you to find work but only to look for some. Can you imagine anything like that! Have the fellow spend money looking for work that simply does not exist at some times of the year. As I said before, you have to hold a middle course between the two extremes, then have reasonable requirements. I shall give you a few examples to give you an idea of the situation.

I have here the case of a well-intentioned 19 year old whom I know very well from St. Pascal de Kamouraska who has been unemployed for several months. He would work occasionally. He would manage to find a job for two or three days and mention the wages he earned on his weekly reports. Some weeks he would not find anything at all. He was regularly pestered by commission officers: There is a mistake here, you forgot to mark this, you forgot to mark that. His parents had made a lot of sacrifices to get him educated. On October 27, that young man tired of the Unemployment Insurance Commission monkey business joined the army. At that point he practically had no other choice.

I have here a young girl, well educated, coming out of school with a good secretarial course with typing and shorthand. She made many contacts. I have a whole page here. She applied for a job at 50 to 60 places. She did not find any. She adds at the end of her letter that she contacted the Unemployment Insurance Commission, Quebec Hydro, Bell Telephone, the Canada Manpower Centre, the Unemployment Insurance office in Rivière-du-Loup, the Manpower Centre in Quebec City, Cabano, the Quebec social services centre, as well as Rivière-

du-Loup, where Mr. Jean-Rock Larochelle, officer Bélanger—she mentions all that here and then concludes her letter by saying:

I would have another 20 names to mention, but having already taken enough of your time, I will stop here. It is almost discouraging to go over all those addresses without any prospect of work yet.

So, with all those facts, the executive management of the Unemployment Insurance Commission is still forcing public servants administering local offices to make people spend money to look for work. I have another case here. An ambitious young man wanted to work at any cost. He had already paid us several visits. I told him: My boy, one way perhaps to wake up a couple of them would be to write the Minister of Labour in Ottawa. Contact the Quebec minister and various government officials. We are going to see their response. Here it is.

Someone, a senior official in the Rivière-du-Loup Manpower Centre, sent him the following reply:

The recruiting of workers for this project—

He wanted to work in the James Bay area.

—has been referred to us for a reply.

Workers for this project are recruited through the Quebec manpower centres and not our Department. We therefore suggest that you communicate with the Cabano office, where you will obtain all the required information.

This man was writing to the Director of Manpower, and he was writing directly to the then minister of manpower (Mr. Andras), and this is the reply that he received:

Mr. Robert Andras, Minister of Manpower and Immigration, has asked me to reply to your letter. I am sure that you will understand that it is your own Canada Manpower Centre which is in the best position to help you. It is only at CMC that you will find people able to advise and help you.

The letter closes in saying:

I strongly advise you to remain in close contact with your Canada Manpower Centre in Rivière-du-Loup. The Manager has assured me that he and his staff will do everything possible to help you, and I hope that their efforts will soon bring positive results.

He was in regular contact with the people of the Rivière-du-Loup-Montmagny-Cabano Manpower Centre.

Here is another letter. This again was written in the hope of getting work in the James Bay area. The reply was as follows:

You can rest assured, sir, that we are giving very particular attention to your case and that we shall communicate with you as soon as a position that could interest you becomes open.

This letter was signed by Yvon Bergeron, Recruiting Coordinator for the James Bay Development.

I have another one here which has been sent directly by the Department of Labour in Ottawa and it is signed by an executive assistant. That man wanted to work at the James Bay project, in Labrador or any other place, he had no definite choice. He was readily available. He was prepared to go any place in this country to find a job. Here is the answer:

As this subject is under the responsibility of the Minister of Labour and Immigration, the Hon. Robert Andras. I took the initiative of forwarding your letter to his office so it will receive appropriate attention. I am convinced that they will communicate with you within a short time.

[Mr. Dionne (Kamouraska).]

I have here another answer from Mr. Boucher, manpower consultant. That letter has been sent from Rivière-du-Loup and it says:

However we will keep your request in our records and communicate with you if we hear of a suitable job opportunity . . .

● (1520)

I could read you similar letters for 20 minutes. I will not do it because I have many other things to tell you today. But I wanted to give you an idea about this matter, which I would call the job seeking nonsense at times when there is no employment or almost none in the area. Why compel the unemployed to spend money on taxis when he does not even have enough to begin with, just so he can get a written statement from an employer he has visited? That does not make any sense. Does Bill C-27 now being debated contain clauses with a view to preventing that kind of nonsense? The administrators of the unemployment insurance have no such guidelines, so it is a free-for-all.

I understand that and I will not criticize the civil servant of my region or any other for that matter. I have letters from just about everywhere. I have read some from the Bay of Chaleurs. I have one sent from Manitoba by a young woman, originally from Kamouraska. She was not entitled to unemployment insurance benefits because she had left her job as a secretary for the Department of National Health in an area where there was a lot of work, to find employment in Manitoba, where it was said that work was not easily available. They did not want to pay. Yet they ended up paying and on top of that the computer which usually gives so much trouble to the unemployed had been helpful to this young woman in this instance because the commission has paid the weekly reports that had been submitted. The commission had granted her a period of 15 weeks for rehabilitation and all the reports she had submitted had been requested after the amounts were paid, but she never paid it because she had no reason to do so.

I contacted the Unemployment Insurance Commission in Manitoba and all the correspondence had been written in English. They did not want it to be brought up before a board of referees because the director, a certain Mr. Boult from Edmonton, had acknowledged that he would have to admit he had corresponded in English, a thing for which he apologized, by the way. So you have an example of what happens. And that in my opinion, is taking place all across Canada.

I am well aware of the problems of the area covered by the offices of Lévis, Rivière-du-Loup and Quebec City.

It happens very often that I have business there, on behalf of employees in the Portneuf area or elsewhere. I have an illustration here. I will not mention the name, because I am somewhat sorry for the gentleman. I am told he is ineligible. He is rather old, and he lived in Tourville, Ste. Perpétue, St. Pamphile. Those are the three villages around his home. I am told he is ineligible for an indefinite period starting from October 31, because it has been established he was not ready and available for work. We have hundreds of those letters.

I have here four workers in my area of Mont-Carmel, Messrs. Roland Drapeau, Jacques Desjardins, René Lévesque, Serge Lévesque, and also Maurice Gagnon. The commission wanted them to go to the north shore, even though they live in Mont-Carmel. They had worked on the north shore before, where they had paid contributions. Circumstances are favourable sometimes to go to the north shore, so they had done so as I did myself when I was a lumberjack. So those five workers made the trip, only to find there were five feet of snow. So they all came back. The money was spent for nothing. It happened, although I am not saying it does too often. Sometimes the bureaucrats have a better understanding of their responsibilities.

We see the results of inquiries, the way they are done. I know some inspectors. They tell me they are paid to do exactly that, and if they don't they can be fired. So they ask all sorts of questions of the unemployed, who don't know much about the statute. They try to trap them. It is an easy job for anybody who is very familiar or simply conversant with that unstraightforward act. There are a lot of ways to get answers under which the assumption can be made that things may have happened in such and such a way. So the inspector helped inflict setbacks. I have the report here. It is astounding indeed to see what happens. It is another way of telling people that all this in the act, which is too complicated.

Some ministers have already told me that they will try to streamline this complex legislation, which is even worse than the one before us. I wonder how this will be possible because there will be tremendous delays and thousands of workers will suffer as a result of a poorly worded legislation. For instance, when they run out of arguments and because there is a mistake in his weekly reports, the unemployed will be told that his claim is in a dormant file—since we do have dormant files, and I believe many public servants are in a dormant state as well, which is unfortunate, because the unemployed, who live at the end of the row in some concession or whatever, right in the middle of a village but several miles away from the Commission's office, have no other income. Some of them are married and have two or three dependents for whom they must provide food and shelter. They are going to get all kinds of silly answers, such as dormant files, technical mistakes, such or such incident which occurred in the payment centre in Montreal.

We have already requested on several occasions—and I was not the only one to make that request—that payments be made through district offices, which would be possible, I believe, and it would be more convenient for those people who are living not too far from the office. However, everything is centralized in Montreal, because—and I will have the opportunity to deal with this subject later—in the back of their minds some people figured that this centralization at the same time would allow officers of National Revenue to deduct the amount of tax deemed deductible so as to better control, later on, the matter of insurability, employment opportunities and so on. They have available numbers and addresses—but I shall deal with the matter later on.

Here is another case of administrative difficulty, that of Mr. Martin of Rivière-Ouelle. His weekly reports came in late, his parents forwarded them to him in Alma, where he had gone to find employment near Lac Saint-Jean. From there, Mr. Martin sent them back to the commission. When commission officers received the reports from Alma, they managed to bungle things. They sent a letter to the claimant asking him to account for the periods he had been away from his area, instead of paying him then what was due to him; there was a delay of one month and a half in the payment of his benefits.

Now, I wonder, why complicate life for people like that.

A further example of confusion: a benefit period established from October 13, 1976, ineligibility from November 20, ineligibility ended on November 29. Now what happens? They realize that the claimant is ineligible on November 20 and on November 29, they say that he is no longer ineligible. Why not take the time to look into the matter before making such decisions?

I have here a letter which I found rather amusing and I would like to read part of it into *Hansard*. A lady is writing to me because she cannot obtain the information she wants. You can judge by yourself. She writes: I inquired at the Rivière-du-Loup office and they replied the first time that the postal strike had delayed the mail. The second time it was the storm. The third time it was the Christmas holiday, and yesterday the New Year's holiday. I am getting impatient, I am entitled to my unemployment insurance. I paid my contributions and I want my benefits. I was going to see a lawyer when someone advised me to write to you.

That is why I have this letter before me now. I understand the problem was finally resolved, but the lady had to wait far too long. It does not make sense to have a claimant wait so long for benefits she is entitled to. According to some officials, the unemployed should listen to the radio and look for job opportunities in papers. If the unemployed moves, there is a penalty, he has to pay for the moving. As you can see, the unemployed pay themselves for the operation of unemployment offices. And in addition to mistakes and delays, some officials have the gall to try and make them pay twice.

● (1530)

And that is not difficult to prove: I am going to do just that right now. The unemployed are stricken by the hundreds from the rolls of the unemployment insurance offices for all sorts of insignificant reasons which result from the administration of unduly complicated legislation and regulations which in no way meet the needs of a great many of the unemployed who are faced with the problem of an extended period of unemployment.

I have hundreds of examples of unemployed people who are the victims of red tape, because the legislation and regulations have been drafted by officials who have never been unemployed or faced with the difficulties of unemployment. I am going to tell you the various ways these guys are taken advantage of: Insurable employment. Let us consider this for a while and see what happens. A person is working in a plant.

The owner of the plant keeps part of his salary as dues to the various plans, whether it be unemployment insurance premiums, income tax, the Quebec Pension Plan, and just about everything which is deducted from pay cheques nowadays. Then, when things slow down in the industry, a number of people are laid off and compelled to apply for unemployment insurance benefits. The Unemployment Insurance Commission pays during three, four, five or six months. But one day the commission sends an inspector—probably more thickheaded than others; in his own way he asks a series of questions to both employer and employees and then the commission decides that those jobs are not insurable. And the workers are told: It is unfortunate but the job you had was not insurable. The income tax people then inform them of their decision. It does not take long. They are told: Your job is not insurable.

Obviously, they were already paid benefits. Then the Unemployment Insurance Commission claims amounts depending on how long the person was unemployed. What can the person do? Those workers go and see their representatives, a lawyer of the legal assistance office or anyone to find a solution. I have here a case which was submitted to me—I took only one, but I have fifteen, a whole list before me—which I will submit to you. Seven seamstresses were working at home. Why were they working at home? It is easy to understand and the judge of the federal court understood very quickly. It was because the owner had set up a sewing shop employing around fifteen persons. It was an old house he had converted into a shop. There was enough room for five or six women to work there. So he had divided the job between those women who wanted to work at home.

It was a kind of production line: one woman would make shirt sleeves, another one the front and a third one the back; then all these pieces were sent to the manufacturer to be assembled. So, various claims up to $1,500 were made to the commission regarding these claimants, dating back to 1974. It took three years before we were able to bring this case before the Federal court. Fortunately we were able to meet the former ombudsman, Justice Marceau, who understood very quickly what the situation was. I have the decision here. The Crown attorney tried to explain that these positions were not of the kind that could be covered by unemployment insurance, using a lot of previous decisions to prove his point. The employer was there. What happened then? First, the women who were working at home have been incessantly bothered by UIC officials asking them to reimburse benefits that, according to them, had been overpaid.

Moreover, one of these women—I could name her, for I have her name here—had worked for another employer and when she became unemployed again, she submitted a claim to the UIC, but with the benefits she was once more entitled to get the UIC officials tried to reimburse what they considered as overpayment for 1974.

From 1974 to 1977 those employees went on working, but they stopped paying unemployment insurance contributions and their employer said: I am looking forward to the day when this case will be settled. A good many employers could have deducted unemployment insurance contributions, and the court case heard on March 24 finally put an end to all this nonsense. I have heard of 20 or 22 similar cases. In Rivière-du-Loup, on May 20 I believe, a Monday anyway, I was before the judge at the federal court and I met the former minister of public works, Mr. Justice Dubé, who is a federal court judge and whom I was very pleased to meet. There were two cases: one was about a man who had worked during the summer for his father, harvesting and doing farm work. His father was a lumber dealer, selling and transporting lumber. It was perfectly insurable employment, but the commission blocked it all. There was another worker from Saint-Jean-de-Dieu, not from my riding this time, but it often happens that people from another riding close to mine tell me about their problems. In that case, the employment was not insurable. He was a carpenter who was repairing the house of a farmer, a very ordinary house as all farmers have in our country, but this was not an insurable employment. Four weeks of non-insurable work, while he had already a number of insurable weeks, but as he was three weeks short these four weeks were not insurable and he was not eligible for benefits.

There are all kinds of tricks, all kinds of gimmicks, as I said earlier, and I could show you that very few unemployed people cheat. Of course there is the odd one because our legislation is full of loopholes, but most cheaters in the entire administration of the unemployment insurance are not those people. If they exist it is because the law has many gaps and allows bureaucrats to withhold benefits which are payable to unemployed people in a fix. It is the way I see our law and I challenge anyone to tell me otherwise because I can support my views with plenty of evidence I can produce any time to show that it is the way things happen.

I know another case which will show you the deficiency of this legislation. I know a man who has worked for 15 years for the same employer and who still works at the same place. Nevertheless, in 1975 he was told that his job was not insurable. He operates a tree-harvester in the bush. We went though a lot of proceedings. It is now in court and I do not know when the hearing will take place, but they seem to be a little faster these days. I was told once they were short of staff, but I suppose that with the very high rate of unemployment in Canada, there are also some unemployed professionals. They have hired some additional staff, because it seems to go a little faster now. That man had been working for 15 years at the same job which had always been considered insurable. In 1975, he made his application as usual. In winter time he is unemployed, as he is a bushworker. After the New Year, there is a period when there is not much to do in the bush, so he lives on unemployment benefits. After a while he was told: This job is not insurable. Then the income tax officials came into this. They like to protect the funds, everybody knows them, they try to get as much as they can, so the job was not insurable. The Commission asked for a refund for excess payment. The man said: I cannot pay that; I am unemployed. When I am working again, I will attend to that. He told me about it. I contended to the Commission that it was an insurable job. Then they went

through the red tape as slowly as ever. The following year, he took the same job, with the same employer. I have all the information here in front of me. We will have a good laugh in the federal court. The following year he submitted his application, the Commission officials accepted it and paid the benefits. They paid, but they paid in a funny way. They declared he was eligible for benefits, but they withheld the cheques he was entitled to, for the refund of the excess payment they had made the preceding year. Have you ever heard of such inconsistency? I have at hand a letter from the Minister of National Revenue (Miss Begin). We wrote the minister to find out if those jobs were insurable or not. This is her answer, I have it here. I have sent it to them in Rivière-du-Loup. I brought it recently to the attention of the umpire's registrar but they keep collecting though. The amount has been decreased a little: they collected $1 a week for three months. Imagine! How foolish it is, for the principle's sake, to collect from him $1 a week when there is still $570 to collect; they will not collect it because they do not have the right to do so. Then they will have to give him back what has been collected, that is for sure.

● (1540)

Here is what the Minister of National Revenue wrote on April 29:

I thank you for your letter dated February 26, which has been referred to me by the President of the Unemployment Insurance Commission. The interest you are showing for the insurability problem of the workers specialized in logging operations is appreciated. Interpretations have been issued by some employers in 1976 to the effect that tree harvester operators did not have an insurable job because they were not hired under a hiring contract as required by Section 3 of the Unemployment Insurance Act. However, having considered additional information subsequently provided by these firms, my officials reversed their previous interpretations. As a result, the Unemployment Insurance Commission has been advised of this new decision, and I am confident that these workers will recover their entitlement in a very near future. I hope that this information will enable you to give a satisfactory answer to your constituents, and I regret any inconvenience they had to bear.

Just imagine! The Commission guys keep trying to collect from my man here, Charles-Emile Lagacé. They do not understand. They and the income tax people are going to tell me, as I said on the phone this week, that this is a decision from the minister. Yes. This may mean something but the act is there and civil servants proceed according to the provisions therein. Have you ever heard anything so crazy? The Minister of National Revenue and the bureaucrats under his authority admitted themselves they had made an error of interpretation and that everything would soon be corrected, but it has not been yet.

What does Bill C-27 provide to correct such nonsense? Nothing. That is why I am against it. And I am even very surprised that there are not more opponents. I commend my friends of the NDP who seem to grasp the situation and are making tremendous efforts to persuade the government that this bill should be modified. But I am surprised indeed that there are so few others like them. I guess this can be attributed to the general desire for our summer recess. Indeed, some are dying for a vacation, but that does not mean we must let a bill through that is going to do so much harm to a great number of unemployed workers.

I have here another case. It is about a 63 years old fellow. I know him very well. He had the misfortune to be ill and after undergoing the necessary treatment, he submitted a claim for sickness benefits. He received his 15 weeks allowances. And after he had recovered, he applied for regular benefits. He was told that he needed a medical certificate stating that he had actually recovered. Therefore, he went to see his doctor. Doctors are getting tired of filling in all these Commission's forms.

If you were aware of some of the telephone conversations a doctor back home has had with an employee of the commission, you would be surprised, because there are all kinds of requirements. One would have to write whole pages to say such things as: Yes, the man was sick, but now he feels better and could do light work. He could go to work. The doctor would have to say that. Then, though it does not make much sense, I always advise the man to get a doctor's certificate. He has one. I have it here, in front of me and I quote from it: I hereby declare that Mr. Castonguay has been fit for work since January 20, 1977. But there again, his own doctor is speaking. For crying out loud, why be picayune about that too? That is not enough, you have to see an independent doctor. And so the correspondence starts all over again. It takes an awful lot of time. The odd storm comes up too, once in a while. Finally, the man goes to Montmagny. Saint-Pamphile is quite a distance from Montmagny. So, he sees a doctor there. This doctor sends his certificate to the Commission, but by now it is March 21. During the whole period from January to March 21, he has not been eligible because someone did not trust the certificate he had obtained from his own doctor.

Let us see what the board of referees say about the procedure. That is why legal aid lawyers were insisting so much and so rightly saying that boards of referees should be made up of competent people who know what the law is about, people who can determine with a sound judgment whether a claimant is in his right or not. I often go to the board of referees. It is a place I find very funny—always unanimity, never any dissension. Those guys sure get along fine.

I note from the reaction of the labour representative that he seems to agree with what they tell him because that makes a lot of sense but the decision is always unanimous. Fortunately, decisions are overruled but sometimes I note they are not and I find it quite strange that there should not be any dissension. It is so easy. I personally sat eight years on UIC boards of referees and when I found that the chairman or the management representative was going too far, then I would record my dissent. That allowed the unemployed or his representative to

go before the umpire without asking for the permission of the chairman of the board.

Just imagine! When the decision is unanimous you have to ask the chairman of the board of referees for permission to get a new hearing or go before the referee. That does not make sense. The chairman of the board of referees just made a decision after eight or ten days and he is told that his decision is no good, they want permission to appeal. He always says no. He does not say so himself but he has an official of the Commission say it for him. So that is the result of the red tape from legislation that gives trouble to unemployed workers.

About the individual I was talking about earlier let us see what the members of the board of referees say: In this case, the availability of the claimant—and this is not happening in Rivière-du-Loup but in Lévis—is related to the recovery from an illness he had in the fall of 1976. The claimant's file is all mixed up, according to the claimant, his doctor, the examining doctor from the Commission and another doctor mentioned in the file. The availability of the claimant is really related to the medical evidence given in the file. But today, the claimant says that he was admitted to the Hôtel-Dieu Hospital in Lévis. This is true. He was sick for 15 weeks.

While confined there, he was told that he could go back to work in December 1976. In fact, he felt well enough to work in December 1976, but his regular doctor, to be sure that he was all right, told him to wait until January 20. The claimant says that he was examined at Laval Hospital and that he again saw his regular doctor in January and that he saw Dr. Mignault in December, January and February. But our files show very little result from all these meetings with the claimant's doctor. Consequently, the board of referees upheld the decision of the commission.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Order, please. I regret to interrupt the hon. member, but I must inform him that his time has expired. Nevertheless, he may go on with the unanimous consent of the House.

Some hon. Members: No.

[*English*]

Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North): Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the motion to give this bill a six-months' hoist because I believe that the premise of the bill is wrong. It has one obvious purpose—to reduce the number of people entitled to draw unemployment insurance benefits. That would save the Government of Canada a very substantial amount of money, but at the expense of the individual and of the municipalities that will have to bear the cost of welfare support for many of the people who will cease to draw unemployment insurance benefits.

One has to assume that the government has brought this bill forward because it believes there are substantial numbers of the over 900,000 people unemployed who could find jobs but simply do not want to work. There cannot be any other reason for this bill. I cannot believe that even this Liberal government would be so cruel as to want to take people off unemployment insurance benefits who are willing and able to work but who simply cannot find work because jobs are not available. An examination of the government's own statistics quickly shows that assumption to be false.

In May over 900,000 people were unemployed, according to the figures produced by Statistics Canada. We all know that a large number of people are out of work who are not included in this figure—people who have given up trying to find work because they know jobs are not available for their skills, or because they live in slow growth areas. According to Statistics Canada, in the month of May there were 35,300 job vacancies in Canada. That means that if every job was filled on the day the figures were taken, there would still be close to 900,000 people unemployed. The percentage of vacancies compared to the number of people unemployed is 4 per cent. In other words, for every 100 unemployed persons, only four jobs were available.

I might be able to understand the logic of introducing this bill if this high unemployment were a sudden phenomenon. And the government cannot claim it is introducing this bill because the unemployment insurance system was not meeting the needs of the people. If it makes such claims, they are not true.

● (1550)

The incidence of unemployment has been rising in the last few years. I shall not quote figures of the last two years, but I shall put on record figures relating to a few months in 1977. According to Statistics Canada, there were 932,000 unemployed in Canada in February, 1977, as compared with 800,000 unemployed in February, 1976; or seasonally adjusted, 7.9 per cent of the labour force was unemployed in February, 1977, as compared with 7 per cent in February, 1976. In Quebec, a province to which members have devoted considerable attention these past few months, there were 303,000 unemployed in February, 1977, as compared with 225,000 in February, 1976, almost 50,000 more people being unemployed this year. Is it any wonder a substantial proportion of people in Quebec have lost enthusiasm for Confederation, for one Canada? Instead of concentrating on bilingualism and language, as the government has done recently, it would be better advised to solve the problems of the economy.

The *Globe and Mail* of March 16, 1977, reported as follows:

> The official number looking for work totalled a record 932,000 last month, according to Statistics Canada, raising the seasonally adjusted rate to 7.9 per cent. If other jobless who had not looked for work in the previous four weeks are included, the actual total of unemployed in Canada was well over a million.
>
> Responding to criticism in the Commons, Finance Minister Donald Macdonald said the unemployed would receive 'substantial attention' in the budget planned for March 31.
>
> And Manpower Minister J.S.G. Cullen told the opposition parties that it was no answer 'to react in panic' to the situation, especially since employment was still rising and the government has already announced make-work programs.

Speaking of work programs, I told the House the other night that the constituency of Winnipeg North Centre had received the grand total of $100,000 this year for Canada Works, as compared with $939,000 it received last year in LIP grants.

Next I shall quote part of George Radwanski's column in the *Financial Times* of March 28, 1977, entitled, "Unemployment: A Bungled Job." Mr. Radwanski, whose column I read regularly, is not one of the government's bitter opponents. On the whole he is kindly disposed to it, but he said this in his column:

It is simply not true that the jobs are there to be had, if only the unemployed weren't too lazy to pursue them. For 932,000 unemployed, Statistics Canada listed only 37,800 full-time job vacancies. For at least 894,200 Canadians, in other words, all the zeal in the world couldn't produce a steady job.

This carries a number of consequences.

In the first place, it violates one of the most basic objectives of a free, prosperous society: To give every willing citizen the opportunity to pursue gainful employment commensurate with his abilities. Without that opportunity, many other freedoms mean little. When unemployment becomes widespread and chronic, the whole system is working badly.

Secondly, unemployment exacts a heavy social cost. When people are involuntarily cut off from the job market, their self-esteem diminishes, their sense of alienation from society steadily increases and at a certain point they simply stop trying, creating a lasting pattern of non-productivity and dependency.

I hope the Secretary of State (Mr. Roberts) is listening, for he is supposed to be concerned about national unity. I wanted to put Mr. Radwanski's thoughts on record, because they echo mine and I have been accused of speaking them for partisan, political reasons. Mr. Radwanski went on to say:

There is also a risk of serious political consequences. Unemployment is becoming particularly serious among the young, with the seasonally-adjusted rate in the 15 to 24 age group now running at 14.4 per cent; this is the age group, of course, that can most easily become radicalized and alienated. The problem has special dimensions in Quebec, where the youth unemployment rate stands at 16 per cent. That can make pro-Confederation arguments sound rather unconvincing to young Quebecers, and contribute to the volatility of the situation.

Despite these hazards, present levels of unemployment are no unforeseen accident.

Mr. Radwanski analyses carefully—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Order, please. It being four o'clock, the House will now proceed to the consideration of private members' business as listed on today's order paper, namely, notices of motions, public bills, and private bills.

* * *

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could rise on a point of order to inform hon. members, before the House proceeds with private members' business, that the government proposes to call order No. 51 on Monday, the amendments to the criminal law.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' PUBLIC BILLS

[*English*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Order, please. Order No. 15, in the name of the hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Beaudoin).

An hon. Member: Stand.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Shall it stand at the request of the government?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Order No. 16, in the name of the hon. member for Davenport (Mr. Caccia).

An hon. Member: Stand.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Shall it stand at the request of the government?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Order No. 18, in the name of the hon. member for Hastings (Mr. Ellis).

An hon. Member: Stand.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Shall the order stand at the request of the government?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Order No. 19, standing in the name of the hon. member for Waterloo-Cambridge (Mr. Saltsman). Shall the order stand at the request of the government?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Milne: Mr. Speaker, if I may rise on a point of order, I think there is general agreement to proceed with Bill C-229, and to limit the length of speeches. I understand several hon. members wish to participate in the debate.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Is it agreed that all orders prior to order No. 29 under private members' public bills shall be stood at the request of the government?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): And that the length of speeches shall be limited to ten minutes, in accordance with the wish brought to my attention earlier?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): It is so ordered.

* * *

BROADCASTING ACT

AMENDMENT TO PROVIDE GUIDELINES RESPECTING THE PORTRAYAL OF SEX AND VIOLENCE

Mr. James A. McGrath (St. John's East) moved that Bill C-229, to amend the Broadcasting Act, (guidelines respecting portrayal of sex and violence), be read the second time and

referred to the Standing Committee on Broadcasting, Films and Assistance to the Arts.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I am sorry to say this bill, which I had hoped would form a vehicle for debate and be referred to the committee for discussion and examination of the evidence, is to be talked out. I have learned that through the usual channels, and in saying that I do not reflect on any members of the House. I do not wish to reflect on the parliamentary secretary, who is doing his job, or on any member who may contribute to the debate; but as a legislator and parent I regret that this matter will not be seized of the attention of the Parliament of Canada, the only legislature in this country with jurisdiction in this area, and I say this despite actions taken by other jurisdictions. I think particularly of the LaMarsh commission which the government of Ontario set up and which recently brought down its report.

● (1600)

It is not my bill that is important, it is the subject matter that is important. My bill is merely a vehicle to get this matter before the attention of the House and, I hope, before the attention of the committee.

On June 14 I wrote to the Minister of Communications (Mrs. Sauvé), bringing to her attention the fact that the LaMarsh commission would be reporting and that my bill would be coming up for debate on this date. I stated that I had asked the government to postpone debate earlier because the minister was out of the country. I felt it would not be fair to her or this important bill if it came before the House while she was away. Obviously she then would not be in a position to have any input into it whatsoever. In my letter of June 14, which has not been acknowledged, I said and I quote:

I would like to point out that the bill was merely intended as a vehicle for debate and a means of providing the House with a reference so that the Broadcasting committee could look into this whole area. This, of course, is especially relevant in the light of the LaMarsh commission findings and my purpose in writing this letter is to ask your co-operation in allowing the subject matter of the bill to be referred to the Broadcasting committee so that parliament will have an opportunity to go into the findings of the LaMarsh commission, examine your own position in this regard and generally to call for witnesses so that a determination can be made by the committee as to just what action would be appropriate for the federal government to follow in this rather controversial issue . . .

As you know, the Canadian Federation of Women's Institutes, the Canadian Federation of Home and School Parent-Teacher Federations, the Canadian School Trustees Association and latterly, the National Council of Women representing over 750,000 Canadian women have all passed resolutions supporting the principle of my bill.

That is the end of the quotation from the letter. To set the perspective or the tone of the debate, perhaps I could give a brief history of what has brought us to this point today. In 1972 the Surgeon General of the United States, having been commissioned by the Congress of the United States, as a result of the findings of Senator Pastore and his Senate Committee, issued a report after a two-year study. In that report it is stated, and I quote:

The overwhelming consensus and the unanimous Scientific Advisory Committee's report indicate that televised violence indeed does have an adverse effect on certain members of our society . . . It is clear to me that the causal relationship between televised violence and antisocial behaviour is sufficient to warrant appropriate and immediate remedial action . . . There comes a time when the data are sufficient to justify action. That time has come.

That was the Surgeon General of the United States in 1972. On February 26, 1975, I introduced this bill into the House, prompted by the findings of the Surgeon General of the United States and my own concern as a parent.

Following that, the then solicitor general, now the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development (Mr. Allmand), being the responsible and socially minded minister that he is, conducted his own study. In fact he made a point of going to the United States and speaking to the Surgeon General's people and Senator Pastore. He returned convinced that there was a relationship between the increase in violent crime in Canada and violence over television. Indeed he went so far as to say on November 17, 1975, as reported at page 9110 of *Hansard*, in reply to my question, and I quote:

Mr. Speaker, we have had consultations with the CRTC and the Department of the Secretary of State on this matter and it is still under study. We may have more to say when the Minister of Justice and myself announce our package on violent crime before the end of the year.

That is how concerned the minister was. He wanted a provision in the bill on violent crime, the so-called law and order bill. That is the last we heard from the government on this matter.

The next event to transpire was the CRTC, as a result of my speeches across the country and the concern that was and still is growing from every source, especially parents, sponsored a symposium in August, 1975, at Queen's University, in which I had the honour to participate. The evidence is in the report of the symposium.

Finally there was the LaMarsh commission which was set up by the government of Ontario. It reflected the concern of that government, and the inability of the Government of Canada, the government which has sole jurisdiction to act. That commission immediately set up public hearings across the province of Ontario. I had the honour of presenting the first brief. The findings of the commission are clear, unambiguous, precise, and definite as can be. It said this:

The Commission was to determine if there is any connection or a cause-and-effect relationship between this phenomenon and the incidence of violent crime in society.

The phenomenon is television violence.

The short answer is yes.

That is a direct quote from the report of the LaMarsh commission. More evidence has very recently come to light. It is from the American Medical Association. I am sure one of our learned colleagues from the medical profession will probably participate in this debate. Referring to a poll taken by doctors of the AMA they stated, and I quote:

According to the poll, doctors said heightened aggression in children, nightmares, epileptic seizures and injuries resulting from imitating TV incidents are among problems that may stem from video violence.

That is a direct quotation from the American Medical Association on June 20, 1977.

I appeal to hon. members to allow the subject matter to go to committee so that the committee can examine the LaMarsh commission and our own medical association, and all the evidence.

My final word is from Dr. Robert Liebert who is recognized as the distinguished authority in this area. He is of Columbia University, New York. He was the principal consultant for the United States Surgeon General. When he appeared at the symposium sponsored by the CRTC he said, and I quote:

". . . the cumulative effect on children of violent television programming is like the planting of a bomb that might explode within 10 or 20 years. Every murder or violent act a child witnesses on TV," he said, "is like a small, even a miniscule weight placed on the balance."

We are playing with fire. Every day we lose is vital time lost. I again appeal to the House to allow the subject matter of my bill to go to committee. I do not want to have it on my conscience if this bill is talked out. That will be the invidious position of the last member who participates in this debate if he or she agrees to talk out this bill just to satisfy the pique of the Minister of Communications who has failed to provide leadership in this very important area.

Mr. Maurice Harquail (Restigouche): Mr. Speaker, I feel it is important for members to avail themselves of the opportunity to participate in the debate on such an important subject matter as that before us this afternoon in Bill C-229. Before I get underway with my remarks, I wish to read the contents of the recommended change to the Broadcasting Act:

The Broadcasting Act is amended by adding immediately after section 47 thereof, the following:

● (1610)

48. (1) Notwithstanding anything contained in this Act, the Commission shall by regulation establish guidelines respecting the portrayal of sex and violence during the broadcast of a program.

(2) No licensee shall broadcast a program portraying sex and violence contrary to the guidelines.

First of all I want to congratulate the hon. member for St. John's East (Mr. McGrath) on his tenacity. We know that for many months, indeed for many years, he has given of his time in an attempt to assist the community by ridding us of this problem, the abuses we see from time to time committed by the electronic media.

I received a communication from the hon. member recently in which he mentioned that the National Council of Women, the Canadian School Trustees' Association, the Canadian Home and School and Parent-Teacher Federation and the Canadian Federation of Women's Institutes have all gone on record as national organizations in support of the bill. I should also like to take this opportunity to say that during the period I spent in municipal government I sponsored a resolution from the Canadian Federation of Mayors and Municipalities to the same effect.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): I remember that.

Mr. Harquail: I am sorry to report to the House that this was about seven years ago and that the Canadian Federation of Mayors and Municipalities has not taken the action I hoped it would. We know, now, what the results have been. Therefore when I learned of Bill C-229, I felt that since I had not experienced very much success in the small way of my contribution through the CFMM, I might take the opportunity this afternoon to support the hon. member's bill.

Turning now to the subject matter, I have some information I would like to put on record. According to Statistics Canada, 97 per cent of Canadian homes have one or more television set, and according to the Nielsen TV Index, pre-school children aged from three to five who are at home watch TV for an average of 54 hours each week, or approximately 64 per cent of their waking hours. By the time a child is five and reaches kindergarten he has spent more time watching television than a liberal arts student spends in the classroom throughout his four years in university.

The National Commission on Crime and Violence reports that American children and young people spend from one quarter to one half of their waking hours watching television, with only sleep consuming more of their time. By the time a child is 14 he has watched the violent assault or destruction of nearly 18,000 human beings on television. During an average year, an older child attends school for 980 hours and watches TV for 1,340 hours, so that by the time he graduates from high school he will spend between 11,000 and 12,000 hours in the classroom and more than 52,000 in front of a TV set.

We all know that figures can be shifted from one side of the picture to the other according to what side of the argument one prefers. That is not my purpose this afternoon. But I believe there is sufficient evidence to support the argument that there is abuse and blatant negligence—I guess that would be the word—on the part of some producers who seem to have been given carte blanche, wide open authority with huge budgets, to take us into an area into which I am satisfied and convinced the majority of Canadians do not want to go. When I think of the non-action of the CRTC and the negligence of the CBC in allowing this type of trash—I suppose that is the word—to be put before Canadians, especially young Canadians, I just do not feel that, given the mechanisms we have in Canada both federally and provincially, in this case federally, we should put up with it.

I feel we are in a position to bring in legislation or to give a direction in policy to have this curtailed if not arrested completely. I am not saying we should try to get into people's minds. That is an approach taken by other countries, and one which we all oppose.

I think that in every society people should be allowed to make decisions for themselves. Therefore, even though some people in the adult community might not be capable of watching this type of program I should like to leave it to their decision. Nevertheless, I feel some limitation should be imposed, at least with respect to pre-school children and children up to the age of 14, 15 or even 16, maybe, and that the type of sex and violence portrayed on television ought to be eliminated completely between the early hours of programming, whenever they get under way, 7 a.m. or 8 a.m., until at

least 10 p.m. or 11 p.m. I feel there is an onus upon parents to see that children have retired by that time, and if there are adult people who wish to watch this type of program after the evening news, that is a decision for them to make. But a child might see in 30 minutes as much violence as most adults experience in a lifetime. It is easy for young minds to understand, because it is vivid and graphic, and above all it is cruel and is presented as a way of life. This leads me to say that no one is safe, adult or child, from the rising level of television-stimulated violence in our society.

Those of us who are careful and diligent enough, and conscientious enough, to regulate our children's television fare carefully and hence protect them from a great deal of violence, could very well find our children victimes of violent young people whose parents are, indeed, not so conscientious and who abdicate this important aspect of parental responsibility. So in that regard no one is safe.

Not surprisingly, the introduction of television after the Second World War brought with it a controversy that closely resembled the previous discussions on radio, films and pulp fiction. This debate started in the United States in the early 1950's and grew increasingly animated throughout the next two decades. During that time, the Americans produced no less than four major government reports, dealing directly or indirectly with the subject of violence on television. These included the Kefauver Inquiry of 1954 on Juvenile Delinquency, the Dodd Surveys of 1961 and 1964, the Mass Media Task Force of the National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence of 1969, and the Report of the Surgeon-General on Television and Social Behaviour in 1972. Without fail, all of these documents concluded that there was too much violence on television.

Then, of course, the consensus of the research community is that the more people watch portrayals of violence on television the more likely they are to engage in aggressive behaviour. This applies especially to children. In this context, the term "aggressive behaviour" refers to acts ranging in severity from verbal abuse to criminal violence, and is best understood—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Order. I must interrupt the hon. member to tell him the time allotted to him has expired.

Mr. Walter Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to take part in this debate in support of my hon. friend from St. John's East with a special feeling of pleasure and pride at being able to support in this Chamber the work of one I regard as the leader in this Chamber—there are others who participated—in advocating a form of regulation of sex and violence in public broadcasting. The hon. member for St. John's East (Mr. McGrath) is known for many things, not least of which is his eloquence, a quality which was displayed so well yesterday in the debate on national unity. He has a tremendous feeling for the atmosphere in which his children, and the children of others, can best grow.

[Mr. Harquail.]

● (1620)

I listened with interest to the hon. member for Restigouche (Mr. Harquail). I recall his work with the Canadian Association of Mayors and Municipalities. What the hon. member for St. John's East is trying to do by this bill is something which parents in Canada would like to see this parliament act upon, and act upon with despatch. I am very much discouraged by the intimation of the hon. member for St. John's East that the bill, which is meant to establish guidelines respecting the portrayal of sex and violence through the broadcasting programs, is not likely to receive second reading and referral to a committee. I say that especially in view of the tremendous amount of evidence that there is a damaging quality to the impressionable minds of children of tender years by what can be seen on the television screen.

I would hope that no one would interpret this bill as an act of censorship; it certainly is not that. But it is a bill which is intended to allow a body duly authorized by this parliament to establish guidelines. It is an attempt to allow evidence to be heard in order to establish some reasonable middle ground in terms of the obstruction of one's right to view what one wants, on the one hand, and the untrammelled right to view, on the other.

I do not think there is any doubt at all that the age of a person or child governs the impression that is made, whether for good or for evil. I think it is exceedingly important for us to remember that. While only the unbalanced might be affected by portrayals of sex or violence on television, if those unbalanced individuals are adults, there is sufficient evidence for us to be concerned about the effect of the portrayal of sex or violence on television on people of tender years—evidence enough that this parliament should act. It should not act willy-nilly, to stand upon rights or to obliterate rights; it should act to establish a way by which we can assure that, after sufficient public hearings, this industry, self-regulating though it says it tries to be, is in fact regulated in a reasonable but certain way for the public good.

I hope this bill will be acceptable to the House because it comes from the foundation of the hon. member's social conscience. In his general work in this area over a number of years he has been a leader, not just in this place but also perhaps in the country.

The other point about sex and violence on television and its impression on children of tender years is that it can give them nightmares. I have seen it in my own children and in children's friends. They told me about these things. It is not always a lasting condition, but it can be a hurtful one. It is certainly not a healthy one. That is the least that can be said for that kind of impression. But in terms of sex and one's value of life, it does lead to distortions at an age when impressions are made. From that point of view this parliament should at least be given the opportunity to discuss in some meaningful way the proposition of guidelines, and a debate is not the place to do that. Here we talk about general propositions. We have no opportunity to discuss and to view the evidence, and I think we should, as parliamentarians, at least have that opportunity.

The hon. member for St. John's East has indicated that the bill as such cannot go to a committee where it can be scrutinized. In view of its importance, I believe that the subject matter of the bill should go to committee where it can be scrutinized and the evidence heard.

I speak now personally and sincerely as a private member of this House, not as House leader of Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition. This bill should go to a place where evidence, expert and lay, of parents and others, can be examined. May I say that I am profoundly grateful to my hon. friend from Restigouche, who is not a member of my party—which indicates the importance of this piece of legislation—for agreeing to second an amendment to this motion. I therefore move, seconded by the hon. member for Restigouche:

That Bill C-229, an act to amend the Broadcasting Act (guidelines respecting portrayal of sex and violence) be not now read a second time but that it be withdrawn and the order discharged, and the subject matter thereof be referred to the Standing Committee on Broadcasting, Films and Assistance to the Arts.

I move this amendment so that the subject matter of this bill can go to the place in this institution where it can be dealt with in detail. This action has occurred three times previously in the House. It occurred on Bill C-220, the Federal Transport Commission of Inquiry Act. It occurred on Bill C-221 having to do with the Criminal Code and the abduction of children. It happened with respect to Bill C-208, to amend the Criminal Code, which involved the provision of humane trapping equipment for animals—all of them private members' bills. If we owe that duty to animals and to transportation, then I say that we owe it to children as well.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): It is on that basis that I move this amendment.

● (1630)

Mr. Jim Fleming (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Fisheries and the Environment): Mr. Speaker, I shall be very brief. When I was asked to speak in this debate I did not know I would rise at this particular point. I regret that, and I speak most sincerely. When the hon. member for St. John's East (Mr. McGrath) first stood, he made it clear that he understands the responsibilities faced by the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Communications (Mr. Milne), and I do as well.

If I may, I should like to spend approximately three or four minutes making several points. As a member of the Standing Committee on Broadcasting, Films and Assistance to the Arts, and as a vice chairman at one point, I have worked with the hon. member for St. John's East. I have attended meetings which were held in his office. Also, I have viewed material put together by the hon. member which indicated some of the problems that are being created for our young people.

I have some problem with the actual form of the bill, but I believe the hon. member for St. John's East made it clear that that was not the essence of what he wanted to talk about, nor why he put it forward. He believes there should be a thorough and thoughtful discussion of this problem. He has felt that for some time, and so have I, as I am sure others have in this House. I support his desire for that discussion. If that discussion is to take place and have proper effect, it must take place here as part of parliament's responsibility and not under some other jurisdiction which does not have those responsibilities.

It is possible to be very philosophical about the pendulum of society and society's mores. If you swing in a certain direction and you go a little too far, then the pendulum swings back. I find myself in something of a dilemma because how can we have too much freedom? You can have too much of what some people may call freedom and deny people what freedom should represent. It should represent a fair and humane society and not a society which twists young minds and misguides them about the society in which they are growing up.

As a journalist for the best part of my adult life before entering parliament, I was against censorship and very much in favour of freedom of information. As the situation regarding pornography has shown us lately, total freedom can lead to very perverse situations—situations which threaten the society we want to improve upon. Sick and perverse material is available now, including youngsters in it, and that material should not be available to juveniles in stores across our country. As well, I believe adults should have total freedom. But when material is available to them which makes them behave in an unnatural and abnormal way, then I believe perhaps that material should not be available to them.

At the very best, we are not sure if there is a direct effect on children. At the very worst, there is a direct effect from sex and violence on television. If that is the case it should be discussed with those who have the power under our laws to regulate the industry. It should be discussed also with those who act under our laws and the people of the country whose children and themselves may be affected by it.

I realize other hon. members wish to speak on this subject, but time is passing and we cannot afford to let the situation continue and wonder why. At the time this bill was introduced in parliament by the hon. member, I was proud to have seconded it. I believe the time is here for us to get down to a thorough and thoughtful consideration. I do not believe in censorship, but we must do something to protect our children and stop what is happening at the moment.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Bruce Halliday (Oxford): Mr. Speaker, orginally I had not intended to speak this afternoon on this bill introduced by the hon. member for St. John's East (Mr. McGrath), but I am impressed by the sincerity which he brings to this debate and the very interesting documentation he has received from the American Medical Association to support the bill. I appreciate the dilemma the parliamentary secretary is in, in not being in a position to allow this bill to come to a vote tonight.

I congratulate my House leader, the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton (Mr. Baker), for having the wisdom to present his amendment which, if it is passed, will allow us to discuss this subject matter in committee.

I am concerned with a government which has the concern of people at heart and yet takes this type of callous attitude toward something as serious as the growth and development of our children. I am reminded of the discussions we have had in this House during the last six months precipitated by the Hon. Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Lalonde) regarding his concern about saccharin. We had good reason to challenge the minister on his unilateral regulation and his control over the use of saccharin, when all he had to go by were some animal experiments with rats. It is disappointing that he would take that kind of information, resulting in discriminatory regulations which preclude us as thinking people from making up our own minds.

However, this situation is similar inasmuch as we have something which has been shown to be more harmful to human beings, particularly children, and we have a government which tells us to forget about it. The government indicated also that it was not going to discuss it. I hope I am exaggerating, and I hope I find today that the government side will recognize this as a very important subject. It should be discussed by the representatives of the people of Canada via a committee of the House of Commons.

The hon. member for St. John's East brought to our attention some very interesting documentation from the American Medical Association which deserves accentuation, to the point where the deliberating body of the American Medical Association is prepared to confirm the risk they see in the violence that has been portrayed on television. Surely we have an obligation, on behalf of the people of Canada, to recognize the decision this body has made. At least we should open up for discussion this subject among ourselves as representatives of the people. I am appalled by government officials who have issued directions to the parliamentary secretary indicating that this is not to be. Hopefully they will reverse their stand shortly and allow this subject matter to come to discussion in committee.

In conclusion, I congratulate the hon. member for St. John's East for bringing this to the attention of the House and the people of Canada. He indicated a concern which he has always expressed in this House for the consumer. It does not matter how that consumer is looked at, whether he is a consumer of food, a consumer of housing, or a consumer of television programming. The government should show equal concern for the consumer and permit the amendment proposed by my House leader to pass, in order for this subject matter to go to the Standing Committee on Broadcasting, Films and Assistance to the Arts.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. F. A. Philbrook (Halton): Mr. Speaker, I should like to offer my congratulations to the hon. member for St. John's East (Mr. McGrath) on his fine contribution. He dealt with matters which are bound to concern all of us, not just as parliamentarians, but as citizens.

[Mr. Halliday.]

I am tired of people speaking of freedom when they should really speak of licence. Exploitation of any kind may not be easy to define, but we must attempt it.

The hon. members who preceded me have examined in some detail the results of scientific research into the effects of televised violence. They did an admirable job in showing how gratuitous and unnecessary depiction of violence can strike at the very core of our social institutions. Those are the ties of affection which naturally bind us to our families, the most important foundation of society, and our fellowman.

● (1640)

I should like to go on and make a few remarks which are rather important to me in relation to this subject. At this point I should like to assure the hon. member for St. John's East that whatever the intention of the House, it would not be my intention to talk out this bill or to defeat this amendment, and I should like to make that very clear right now.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Philbrook: But if the House will bear with me, I should like to make a few remarks which I think are important and bear on this subject. I should like to direct the attention of the House to a very different level of analysis, and examine televised violence, not just as a problem which threatens the individual psyche and social well-being, but also as symptomatic of problems which face the entire broadcasting industry in Canada. These may seem like strong words, but I think that if you will bear with me you will find that they are not altogether inappropriate.

In recent weeks we have heard equally strong words about the relationship of television violence and the state of our broadcasting system from many quarters, particularly from the LaMarsh Commission on violence in the media which recently reported to the government of Ontario, even though the provinces have no jurisdiction over television. It is an unusual situation but still important.

It seems to me that all the critics, however different their conclusions and recommendations, agree on one point: that the problem of violence on television is primarily a problem of the domination of the Canadian airwaves, and more especially of Canadian cable systems, by American programing. American programing is violent and Canadian programing is not—it is as simple as that. One of my colleagues has already cited the statistic that 97 per cent of the violence appearing on Canadian television is of American origin, and less than 3 per cent is natively Canadian. What more striking proof could we want?

But, although much has been heard lately, I should like to remind the House that there is nothing particularly new to be found in the recent spate of criticism of the broadcasting system. Approximately one and a half years ago, in a speech which she delivered in Ottawa, the Minister of Communications (Mrs. Sauvé) stated that:

> If there is a singular problem today, it is the domination of our airwaves and our cable system by American programs.

The minister pointed out that, as a by-product of this domination, the country was being flooded with violent programs that bore no relationship to day to day Canadian realities—and perhaps even less relationship to our historical traditions.

The minister concluded by saying that American domination—and the concomitant violence of programing—is an obvious cultural problem which will only be solved in the long term by developing Canadian alternatives that are attractive to Canadian viewers. This is one of the most important points I should like to make.

I think it is now widely agreed that this will be one of the major challenges to be faced by our broadcasting system—at least in English Canada—in the coming years. Here we could perhaps take a lesson from our French Canadian colleagues. The LaMarsh Commission has presented an elaborate and somewhat revolutionary plan for accomplishing this goal, certainly judging from the reaction it received. The president of the CBC, Mr. Johnson, has recently published his objectives in this regard which call, among other things, for Canadianizing the airwaves, and about time, I say.

If I am correct in stating that there is widespread agreement on the nature of the problems which are facing our broadcasting system, I think I am also correct in stating that there is widespread recognition that there are a number of serious considerations which would stand in the way of any attempt to deal with these problems.

First of all, there is popularity to be considered. Really, how popular is violence? Many would argue that there is considerable popular demand for violent programing, and that shows which feature this type of programing often do quite well in the ratings game. Unfortunately it is not possible to provide a comprehensive assessment of this argument. At the present time the relationship between ratings, popularity, and public attitudes is not well understood. Nevertheless one point should be made. In the first place it is important to note that violent programs are not as overwhelmingly popular as is generally supposed. I think that probably has to be encouraging in terms of the best of what we suspect of human nature.

The spring 1976 Bureau of Broadcast Measurement findings demonstrate that there were no violent programs among the ten most popular shows, and only three in the top twenty. Secondly, even if a violent program achieves a very high rating—say a 20—all that this indicates is that 20 per cent of the population is watching it. If that sounds like a funny statement, let me explain.

Beyond this, it is possible to argue that the ratings of violent programs are artificially inflated, that is, they are packed into prime time. Prime time television is overwhelmingly dominated by violent programing. On most stations, little else is available, and this means that it is often difficult, if not impossible, to switch channels to other less violent programs. Under these circumstances, it would not be surprising if such programing did well in the ratings. To the contrary, it would be surprising it if did not do extremely well. Yet violent programs are not nearly as popular as non-violent programs, regardless of their availability. If this line of reasoning is pursued, it suggests that the present ratings of violent programs would fall even lower if genuine alternatives were available, and we hope that is one of the most important parts of the answer and a situation which we will see come to pass. That is one of the very real points.

The second of many considerations that could be raised involves the reality of hard economic facts, and there are some real ones with which we have to deal. I would not suggest for a minute that this is a prime consideration. Given a choice, I think that we have to think in terms of the moral value of our broadcasting. We have to think of good taste, and so on, and certainly we have to put economic facts second and find a way to do what is right. But these considerations are there, not only for parliament and for the broadcasting industry, but they are there for every Canadian to consider and on which to make up his mind and take a stand.

As we know, Canada has a very small market, and at the same time we want as much Canadian content as possible—something in the area of 60 per cent. This means that we may have to make sacrifices, we may have to think in terms of subsidies. At present our subsidies are of two kinds: one from the government—this is a problem which perhaps the Canadian people have not come to grips with—and the second from foreign shows. It is a simple fact that to have the desired amount and quality of broadcasting of Canadian content we must have foreign shows at present to subsidize our Canadian shows. The cost of shows is in the ratio of $2,000 for half an hour of an American show to $60,000 for half an hour of a Canadian show. This is just to give you some idea of the extent of the problem. This is our dilemma. Undoubtedly some violence is popular. It is on both the United States and Canadian channels. If we eliminate it on Canadian channels, many of our people will switch to the American channels and see it anyway.

Mr. McGrath: It could be blacked out.

Mr. Philbrook: That is another serious subject—blacking it out.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Order, please. Because of an order made earlier today, I must interrupt the hon. member to say the time allotted to him has expired.

Mr. Ross Milne (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Communications): Mr. Speaker, I am sure the vast majority of members in the House would join me in congratulating the hon. member for St. John's East (Mr. McGrath) for bringing this bill forward, and perhaps would share the viewpoint of the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton (Mr. Baker) and the hon. member for Restigouche (Mr. Harquail) that the substance of this bill might be referred to committee.

I would not want anyone—particularly the hon. member for St. John's East—to think that those who have participated in the debate are the only ones interested. I think that from time to time the hon. member for Glengarry-Prescott-Russell (Mr. Ethier), the hon. member for Ottawa-Vanier (Mr. Gauthier),

the hon. member for York South (Mrs. Appolloni) and others have spoken in this Chamber expressing their concern. I expect that in the next few minutes there will be some urging that we accept the motion put forward by the hon. member opposite, but I want to reinforce the argument put forward by the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Philbrook) that in the CRTC survey of programing on violence that is available to Canadian people it is stated that 97 per cent of this comes from the United States. Of the violence that is available to the Canadian viewing public, both from off air and through cable, roughly 3 per cent of it is generated by Canadian broadcasting.

● (1650)

It seems to me that pursuing this motion would present two very great difficulties. If we really want to reduce the amount of violence which is available to Canadian viewers, we would have to jam signals from American stations, and I suspect hon. members might find their in-baskets with more mail in them than usual if the government were to proceed with that in an effort to reduce the amount of violence which is shown on screens.

In terms of the 3 per cent that is generated within the country, hon. members should think about the difficulty in drawing acceptable guidelines. I suggest that the end result would be a division. There would be those who would think that the guidelines would be too restrictive and impinging on freedom of broadcasters to present what programming they feel desirable and upon the freedom of viewers. Other groups would feel that the guidelines would not be restrictive enough. As the parliamentary secretary on behalf of the minister I have had the opportunity to talk with various groups which have come to the department expressing these very concerns. Some feel very strongly that there should be more restrictions. These various groups have varying motivations.

I have also heard the representation that freedom of broadcasting is one of the fundamental rights in our democratic system and that it should not be interfered with and drawing these guidelines would be largely ineffective because 97 per cent of the violence that is available is generated in the United States.

Earlier today I was talking to the hon. member for Ottawa-Vanier, and he raised a point which I think should go on the record. Had he been able to be here he would have wanted to speak in this debate. The hon. member suggested that if there is violence in programming, broadcasters should forewarn parents and children at the beginning of that programming. I watch very little television, but I have had occasion to see on the television screen at the beginning of particular programs a statement that part or all of the contents of certain programs might be offensive or harmful for family viewing. I think that is the way we should be proceeding. That way there is still a choice on the part of viewers as to whether they choose to watch or not. That would not interfere with either the freedom of the broadcaster or the freedom of the viewer.

One of the most persuasive ways to make viewpoints known would be for those people who share the view set out in the bill of the hon. member for St. John's East to make representations to broadcasters, and more particularly, to sponsors. I do not think there is anything more persuasive to a broadcaster or a sponsor than off switches on televisions. Sponsors spend large amounts of money to sponsor programs, and if the viewing public feels that those programs are not acceptable or to their liking, I think turning off the switch is one of the most effective ways of convincing producers that there really should be a different thrust.

I want to speak in support of the minister, who has on a number of occasions spoken about this point across the country. She has tried encourage people who feel strongly about this to communicate their points of view directly to television stations and to advertisers.

Mr. McGrath: That is a cop-out Ross.

Mr. Milne: My memory is not terribly long, but I do remember the debate which went on at great length in this House on Bill C-58. Many adamant viewpoints were expressed. Bill C-58 was a measure put forward as a means of helping the broadcasting industry in Canada to be strengthened. When we consider that 97 per cent of the violence that is shown on the screens in Canada is American generated, there really needs to be a considerable strengthening of Canadian programming.

According to the background on this subject I have read, Canadian programming is predominantly non-violent. The broadcasting industry in Canada generally does not use the medium of violence to attract an audience, but those who feel strongly that violence is detrimental should let the industry know. I certainly respect the opinions of the hon. member for Halton and the hon. member for Oxford (Mr. Halliday). They are both medical doctors who obviously have researched this subject and know about the impact on behavioural patterns of children when they are subjected to or have the opportunity to watch a great deal of violence.

We should seriously discuss the Canadian broadcasting industry in this House, and we should be discussing what can be done to strengthen it. Those people who speak about this matter should be making that one of the cornerstones of their argument. We need a much stronger and more dominant broadcasting system. If the majority of people are against watching violence on television, then that same majority want to view good programming which is generated by Canadian sources.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Don't talk it out, Ross.

Mr. Milne: It was interesting when Bill C-58 was being debated—

Mr. McGrath: Don't talk it out.

Mr. Paproski: Let it go to the committee.

Mr. Milne: —there were very few people who—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Order, please. The hour provided for the consideration of private members' business has now expired. This House stands adjourned until Monday at 2 p.m. pursuant to Standing Order 2(1).

At 5 p.m. the House adjourned, without question put, pursuant to Standing Order.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Monday, July 11, 1977

The House met at 2 p.m.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

POLYSAR

SUGGESTED ACCEPTANCE OF CONCLUSIONS OF COMMITTEE REPORT—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Peter Elzinga (Pembina): Mr. Speaker, I rise under the provisions of Standing Order 43. My motion is short and to the point. I move, seconded by the hon. member for Edmonton Centre (Mr. Paproski):

That this House congratulate the public accounts committee on its report on the Polysar affair and further accepts the conclusions of the report urging the government to give prompt and serious consideration to its recommendations.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I have consistently rejected putting the question on motions under Standing Order 43 calling for congratulations. However, urging the government to give serious consideration to certain recommendations perhaps adds another element. In order that the motion may be presented for debate, pursuant to Standing Order 43 it will require the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

* * *

[*Translation*]

SOCIAL SECURITY

PROPOSAL WIDOWS OF PENSIONERS AGE 60 OR OVER BE PAID TWO THIRDS OF JOINT PENSION—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Eudore Allard (Rimouski): Mr. Speaker, under the provisions of Standing Order 43, I ask for the unanimous consent of the House to move a motion dealing with an important matter of pressing necessity.

In view of the fact that most aged people experience very distressing housing problems, especially affecting widows of pensioners, that the federal government should grant priority to those senior citizens, and that a new policy in favour of Canadians belonging to that age group has long since been overdue, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Roberval (Mr. Gauthier):

That the House enjoin the Minister of National Health and Welfare to take the necessary steps so that a 60-year old woman who is unfortunate enough to lose her pensioned husband may draw two thirds of their joint pension till age 65 when she would obtain the full amount of her old age pension.

Mr. Speaker: Under the provisions of Standing Order 43, presentation of such a motion requires the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

* * *

[*English*]

PARLIAMENT HILL

CONGRATULATIONS TO PERSONNEL TAKING PART IN CHANGING OF GUARD CEREMONY—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. C. Douglas (Bruce-Grey): Mr. Speaker, I rise under the provisions of Standing Order 43 on a matter of urgent and pressing necessity which I genuinely believe will receive the unanimous support of the House. Considering the magnificent spectacle which takes place daily I move, seconded by the hon. member for Ottawa-Vanier (Mr. Gauthier):

That this House extend its congratulations to the personnel involved in the Changing of the Guard ceremony composed of members of the Governor General's Footguards of Ottawa and the Canadian Grenadier Guards of Montreal and the regular bands of the Canadian Armed Forces for their contribution to a ceremony which has now become a colourful tradition of international repute in the national capital.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[*English*]

ATOMIC ENERGY OF CANADA LIMITED

MINISTER RESPONSIBLE FOR CORPORATION AND FOR DEFICIT—PROPOSED AUTOMATIC REFERENCE OF ANNUAL REPORT TO COMMITTEE

Mr. Walter Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, my question to the Prime Minister concerns the incredible statement he made in Vancouver about ministerial responsibility as it relates to the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources and AECL's $290 million boondoggle about which we heard last week. The Prime Minister said this about this $290 million loss:

If you are in a hotel and somebody down at the end of the line steals something from other rooms, it doesn't mean that the manager has to be fired as incompetent.

The Prime Minister said this as if referring to the stealing of some towels. Bearing in mind the revelations of the past week—and if anyone stole $290 million worth of towels from this government, if it operated a hotel, and I hope it does not, the manager would deserve to be fired—my question to the Prime Minister is this: Is the minister of Energy, Mines and Resources responsible for AECL? If he is not, who is responsible for the agency, from the point of view of the Prime Minister?

An hon. Member: Put him in charge of towels.

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the answer to the first part of the question is, yes, he is the minister through whom AECL reports to the House of Commons. As for the matter of responsibility in the case of Crown corporations, the opposition themselves have put themselves on record several times as saying they did not want ministers running Crown corporations. Everytime we attempt to do it, there is objection to it.

• (1410)

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): The Prime Minister knows that is not so, Mr. Speaker. The Prime Minister should apprise himself of Section 70(1) of the Financial Administration Act which specifically states that the minister is responsible for authorizing the operating budget with respect to this particular Crown corporation and other Crown corporations. Does the Prime Minister agree that this puts an onus upon the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources for the operating budget and as well puts a responsibility on him for the operating deficit, about which he was warned, which amounted to a total loss in operating expenses over revenue in 1977 in excess of $290 million? Is this not a responsibility of the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources and is there any good reason why the Prime Minister should tolerate such an incompetent in his cabinet?

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, I have dealt with this several times, that is, the problem of interference with Crown corporations by ministers of the government. The rules are quite well established that the minister should not involve himself in the day-to-day operations of the Crown corporation. I have indicated before, and I believe the President of the Treasury Board has also, that we are going to bring in some Crown corporation legislation. Hopefully it will give the government power to intervene in the operation of Crown corporations. I look forward to having the support of the opposition on this. Of course, they will have to flip-flop because they have always said we should not interfere.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): If there are going to be any flip-flops, we have a great example to follow from this government. We are not talking about the day-to-day operations of the Crown corporation and the Prime Minister knows that. What we are talking about is the question of accountability to parliament, and the people, of these Crown corporations. That is the issue. Does the government intend, at least as a first step, to require that all future annual reports of all Crown corporations be referred automatically to the appropriate standing committee rather than have to wait the convenience of the government with respect to this matter? We can see what lack of control has led to in terms of AECL.

[Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton).]

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, with regard to the first part of the hon. member's question, he must realize that an overwhelming portion of this loss was in one contract with Argentina. Surely even the House leader of the opposition would not argue that it could have been the minister's role to negotiate this contract when a Crown corporation was the agency.

MINISTERIAL RESPONSIBILITY FOR HIRING AND FIRING EXECUTIVE OFFICERS—ROLE OF DR. FOSTER IN FUTURE

Mr. Gordon Towers (Red Deer): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources. In view of the minister's statement concerning Atomic Energy of Canada Limited last Thursday that "the board of directors recommended to me that Dr. Foster be asked to step down as president and chief executive officer and I have already acted on that proposal" and "a committee of the board is now engaged in a search for a new president and chief executive officer with the business training and experience needed to manage AECL", will the minister tell the House exactly what his ministerial responsibility is in the firing and hiring of presidents and chief executive officers of AECL? In other words, who is giving the orders?

Hon. Alastair Gillespie (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, I made it very clear that I accepted my responsibility to appoint and to remove the senior officers, that is to say the chairman and the president, the chief executive officer.

Mr. Towers: The minister also said "I am hopeful that the company will continue to benefit from his pre-eminent technical knowledge and experience in the nuclear field." Can the minister state now what position Dr. Foster will hold in AECL and will the minister be making that decision?

Mr. Gillespie: Mr. Speaker, I cannot give the hon. member a precise answer as to what particular role Dr. Foster will have in the future with respect to AECL. I hope, and I have discussed this with him, that it will be possible to work out some kind of technical consulting assignment so that the corporation will have the benefit of his pre-eminent knowledge in this field.

Mr. Towers: Will a position be created for Dr. Foster or is one already in existence?

Mr. Gillespie: With respect to the assignment as a consultant, there is the matter of defining the precise nature of that

assignment of Dr. Foster. I expect that might take place in about two months time.

* * *

ELECTION EXPENSES

CONTRIBUTIONS TO POLITICAL PARTIES BY CROWN CORPORATIONS—POSSIBILITY OF PROVIDING GUIDELINES—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister. The report on political contributions reveals the fact that Canadair, a wholly owned government Crown corporation, and Panarctic, in which the government has a controlling interest, have both made political contributions to political parties in this country. In view of the fact that the Canadian people would undoubtedly be concerned about agencies supported by public money making contributions to any political party, I want to ask the Prime Minister whether he thinks these contributions are appropriate in the circumstances.

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): I am not aware of those facts, but if they are as stated it would seem surprising to me that Crown corporations, being wholly owned by the people of Canada, would want to make contributions to any political party. Here again, I suppose, we are in the area of ministerial responsibility. We have just heard an indication that in some cases members want the ministers to intervene—it is said the minister should have done so in the case of AECL; in other cases as in the case of Petro Canada, the opposition has argued that the minister should not intervene. I shall try to ascertain from the hon. member what he wants the minister to do—to take the Crown corporation to task over this or to let parliament do it at the appropriate time.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): We have been assured from time to time by the Prime Minister and his colleagues that there were guidelines laying down the manner in which the Crown corporations should carry on their operations. Is there any provision in the existing guidelines which would prohibit Crown corporations from making political contributions? If there is not, will the Prime Minister undertake to see that such a provision is placed in the guidelines and made public?

Mr. Trudeau: If my memory serves me well, these guidelines were made public in the House a few months ago; perhaps we could both refer to them. My memory is that they have to do with the operation of Crown corporations within the bounds of law and propriety; I do not think they refer in particular to contributions to political parties. I am sure the hon. member would not argue that contributing to political parties is improper per se though perhaps in the case of a Crown corporation, or possibly unions working for Crown corporations, we could make sure there are no contributions of that nature permitted. But I would be interested to ascertain the hon. member's views on this subject.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): This is hardly an occasion upon which I have an opportunity to express my views but the Prime Minister surely knows by the nature of my question that I am opposed to Crown corporations making political contributions. What I am asking him is whether he is prepared to put into the guidelines a provision prohibiting Crown corporations from making contributions to political parties.

I wish to ask the right hon. gentleman also a question with reference to Polysar which he was told as far back as 1973 had been paying kickbacks into unnumbered bank accounts—a fact which has since been verified by the Public Accounts Committee. What steps has the government taken to make sure that not only Polysar but other Crown corporations will be prohibited from following such a practice in future? Can we be assured that this practice will not continue in Polysar and that it will not be pursued by other corporations? Can the Prime Minister give us this definite assurance?

Mr. Trudeau: Yes, Mr. Speaker. If I may answer the latter part of the question first, I would refer the hon. member to statements made some months ago about Crown corporations being told to operate within the framework of law and propriety. The ministers contacted the various Crown corporations at that time to make sure that these various guidelines would be adhered to. As to the first part of the question, I would remind the hon. member, as I was reminded by the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce on my left, who apparently was informed of these facts, that in the case of Canadair it was apparently not the property of the Canadian government at the time it made these contributions to parties. If that is true, the hon. member's question seems irrelevant. With regard to Panarctic, we are, of course, only minority shareholders and it might be very difficult to ensure that the majority shareholders do not want to recognize what political parties are worthy of their support.

* * *

● (1420)

[*Translation*]

NATIONAL ENERGY BOARD

REQUEST FOR FRENCH COPY OF REPORT ONE WEEK BEFORE DEBATE

Mr. C. A. Gauthier (Roberval): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources.

Considering that all members sitting in this House, either French-speaking or English-speaking, have the duty to study very carefully the National Energy Board report in view of the debate that will take place in August or a little later at the opening of the session, considering also that the said report is made up of three volumes, only one of which is available in French, would the minister be kind enough to tell us whether the other two volumes are being translated now? If so, can we hope to receive them at least one week before the debate takes

place, because French-speaking eastern members are just as interested as the others in this matter?

[*English*]

Hon. Alastair Gillespie (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, I shall make every effort to see that it is available for the House. While I cannot promise it, I can assure the hon. member that I will make the strongest possible representations to the National Energy Board that they supply that information.

On the first part of the hon. member's question dealing with the annual report of AECL, today I talked to the acting chief excutive officer with regard to expediting the French copies of the report, and I hope we will be able to provide them to the House very shortly.

* * *

POLYSAR

ALERTING OF COUNTRIES WHOSE CITIZENS ACCEPTED KICKBACKS—REASON FOR ALLEGED FAILURE TO INVESTIGATE COMPLAINT OF AUDITOR GENERAL

Mr. Don Mazankowski (Vegreville): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct my question to the Prime Minister. It arises out of the second report of the Public Accounts Committee, commonly referred to now as the Polysar report. The committee concluded that in its opinion Polysar had engaged in improper business practices which were designed to break foreign laws on tax evasion, currency control and fraud. This, by implication, makes the government of Canada, parliament and the people of Canada unwitting accomplices in the commission of crimes against countries friendly to our own. I wonder whether the Prime Minister would advise the House what steps the government is taking to alert the home governments of these Polysar customers engaged in the rebate practices as to the names, dates of involvement and amounts, of cash rebated in each case of improper kickbacks?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I have not read the report of the committee, which I understood was brought down last week while I was travelling in the fair provinces of British Columbia and Alberta, and I am not yet informed as to what disposition will be made.

Mr. Mazankowski: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. It is encouraging to note that the Prime Minister is not going to leave this decision to the executive of the Crown corporation. The committee also stated that the investigation of the former minister of public works, the hon. member for Westmount, was inadequate and in the same paragraph notes that there was no response to Mr. Henderson's letters, the former auditor general. May I ask the Prime Minister whether this reluctance to reply to Mr. Henderson's letter was a matter of policy, or did the Prime Minister feel that he had no responsibility or obligation to ensure that this extremely important matter would be followed up, a matter about which the auditor general felt compelled to write directly to the Prime Minister?

[Mr. Gauthier (Roberval).]

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, I repeat that I have not read the report to which the hon. member refers, but my recollection of events is that the auditor general felt it important enough to write to me but not to put it in his report to parliament. Secondly, I think my recollection is right that he was no longer auditor general within a very short period of time after I had received this letter.

Mr. Mazankowski: Mr. Speaker, my supplementary is simply this: did the Prime Minister not feel he had an obligation to follow up this very important matter? Did he feel satisfied leaving it in the hands of the former minister of public works, now the hon. member for Westmount? Is he saying that he ignored the letter and left it entirely up to the former minister of public works?

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, several months ago I answered these questions, perhaps as much as a year ago. I made it quite clear that I saw the Auditor General's letter and was somewhat dismayed by it. I wrote the former minister of public works and asked him to follow it up. I believe these letters were tabled at the time. This is the way I generally run my government, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): It shows.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Trudeau: I am glad to see the opposition finds that it shows. This is the reason our cabinet does not fall apart, as happens on the opposite side.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Allan Lawrence (Northumberland-Durham): Mr. Speaker, if I may further refresh the Prime Minister's memory, in the Prime Minister's letter to the then president of the treasury board he asked for the president of the treasury board to investigate and report back to him. The evidence presented in the Public Accounts Committee is that the then president of the treasury board never did. If the Prime Minister runs his cabinet and his office this way, may I simply ask him what provision he is making to make sure that when he asks for a report he gets it?

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, I am sure, as with the hon. member's office, that there is some provision for bringing items forward and seeing that they are followed up.

Mr. Lawrence: After six years?

Mr. Trudeau: In this case perhaps somebody did ascertain from the then minister of public works that he had contacted Polysar and that he had been given assurances which were then made part of the record.

HER MAJESTY, THE QUEEN

INQUIRY AS TO ATTENDANCE AT OPENING OF NEXT SESSION OF PARLIAMENT

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Prince Albert): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Prime Minister. He has been out in Alberta where he witnessed a wonderful reception.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Diefenbaker: I am not speaking of the synthetic or organized one.

Mr. Paproski: No!

Mr. Diefenbaker: I am speaking of the reception for the Prince of Wales and Prince Andrew which revealed something of the loyalty of the people of Alberta, including the Indians particularly, to Her Majesty. I should like to ask the Prime Minister whether or not arrangements have now been made whereby on this her silver anniversary year she will be given an opportunity this fall to open parliament and to generally carry out the responsibilities which are hers?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, we hope to make an announcement on this in due course. When we know when parliament closes, then we will be in a position to know when it opens.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, at the rate the government is going in its unsettled way, I can understand that the Prime Minister does not know where the government is going or where its policies are going.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Diefenbaker: The government should let parliament know whether she is going to be invited here. Regardless of whether this session takes another week or month, is she going to be invited here this fall? Why is there this unnecessary evasion? Months ago the Prime Minister said that he had this in mind. I now ask him: has it gone out of his mind, or does he intend to have her here?

● (1430)

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, I think I should let the right hon. gentlemen in on the secret. He is not a member in full standing of the Royal Society of Canada, as I am.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

An hon. Member: That is worn out.

Mr. Trudeau: However, I think the right hon. gentleman would be interested in knowing that when I saw Her Majesty in London, I told her that if there were a new session around that time I hoped she would want to read the Speech from the Throne. She accepted with pleasure, but I cannot make an announcement on it until we know if the opposition is going to co-operate in bringing this session to an end.

Mr. Diefenbaker: The Prime Minister spoke about the Royal Society of Canada, and he pointed out that he is a full sized member of the Royal Society. That, of course, gave him the opportunity to do his pirouette in London.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Diefenbaker: I rather expected him to do the can-can when he was in Paris. I point out that those in the same position as myself in the Royal Society include two former Governors General of Canada and our predecessors Mr. Pearson and Mr. St. Laurent.

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Trudeau: It's about the pirouette, Mr. Speaker.

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

* * *

[*Translation*]

TRADE

ARTHUR REPORT—POSSIBILITY OF INCREASING SALE OF AUTOMOTIVE PARTS TO UNITED STATES

Mr. F. A. Philbrook (Halton): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce.

In view of the findings of the Arthur report on the North American automotive industry, does the minister intend to consider the possibility of increasing our exports of automotive parts?

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, we are now working with the automotive industry and the manufacturers of parts to help them increase their production. We had contacts with other countries and we hope to find foreign markets for Canadian automotive parts, as the hon. member is suggesting.

* * *

[*English*]

FARM CREDIT CORPORATION

POSSIBLE CONFLICT OF INTEREST IN AWARDING OF CONTRACT BY CHAIRMAN TO MANITOBA INSTITUTE—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Perrin Beatty (Wellington-Grey-Dufferin-Waterloo): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister. In view of the fact that the Minister of Agriculture has confirmed that the chairman of the Farm Credit Corporation was also a director of the Manitoba Institute of Management at the same time as he awarded it a consulting contract on behalf of the Farm Credit Corporation for which tenders were not called

and which cost the taxpayers over $80,000, can the Prime Minister tell the House whether he is satisfied that the awarding of this contract to a company of which the chairman was a director in no way conflicted with the government's conflict of interest guidelines and, in particular, in no way conflicted with the Prime Minister's statement in the House on December 18, 1973 that, and I quote:

> Regarding outside employment, public servants are being asked not to accept outside office or employment that could place on them demands inconsistent with their official duties or call into question their capacity to perform those duties in an objective manner.

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I was apprised of this matter just as I came into the House by the excellent Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Agriculture. I am not sure if he is in a position to report yet, but he told me he was following this up and might be prepared to answer tomorrow.

REASON PRELIMINARY STUDY BY MANITOBA INSTITUTE COST MORE THAN STUDY BY SIBALD

Mr. Perrin Beatty (Wellington-Grey-Dufferin-Waterloo): Mr. Speaker, in the continuing absence of the Minister of Agriculture I will ask a question of the acting Minister of Agriculture. In view of the fact that although the controversial and thoroughly thorough—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Beatty: I am so taken aback by the Prime Minister's pirouette that I am lost for words. In view of the fact that the controversial and thorough Sibald management audit of the Farm Credit Corporation cost the taxpayers only $76,892 while the preliminary study by the Manitoba Institute of Management which merely defined the parameters of the Sibald study cost over $80,000, can the acting minister tell the House why the preliminary study cost more money than the final report, and in view of the fact that the Manitoba Institute of Management tendered unsuccessfully on the management audit, does the minister not agree that putting the initial study out to tender might have saved taxpayers a considerable amount of money?

Mr. Irénée Pelletier (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, I would like to advise that the Minister of Agriculture is in Victoria today, and for the next three days, with the ministers of agriculture of the provinces, and the hon. member knows that.

Some hon. Members: Shame.

Mr. Pelletier: I have discussed this question with officials of the department, and I am advised that Dr. Kristjanson's actions did not involve a real conflict of interest. The Manitoba Institute of Management is a non-profit educational institute, and its selection to define the terms of reference of a management audit, although made initially by the chairman, was ratified by all members of the corporation.

[Mr. Beatty.]

HOUSE OF COMMONS

PRESENCE IN SPEAKER'S GALLERY OF DELEGATION FROM FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF WEST GERMANY

Mr. Speaker: Before carrying on with the question period, I know all hon. members will want to join with me in calling attention to the presence in our gallery of a very distinguished delegation from the Federal Republic of West Germany, headed by its most distinguished chancellor, His Excellency Helmut Schmidt.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

* * *

CROWN CORPORATIONS

PROPOSED AUTOMATIC REFERENCE OF ANNUAL REPORTS TO COMMITTEES—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Joe Clark (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister, who I naturally would like to welcome back from an event where I understand that he too became a "mangeur de hot dog".

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Clark: In his discussions regarding Crown corporations the Prime Minister has often talked about changing the relationship between Crown corporations and the government but not their relationship with parliament. Perhaps the Prime Minister missed the question of the House leader of the Official Opposition, who asked the Prime Minister whether it is going to be the intention of the government to require an automatic, regular reference of annual reports of Crown corporations to the appropriate standing committees of the House of Commons so that parliament, too, can be involved in the policy direction of Crown corporations. Will the Prime Minister answer that question and tell us whether his government now intends to change its policy and make regular references of annual reports of Crown corporations to appropriate standing committees of the House?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I thank the Leader of the Opposition for welcoming me back from that very festive occasion.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Trudeau: I can assure him that I have not and have never had any contempt for those who eat hot dogs. As a matter of fact, I just ate some with my family at lunch, and I feel fine.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): How does the family feel?

An hon. Member: You look a little peaked.

Mr. Trudeau: The right hon. gentleman from Prince Albert referred to a pirouette.

An hon. Member: He is still here.

Mr. Trudeau: The right hon. gentleman has not left the House, but he moved from his place because, I suppose, he was afraid I would take a shot at him.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

An hon. Member: He is going back to his seat; fire away.

Mr. Trudeau: Having dealt with the preamble of the question of the Leader of the Opposition, the government has no objection to referring all annual reports of Crown corporations, but I do not think we would want to make that part of any law because I think the opposition would find its schedule somewhat overcrowded. The opposition complains now that it does not have time to consider the estimates of departments, and if it wants to refer reports of Crown corporations, it will not have time even to do the things which relate directly to the government let alone those things which relate indirectly to the government.

Mr. Clark: One thing this House need never fear is that the Prime Minister might sometime answer questions directly. After the Prime Minister's latest approach to a pirouette would he agree as a matter of policy to recommend a change in the Standing Orders of the House of Commons—we would certainly accept such a change—regarding references of annual reports of Crown corporations to standing committees in a way which would allow the opposition parties to choose those annual reports that they would like to have referred each year, thus ensuring that there would be a capacity in parliament to review the activities of Crown corporations and to participate in policy direction? Would he agree—I see he is consulting with the House leader, who performed in a sterling way in his absence—to that kind of amendment to the Standing Orders to give parliament a role in the direction of Crown corporations?

• (1440)

Mr. Trudeau: I did confer with the House leader and he has confirmed what I said in my first answer, that if the opposition wants to refer any particular annual report and time is made for it in the conduct of the debates, we would gladly entertain that suggestion. I would just repeat that it does not seem to be a good practice to make it automatic or to give the opposition the right to select at random. This is an amendment to the Standing Order—

An hon. Member: We are talking about parliament selecting, not the opposition.

Mr. Trudeau: The Standing Orders apply, of course, to parliament, but sometimes they can be changed to suit the convenience of the opposition and sometimes they can be changed in the interest of parliament as a whole.

Mr. Paproski: Too many jumps on the trampoline.

Mr. Trudeau: We have suggestions of our own for changing the Standing Orders, and if the House leaders want to get together, they can improve them.

Mr. Clark: The Prime Minister once again is demonstrating his claim to the title of "Wizard of If". I would like the Prime Minister to tell the House of Commons whether he is prepared to have the Standing Orders of parliament changed to allow a regular review of those Crown corporations which parliament chooses to review and, if not, why not?

Mr. Trudeau: Yes, Mr. Speaker, we would be prepared to change the Standing Orders in that way if the opposition would be prepared to change the Standing Orders so that the second reading of any bill would last only one day.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

* * *

INDIAN AFFAIRS

MEASURES TO IMPROVE CONDITIONS FOR NATIVES—DISCUSSION OF TREATY RIGHTS

Mr. John Gilbert (Broadview): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development. In view of the exchange between Prince Charles and the Indian chiefs concerning the visit in Alberta at which Prince Charles expressed his concern about many of the hardships endured by native people in Canada and the Indian chiefs expressed their concern with regard to the encroachment of their treaty rights, unemployment, poverty and the problems with alcohol, has the minister any specific programs dealing with some of these critical issues?

Hon. Warren Allmand (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): I have, Mr. Speaker, but there are too many of them to discuss in the House in the question period.

An hon. Member: We'll give you time.

Mr. Gilbert: Mr. Speaker, probably the minister should direct his attention to the question of treaty rights and the encroachment the Indian chiefs are alleging. With regard to the discussions that would be taking place in the near future concerning treaty rights, is it the intention of the minister to present specific proposals so that they would form the basis of discussion with the Indian chiefs?

Mr. Allmand: Many things were discussed. Some of them had to do with the treaties, some with economic development, some with local control. I might say that this afternoon we are having a meeting of the joint committee of the cabinet and the National Indian Brotherhood regarding certain matters relating to the revision of the Indian Act, and so on. Furthermore, I have been asked to return to Alberta on September 22, which is the actual date of the signing of Treaty 7, for further discussions on that treaty and what might be done to improve it.

Mr. Clark: Send Alastair to renegotiate it.

Oral Questions

THE CANADIAN ECONOMY

INFLATION—GOVERNMENT TARGET FOR RATE THIS YEAR AND NEXT

Mr. Sinclair Stevens (York-Simcoe): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Finance. In view of the McCracken report which was prepared for OECD nations making it clear that unemployment and inflation are tightly linked together, would the Minister of Finance indicate what he believes would be the rate of inflation in Canada this year—originally the target was 6 per cent—and could he indicate what the target will be for next year—originally it was to be 4 per cent?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): As I have indicated to the House several times, we anticipate—principally because of the food price increases in the first quarter—that we would not be able to be within the guideline hoped for under the Anti-Inflation Act. As to what the target would be for next year, as I have often said to the hon. gentleman, it seems to me that given the effect of outside events, it is unwise to try to set precise targets.

SUGGESTED BILATERAL ARRANGEMENTS WITH FOREIGN EXPORTERS TO HELP MAINTAIN EMPLOYMENT IN MANUFACTURING

Mr. Sinclair Stevens (York-Simcoe): My question is again to the Minister of Finance. Since employment in our manufacturing industries now stands at one per cent lower than last year, can the minister tell the House whether he views the manufacturing industry to be an important source of new jobs and, if so, having regard to the weakened state of some sectors, such as textiles, footwear and electrical products, will he consider at least having bilateral arrangements with foreign exporters which might help to preserve employment in the manufacturing industry?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): In a number of cases in the past we have sought such export limitation arrangements. I would have to say in general terms, however, that those kinds of arrangements have been increasingly difficult to achieve in recent years. I quite agree with the hon. gentleman that expansion in manufacturing employment is fundamental to continued progress in Canada. We recognize the difficulties that are involved, particularly in the multilateral trade negotiations, of having to make exchanges in certain tariff protection which we have at present. It is for that reason that we are seeking a substantial reduction in foreign tariffs, particularly those of the European Economic Community.

POSSIBILITY OF NEW BUDGET TO IMPROVE CONDITIONS

Mr. Sinclair Stevens (York-Simcoe): Again I direct my question to the Minister of Finance. In view of the fact that we have the highest unemployment level of any of the large OECD nations, we have high and continuing inflation, the highest budgetary deficit in our history, a low real growth, only 4 per cent compared with the anticipated 5.5 per cent for OECD nations, and the highest imparted deficit of any OECD nation, would the minister indicate if he is considering a new budget as early as possible to help redeem his record?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the hon. gentleman voted against the last budget which would create further employment—

Mr. Stevens: It is not working.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): —and economic growth in Canada while at the same time containing inflation, it is difficult to see how the recommendations of the hon. member for York-Simcoe could be taken seriously by anyone.

* * *

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS

INCREASE IN COMMUTER FARES IN MONTREAL AREA—GOVERNMENT ACTION

Mr. Hal Herbert (Vaudreuil): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport. Canadian National Railways have recently put into effect another fare increase for commuter train service in the Montreal area and the Canadian Transport Commission did not intervene. I would like to ask whether the Minister of Transport considered any action and, if so, why was none taken?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, last October the minister contacted the CN authorities who have already accepted his suggestion to postpone the rate increase and the service reduction. This intervention was conditional on an agreement with transport minister Raymond Mailloux and the various public organizations, so that the Montreal area transportation committee, which has been set up by the provincial government, might table its report in July 1977. Hopefully the province of Quebec will act in the areas of transportation where it has full competence, and advise this committee of its intentions and its schedule for the whole program. I must tell the hon. member that it is the Canadian Transport Commission which authorizes all rate increases it deems necessary and, in this case, the commission had granted this increase.

* * *

[*English*]

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

SUGGESTED INQUIRY INTO ORGANIZED CRIME—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Elmer M. MacKay (Central Nova): My question is for the Minister of Justice. Now that the government has called an inquiry into certain aspects of the RCMP without, of course, a specific reference to the commissioners to assess the

responsibility of its political directors, will the minister and the government now have the sense of appropriateness to accede to the requests of the opposition parties for an inquiry into organized crime in this country, because to do otherwise would seem to indicate a curious sense of priorities and a lack of appropriateness under the circumstances?

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, this was a subject which was thoroughly discussed at the recent federal-provincial meetings of attorneys general. Certainly, from that discussion I drew the conclusion that it would not be appropriate for the Minister of Justice or for the federal government at this time to call such an inquiry. We did issue a joint statement regarding police intelligence and police communications between our government and the various provincial governments.

* * *

ROYAL CANADIAN MOUNTED POLICE

QUEBEC INQUIRY INTO BREAK-IN AT L'AGENCE DE PRESSE LIBRE—MINISTER'S KNOWLEDGE OF MATERIAL TO BE PRESENTED BY FORCE

Mr. Elmer M. MacKay (Central Nova): Mr. Speaker, the minister gave almost the same answer when we requested an inquiry into the RCMP earlier, but there has been a reversal there as well. I would like to ask the Solicitor General if he has been fully briefed on the documentation and other material that the RCMP is prepared to make available into the Quebec inquiry into L'Agence de Presse Libre break-in and whether any process of evaluation or consultation has been set up or initiated between the Solicitor General and his Quebec counterpart following the announcement of the Quebec inquiry, since according to the minister earlier there was none previous to the announcement of the inquiry?

● (1450)

Hon. Francis Fox (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, the Quebec commission is in the process of being set up and I, of course, will be represented by counsel on that commission.

* * *

PRIVACY

REQUEST FOR CHANGE IN LEGISLATION ON WIRETAPPING—POSSIBILITY OF REFERRING LEGISLATION TO SUPREME COURT

Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Calgary North): Mr. Speaker, my question for the Minister of Justice relates to the Prime Minister's statement about when the House may recess. The effect of my question would certainly be to shorten Bill C-51. I am not talking about the gun control part of it. I heard the Prime Minister say something about taking a shot at the right hon. member for Prince Albert, but I am sure with his ability he will be able to handle that situation. My question relates to the invasion of privacy. It would seem to me that the police have no business in the homes of law abiding citizens, rooting around for information. In relation to unauthorized wiretapping, derivative evidence means evidence outside the conversation would be admissible. Would the minister reconsider his position in light of the statement made by Mr. Cartwright and Mr. Cooper and other members of the Advocacy Society of Toronto, who are benchers? Would the minister repent and tell us now that wiretapping is illegal and if the court gives approval of it they are tacitly agreeing with illegal acts?

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, I would agree totally with the hon. member that unauthorized wiretapping is illegal and surely should carry with it the full sanction and penalties provided for in the law against those who engage in it.

Mr. Woolliams: Mr. Speaker, we have heard that answer many times. We have the Rae case in which evidence was declared admissible because it was relevant, however. Is the minister prepared to take the section dealing with the invasion of privacy and the amendment—which he considered a compromise with other members of the committee within his own party—and put that before the Supreme Court by terms of reference to see if it complies with the terms and conditions of the Bill of Rights which guarantees privacy and freedom in this nation?

Mr. Basford: First, Mr. Speaker, the amendment that was proposed by myself and other members of the committee is in my view along the substance of the recommendations of the Law Reform Commission, relative to evidence generally. Second, I think I would resist a reference. Obviously, the Supreme Court of Canada and certainly I—at least, as minister—have always endeavoured to keep the number of references to a minimum because that court, like any other, prefers to deal if at all possible with factual situations. Obviously, the amendment and the legislation will have to be certified by officers of the Department of Justice as complying with the Bill of Rights. If someone has a view that such certification is incorrect they would be entitled to take that argument before the court and before the Supreme Court of Canada.

* * *

CROWN CORPORATIONS

FAILURE TO EMPLOY WOMEN IN MANAGEMENT POSITIONS—GOVERNMENT ACTION

Mr. R. Gordon L. Fairweather (Fundy-Royal): Mr. Speaker, my question to the Prime Minister is about Crown corporations and the proposal to introduce legislation reorganizing them. The recent report of the Advisory Council on the Status of Women noted the deplorable record of almost all Crown corporations respecting women in management positions. This oversight probably does not need legislation but could the Prime Minister suggest to his Cabinet colleagues that the Public Service Commission policy—which I presume is government policy in this regard—would fit very well into the

Crown corporations. As of now I regret to say the record is deplorable.

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the feeling expressed by the hon. member and the goals he suggests are ones that we share. There should be a better record in the area of employment of women in Crown corporations. Incidentally there should be a better record in the promotion of bilingualism. These are two areas in which Crown corporations have been contacted to enjoin them to more progress. I shall ask the minister responsible for the status of women to bring me up-to-date on the facts and figures as regards women. On the acceptance and promotion of bilingualism, I have already asked for a report.

* * *

SMALL BUSINESS

DATE OF ANNOUNCEMENT OF POLICY

Mr. Otto Jelinek (High Park-Humber Valley): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of State (Small Business). On December 9, 1976 I asked the minister when we could expect an announcement on a much needed small business policy and his reply was, "Soon". Nearly six months later, on May 30 this year, with still no semblance of a policy, we spoon-fed the minister, by way of an opposition day, a number of suggestions and recommendations toward the formation of such a policy. I should like to ask the minister once again whether he could report on the progress of at least some form of a paper dealing with a small business policy and specifically when can we expect it to be made public?

Hon. Len Marchand (Minister of State (Small Business)): Mr. Speaker, I have said on a number of occasions that the target date I had set for presenting a paper to Cabinet was June. The paper is just about complete and should be going forward to my colleagues shortly.

Mr. Jelinek: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Could the minister give the House an undertaking that the announcement on small business policy will be made in the proper forum, this House of Commons and not outside?

Mr. Marchand: Mr. Speaker, it would certainly be my desire to make every announcement in the House of Commons, if time permits, but I hope this place will shut down soon so that we can all go home and see our constituents.

* * *

NORTHERN AFFAIRS

DATE OF POLICY STATEMENT—SUBJECT MATTER OF STATEMENT

Mr. Bill Jarvis (Perth-Wilmot): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development who has made several references recently to a policy statement he proposes to make regarding the north, a policy statement which is apparently to be the framework on which decisions affecting the north will be made in future, such policy decisions as those affecting pipelines, for example. In view of the fact that we will be debating the pipeline soon, can the minister tell the House whether the policy statement will be made in this House on or before July 15?

[Mr. Fairweather.]

Hon. Warren Allmand (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): Mr. Speaker, the policy statement would relate more particularly to the constitutional evolution of the north and not necessarily to pipelines and so forth, although it would have some significance for these other decisions. Whether it would be made in the House or not would depend upon when it is approved by a committee of Cabinet and that has not yet been done.

Mr. Jarvis: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. The minister originally indicated that the statement was to be of a constitutional and political nature. Is it now the minister's intention to enlarge that framework so that in terms of a policy statement it will include the social, economic and environmental concerns in the broadest sense, and not in terms of specific issues? Does the minister now propose to enlarge that statement and the constitutional, environmental policy statement that he originally intended to make?

Mr. Allmand: No, Mr. Speaker, it will still deal principally with the constitutional evolution of the north. Of course, it will relate to powers which govern these other subjects but it is principally a constitutional document. It concerns many more ministers than myself and is subject to review and amendment by my Cabinet colleagues.

* * *

VETERANS AFFAIRS

PENSIONS FOR WIDOWS OF VETERANS WHOSE DISABILITY PENSION LESS THAN FORTY-EIGHT PER CENT

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, may I put a question to the Minister of Veterans Affairs. In view of the promise the minister made a few days ago that he would do his best to get action this year with respect to the provision that denies a widow's pension where the veterans disability pension was less than 48 per cent and also with respect to closing the gap between the disability pension and the base to which it was attached a few years ago, and it is now reasonably clear that the Queen will be reading the Speech from the Throne at the opening of the next session of parliament, will the minister do his best to get that legislation approved in time for it to be included in the Queen's Speech from the Throne in October?

Hon. Daniel J. MacDonald (Minister of Veterans Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I will certainly do my ministerial duty and do what I can with respect to that matter.

● (1500)

WAR VETERANS ALLOWANCE ACT

REQUEST THAT REVIEW BE EXPEDITED

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Will the Minister of Veterans Affairs also do his best to expedite the review of the War Veterans Allowance Act, which he announced a short time ago.

Hon. Daniel J. MacDonald (Minister of Veterans Affairs): Mr. Speaker, with respect to the last question, the process has already begun. We had our first meeting with the representatives of the veterans' organizations. The hon. member must realize that this has taken a considerable time, but it is already in process.

* * *

VETERANS AFFAIRS

HOUSING REPAIR PROGRAM—REASON FOR DELAY IN IMPLEMENTATION

Mr. Jack Marshall (Humbert-St. George's-St. Barbe): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Perhaps the minister will recall the request the Newfoundland branch of the Canadian Legion made to him and the then minister of state for urban affairs for funding for a program for veterans and their widows to cover emergency repairs to houses. This has been in process for three years. The minister and the present Minister of National Defence made a commitment to that provincial command of the Canadian Legion. Could the minister explain to this House and veterans of this country the reasons for the inexcusable delay in providing the funding recommended by the excellent survey?

Hon. Daniel J. MacDonald (Minister of Veterans Affairs): Mr. Speaker, with reference to the survey, as the hon. member knows I and my colleague the Minister of State for Urban Affairs looked into the matter. I think the hon. member realizes that this comes under the Residential Rehabilitation Assistance Program, and it is up to the province to designate certain areas where the program can be implemented and applied. The matter is not exactly under federal jurisdiction but must be worked out with the province. I understand that some delay has been occasioned in this regard, and the program has probably not been assigned to the various areas of the province referred to.

PROPOSED RESIDENTIAL REHABILITATION PROGRAM—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Jack Marshall (Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Since the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources has announced his insulation program, and since the Residential Rehabilitation Assistance Program has been greatly beneficial, its restrictions being lack of funding, would the minister now consider suggestions made to him, namely, that he should provide, under the veterans housing program, a national residential rehabilitation program for veterans on fixed incomes who cannot afford to insulate their homes or bring them up to a state of reasonable repair?

Hon. Daniel J. MacDonald (Minister of Veterans Affairs): Mr. Speaker, housing, today, comes pretty well under the Minister of State for Urban Affairs who is responsible for all Canada, and anything we do in relation to housing for veterans would therefore be done under the authority of the minister. We shall have to assess whatever assistance my department is able to give and I shall be glad to see what we can do.

* * *

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order to ask the government House leader his plans for government business this week.

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Speaker, the plan for the week is easy to state. I should like to dispose of the amendments to the criminal law which will be before the House today, and complete third reading of the unemployment insurance bill and the Air Canada bill. Some bills are at various stages, either in committee or on third reading. I regard them as not possible of attainment this week, so to speak. I wish to place the bills previously mentioned before the House this week, and I would also contemplate calling the bill in the name of the President of the Treasury Board at some point this week.

Mr. Paproski: We didn't hear the last part.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, is it clear that the first two bills we shall deal with are C-51 and C-27?

Mr. MacEachen: I beg your pardon, Mr. Speaker; I did not hear the hon. member's question.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, the minister announced a number of items, but did not make clear the order in which they will be considered. Will the first two bills be C-51 and C-27?

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Speaker, the first is the amendments to the criminal law, which will be before the House today and tomorrow. If it is not completed before the end of the day tomorrow, I shall advise what the next item of business will be.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. When I asked the Prime Minister a question about the political contribution made by Canadair, he said he was reminded by his colleague the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce that Canadair at the time was not a Crown corporation. The fact is the Canadian government took over Canadair on January 5, 1976, and the reports filed by the Chief Electoral Officer show that the contribution to the Liberal party was made in the last five months of 1976. I

am not accusing either the Prime Minister or the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce of misleading the House. Perhaps the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce is more preoccupied by the beckoning voices calling from another place. But I object strenuously to the Prime Minister and his colleagues trying to put off and evade a question by giving to the House information not in accordance with the facts.

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, I am not sure if the point is a point of order, but I gladly accept the date the hon. member put forward. In that case, my first answer stands. The hon. member may recollect that I only gave those dates after hearing some information from a colleague on my left.

Mr. Beatty: That was a mistake.

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, obviously his knowledge of the facts is not as accurate as the hon. member's articulation. I repeat, my first answer stands without any argument as to date.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

ANTI-INFLATION ACT

TABLING OF REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATOR

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I should like to table copies of references to the administrator, under the Anti-Inflation Act, with respect to Perolin-Bird Archer Limited, the Wellesley Hospital, Silverwood Industries Limited, and the Arborg Memorial Hospital.

* * *

PETITIONS

ACCEPTANCE OF PETITION PRESENTED BY MR. RODRIGUEZ

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I have the honour to inform the House that the Clerk of the House has laid upon the table the fifteenth report of the Clerk of Petitions, stating that he has examined the petition presented by the hon. member for Nickel Belt (Mr. Rodriguez) and finds that it meets the requirements of the Standing Orders as to form.

* * *

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

Mr. Ross Milne (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Communications): Mr. Speaker, the following questions will be answered today: 323, 2,054, 2,636, 2,650, 2,730 and 2,752.

[Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands).]

[*Text*]

AIB—REPORTING OF PRICE INCREASES

Question No. 323—**Mr. Orlikow:**

1. How many companies are required by the Anti-Inflation Board to report any proposed price increases and how many have filed such reports?

2. What are the names of the companies who have not filed such reports?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): 1. Two hundred seventy-four companies are presently required to report proposed price increases in excess of two per cent for any given quarter. All compliance companies are restricted to raising their prices only once per quarter. As of September 30, 1976, 131 companies had filed prenotification reports with the Anti-Inflation Board. Approximately 1,000 individual applications were filed by this group of companies. Sixty-one of the companies required to prenotify had not filed reports thus signifying that they have not raised their prices by more than 2 per cent in any calendar quarter since the inception of the board.

2. See statement following.

November 22, 1976—List of suppliers required to prenotify on price increase which will result in an increase of gross revenue of over 2 per cent for the product category and who have as of November 15, 1976, not notified the AIB of such increases.

02 Chemical Companies: Canadian Liquid Air Ltd., Canadian Oxigen Limited, Liquid Carbonic Canada Ltd.

04 Financial and other services—Property and Casualty Insurance Companies: Commercial Union Group, Continental Insurance Group. Manufacturing and Service Companies: *IBM, *Canadian Corporate Management. Life Insurance Companies: *Confederation Life Insurance Company, *Industrial Life Insurance Co., Les Prévoyants, Cooperators Insurance Association, Allstate Insurance Co. of Canada. Car Rental/Leasing Companies: Tilden Rent-A-Car, Avis Transport of Canada Ltd.

04 Forest Based Industries: Scott Paper Ltd., British Columbia Forest Products Ltd., Weyerhauser Canada Ltd., Canada Flushwood Door Manufacturing Ltd.

05 Construction Industry: Great West Steel Industries Ltd., St. Marys Cement Ltd., Independent Cement Inc., Lake Ontario Cement.

09 Non-Durables: *Harding Carpets Ltd., *Peerless Rug Ltd., *Warner Lambert Canada Ltd., Ayerst McKenna and Harrison, *Lever Brothers Ltd., *Proctor and Gamble Company of Canada Ltd., Consumers Glass Co. Ltd., Gillette of Canada Ltd., International Paints, Merck, Frosst Laboratories, Standard Paper Box Ltd., *Sklar Furniture Ltd., *G.W.G.

010 Hotels: Skyline Hotels Ltd., Western International Hotels. Federal Crown Corp.: Atomic Energy of Canada Ltd., Petro-Canada.

011 Transportation Equipment: Standard Products Canada Ltd., *Douglas Aircraft Company of Canada, *Chrysler Canada Ltd., *General Motors of Canada Ltd., *American

Motors Canada Ltd., Bendix Home Systems Ltd., Motor Coach Industries Ltd., Davie Shipbuilding Ltd., *Michelin Tire Manufacturing Company Canada Ltd., *John Deere Limited, Versatile Manufacturing Ltd., *Pratt and Whitney Aircraft of Canada Ltd., Marine Industries Ltd., *Racair Ltd., AP Parts Canada Ltd., Allis Chalmers Ltd., Canadian Trailmobile Ltd., Canadian Vickers Ltd., *Canadian Fabricated Products Ltd., National Steel Car Corporation, MLW-Worthington Ltd., *Holmes Foundry Ltd. Total: 61.

---

*Suppliers so indicated have been required to prenotify only since May 24, 1976.

Some suppliers on this list are required to prenotify for only a part of their total product range.

CBC FARM NEWS

Question No. 2,054—**Mr. Schellenberger:**

1. For each year (a) 1975 (b) 1976, how much time did CBC give by radio and television nationally to farm news?

2. How much time did regional stations devote to farm news?

3. Has there been a drop in farm related programmes and, if so, for what reason?

Hon. John Roberts (Secretary of State): I am informed by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation as follows:

	Fiscal Year	English Radio	English TV	French Radio	French TV
1.	(a) 1975/76	4:00	47:30	86:40	52:00
	(b) 1976/77	11:00	47:30	86:40	52:00
2.	1975/76	1436:00	157:00	299:15	47:40
	1976/77	1869:00	158:30	335:00	148:40

NOTE: Edmonton also telecasts a 52 week half-hour program in English produced by the Alberta Department of Agriculture.

3. No.

CBC REPRESENTATIVES WHO ACCOMPANIED THE PRIME MINISTER TO LONDON SUMMIT IN MAY, 1977

Question No. 2,636—**Mr. Roy (Laval):**

1. Did CBC representatives (reporters, cameramen, etc.) accompany the Prime Minister to the London Summit in May and, if so, how many?

2. Were cameras used and, if so, how many?

3. In the transmission on the English network, via American satellite, of the interview with the Prime Minister, was any American equipment used and, if so, for what reason?

Hon. John Roberts (Secretary of State): I am informed by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation as follows: 1. Yes. One reporter each from the English TV and radio networks and French TV and radio networks.

2. One camera, owned by a contract crew in London.

3. There were no satellite feeds from London; the film was sent to Canada by air. A joint feed (CTV, CBC English network and CBC French network) was made from Paris during the Prime Minister's visit there via the international satellite. No American equipment was used.

BRUCELLOSIS

Question No. 2,650—**Mr. Cossitt:**

1. Is the Department of Agriculture aware of complaints from farmers in Leeds County and other areas of Eastern Ontario about the slow processing of brucellosis tests and, if so, what steps are being taken to improve the situation?

2. Do test results take longer than ten days to be returned to the farmer and, if so (a) what is the average length of time required (b) could the time be reduced to ten days or less and, if not, for what reason?

Hon. E. F. Whelan (Minister of Agriculture): 1. The department is aware of complaints from farmers in Leeds County and other areas of Eastern Ontario concerning delays in the processing of brucellosis tests. Delays occurred in the late winter and early spring when an increased number of blood samples were submitted to the Departmental Laboratory in Ottawa for testing. The situation is now improved and samples are being processed promptly.

2. Normally it takes longer than ten days for test results to be returned to the farmers. (a) The average length of time required is about thrirteen days. (b) The processing and testing of the samples at the laboratory requires approximately five days. The results of the test are then forwarded to the local office of the Health of Animals Branch, Agriculture Canada, for processing. The farmer is informed of the test results by mail. The time could be reduced to ten days by advising the owner of the results of the test by telephone and this is done when such a request is received from the owner.

HIGH-POWERED RADIO AND/OR TELEVISION STATION ON ISLANDS OF SAINT-PIERRE AND MIQUELON

Question No. 2,730—**Mr. Jones:**

1. Did the government participate in negotiations for the establishment of a high-powered radio and/or television station beamed into Canada and located on the Islands of Saint-Pierre and Miquelon and, if so (a) for how long (b) have the negotiations been completed (c) what part did the Department of External Affairs and the Department of Communications or any other department or branch of the government play in such negotiations?

2. What interference or interruptions is this likely to have with radio and/or television stations in Canada publicly and/or privately owned?

3. What are the details of any international conventions or agreements covering such negotiations and the establishment of such a radio and/or television station?

4. Are Canadian interests being protected in such negotiations and, if so (a) by whom (b) in what way?

Mr. Ross Milne (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Communications): In so far as the Department of Communications is concerned: 1. No. However, there were negotiations between France and Canada, which were concluded in 1971, related to television stations limited to provide coverage of the Saint-Pierre and Miquelon Islands only, using the transmission system developed in France, (which is not compatible with television receivers normally used in Canada). (a) In respect to the above noted negotiations, a Memorandum of Understanding was signed in 1971 relating to the control of the utilization

of certain television channels operating in the Saint-Pierre and Miquelon Islands and in those areas of Canada within 230 miles of the Saint-Pierre and Miquelon Islands. The establishment of this memorandum is in accordance with Article 31 of the International Telecommunication Convention. From time to time, when either Canada or France wants to establish a new television broadcasting station or to change the technical parameters of an existing station that may impact on the other country, direct negotiations are undertaken to coordinate the change. Canada is currently negotiating for two proposed new television stations in Newfoundland. The coordination of the operation of radio stations is in accordance with Article 9 of the Radio Regulations of the International Telecommunication Union and Article 35 of the International Telecommunication Convention. (b) The Memorandum of Understanding was signed on November 5, 1971. Negotiations to coordinate the establishment of new stations or changes to existing stations are undertaken as and when the need arises. To date, the following television stations have been coordinated under the Memorandum of Understanding: For France: St-Pierre (2 stations), Miquelon (1 station). For Canada: (a) In Newfoundland—CJWB-TV, Bonavista; CJWN-TV, Corner Brook; CBYAT, Deer Lake; CBNAT, Grand Falls; CBNT-2, Placentia; CBNT-1, Port Rexton; CBNT, St. John's; CBYT-1, Stephenville; CBWAT-7, Musgrave Harbour; CBNT-10, Clarenville; CBNT-26, ST. Vincent's; (b) In Nova Scotia—CBHFT-4, Cheticamp; CBHFT, Sydney. In respect to radio stations, on Saint-Pierre and Miquelon there are only two. These were established in 1955 and 1963, respectively. Since 1955, Canada has established 22 new radio stations in Newfoundland alone. Also 2 stations established prior to that date have increased power, as have several of the 22 stations. All these actions were coordinated as per 1(a). There are no negotiations underway at the present time regarding radio stations. (c) The discussions were essentially technical in nature and were conducted by officials of the Department of Communications. The Department of External Affairs, which also has responsibility for the negotiation and approval of international treaties, agreements and arrangements, provided advice and was kept informed of all developments regarding the Memorandum of Understanding.

2. If contemplated station operations are coordinated in accordance with bilateral and/or international regulations and agreements referred to above, there should not be any deleterious effect on radio and television stations operating in Canada from stations on Saint-Pierre and Miquelon.

3. As explained in 1(a).

4. Yes. (a) By the Department of Communications and Department of External Affairs. (b). In accordance with the bilateral and international arrangements referred to above, the operational and technical parameters of radio and television stations on the Saint-Pierre and Miquelon Islands must be accepted by Canada before the station is put into service.

[Mr. Milne.]

INDIAN EDUCATION

Question No. 2,752—**Mr. Smith (Churchill):**

1. Have any Indian Bands expressed an interest in taking over control of education for their Reserve and, if so (a) are monies available for the Bands to review their existing system and to plan for eventual takeover (b) are monies available for training of Band members in preparation for local control of education (c) is training available through the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development?

2. Do the provinces have legislation enabling Indian representation on school boards and, if so, which ones?

3. Does the Department have a policy regarding the building of high schools on Reserves and, if so, what is it?

4. Is the Department conducting programmes to ensure that all Indians have an opportunity to become literate and, if so (a) what are they (b) what is the present rate of illiteracy?

5. Do a disproportionate number of Indian students end up in non-academic streams and, if so, what is being done to change the pattern?

6. Is there a growing number of Indian people pursuing higher education and, if so, is the Department able to meet the financial demands this entails?

7. Are the Indian Bands involved in deciding the kind of structure they should have for new schools being constructed on their Reserves?

8. (a) How many student residences (residential schools) does the Department still own that are no longer in use (b) what amount is being spent maintaining such residences each year?

9. Has the Department built any group homes or hostels for Indian students in the provinces or territories and, if so (a) how many (b) in what locations (c) in what way does the cost compare in the operation of a student residence to that of a group home?

10. Are there any plans to transfer responsibility of post-secondary education to the Department of Manpower and Immigration?

11. What is the Department's present policy regarding the employment of Guidance Counsellors?

Mr. B. Keith Penner (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): 1. Yes, many Bands have expressed an interest in taking over control of education for their reserves. More than 35 bands are now controlling almost entirely their education programs, with the exception of capital expenditures for school construction. Many more bands, an estimated 200, are partially controlling their education programs in varying degrees between the operation of kindergartens to complete control. (a) Most regions have been able to provide limited funds for bands to review their existing educational system and to plan for functional take over. (b) and (c) The department has several methods of providing band members with training in band administration in general and for local control of Indian education.

2. Yes, the following provinces have legislation enabling Indian representation on school boards: British Columbia, Saskatchewan, Manitoba, Ontario and New Brunswick. At present such arrangements are being made to enable Indian representation on school boards in the James Bay area in Quebec.

3. The matter of building high schools on reserves is one which has been and will be under review in consultation with the Indian people. There have been a number of requests from Indian people for the extension of the grade level in their reserve schools to include high school grades. This is necessary because there are factors which must be examined by the Indian people and the department. These include small enrol-

ments, geographical areas, limited possibilities for variations in courses offered, etc.

4. The department does not have statistics regarding the present rate of illiteracy, however, the regions do arrange to provide training according to the wishes and needs of the Indian people in this area. These arrangements may include Basic Literacy and Upgrading programs which are organized by the Department of Manpower to improve the level of literacy on the reserves.

5. Numbers which would indicate the proportion of Indian students following non-academic streams in relation to the total number of Indian students at the secondary level are not readily available. However, the pattern of academic and non-academic streams changes according to the goals, needs and wishes of the students and parents. The department and the Indian people ensure, through their counselling services, that sufficient information is made available to the Indian students and their parents to enable them to select the stream which the students should follow. This being the case, the department would not be taking steps to change the pattern.

6. The number of Indian people pursuing higher education has been steadily increasing. Since 1975-76 when 3,565 Indian students were enrolled in Universities and Post-Secondary training institutions, the number has grown to over 4,000 which representes a percentage increase of over 12 per cent. To date, the department has been able to meet the financial requirements in this area.

7. While no delegation presently exists to permit Indian Bands and School Committees to plan their own school facilities, Band Councils or their representatives are consulted in the preparation of the project brief and are involved in the preliminary design work as well as in other design stages.

8. (a) Six. (b) The department is spending $403,500 annually to keep the following redundant student residence facilities operative:

Region	Student Residence		Cost	
Yukon Region	Lower Post		$ 98,000	
B.C. Region	Alberni		29,000	
Alberta Region	St. Paul's		45,000	
	Desmarais		51,000	
Ontario Region	Fort Frances		81,500	
	Cecilia Jeffrey		74,000	
	Horden Hall		35,000	
		Sub-total	$413,500	
		less	10,000	revenue from Desmarais
		Total	$403,500	

9. (a) Yes, the department has built 18 group homes in the following locations:

(b) Region	Location	Number
Yukon Region	Ross River	1
	Upper Liard	1
	Watson Lake	1
Saskatchewan Region	Onion Lake	2
Ontario Region	Moose Factory	2
Quebec	Mistassini	3
	Fort George	8
	Total	

(c) In all of the areas, with the exception of those in Quebec, the per pupil cost of operating and maintaining group homes is as high or higher than the operation of student residences in the same areas. All of the 18 group homes presently in operation are band-operated under the contriubutions to bands program.

10. The department has no plans to transfer responsibility of post-secondary education to the Department of Manpower and Immigration.

11. The current policy of the department regarding the employment of guidance counsellors is flexible. Wherever Indian people request the services of guidance/educational counsellors, the department meets their requests subject to the availability of man-years and salary dollars. However the current trend is to engage Indian social counsellors in line with the wishes of the Indian people.

[*English*]

Mr. Milne: I ask, Mr. Speaker, that the remaining questions be allowed to stand.

Mr. Speaker: Shall the remaining questions be allowed to stand?

Mr. McCleave: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege, again.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member is rising frequently under the guise of a question of privilege. At this moment it is neither a question of privilege nor is it necessary for the hon. member to so describe it. It is customary to ask, after stating that the questions enumerated have been answered, whether the remaining questions shall be allowed to stand. Hon. members have the opportunity to raise the grievance that certain questions have not been answered, but that is not a question of privilege.

Mr. McCleave: Mr. Speaker, I rise again to say there are 22 questions in the name of the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Cossitt) not yet answered, and I intend to move the adjournment of the House tomorrow to show my protest.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Shall the remaining questions be allowed to stand?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

CRIMINAL LAW AMENDMENT ACT, 1977

AMENDMENTS TO CRIMINAL CODE

The House resumed, from Thursday, June 30, consideration of Bill C-51, to amend the Criminal Code, the Customs Tariff, the Parole Act, the Penitentiary Act and the Prisons and Reformatories Act, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Before resuming consideration of the motions of the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams), seconded by the hon. member for Edmonton Centre (Mr. Paproski), perhaps I could indicate to the House, further to comments I made on June 30, what I have in mind with respect to the grouping of motions at the report stage of Bill C-51. I have some notes prepared with respect to these groupings, and in order to save hon. members some stenography of their own I can simply read them for the record and provide photo copies for hon. members to consider while they debate these motions. That will give them an opportunity to consider the matter.

As I indicated earlier, motion No. 2 standing in the name of the hon. member for Palliser (Mr. Schumacher) was to be debated and voted on separately. However, motions 21 and 22, also in the hon. member's name, are similar in nature and I intend to group them for debate with motion No. 2, so that a vote on motion No. 2 earlier referred to will, I think, dispose of motions 21 and 22. Since the grouping earlier has been somewhat altered I should perhaps review the groupings that we have brought forward for discussion up to this point.

● (1510)

Motions Nos. 3, 4, 5, and 6 will be grouped for debate and, if required, a vote on motion No. 3 will also dispose of motions Nos. 4, 5 and 6. Motions Nos. 8, 9, 10 and 11 will be debated and voted on separately. Motions Nos. 12, 13 and 14 could be grouped for debate and a vote on motion No. 12 will dispose of motions Nos. 13 and 14. Motions Nos. 15 and 16 could be grouped for debate and, if required, voted on separately.

I have since had an opportunity to have a closer look at the remaining motions and it would be my intention to group them as follows. Motion No. 17 standing in the name of the hon. member for Moose Jaw (Mr. Neil) will be debated and voted on separately. Motions Nos. 18 and 19 could be grouped for debate but would require separate votes. Motion No. 20 will be debated and voted on separately. I have already indicated to hon. members that motions Nos. 21 and 22 will be grouped with motion No. 2 for debate and vote. Motions Nos. 23 and 24 could be grouped for debate and one vote.

Motions Nos. 25, 26 and 27 should be grouped for debate and, if required, the question will be put on motion No. 25, with an affirmative vote disposing of motions Nos. 26 and 27. A negative vote on the motion, however, will require the question to be put on motion No. 26, which in turn will dispose of motion No. 27. Motion No. 28 has already been grouped with motion No. 7. Motion No. 29 standing in the name of the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Leggatt) will be debated and, if required, voted on separately. Motions Nos. 30, 31 and 32 should be grouped for debate, and a vote on motion No. 30 will also dispose of motions Nos. 31 and 32. Motions Nos. 33 and 34 could be grouped for debate and vote.

Motions Nos. 35, 36, 37 and 38 should be grouped for debate and, if required, a vote on motion No. 35 will dispose of motions Nos. 36 and 37. The question on motion No. 38 should be put separately. Motion No. 39 standing in the name of the Solicitor General (Mr. Fox) will be debated and voted on separately.

[Mr. Speaker.]

Mr. Alex Patterson (Fraser Valley East): Mr. Speaker, on the last occasion this bill was before the House I indicated that it was my desire to make a few comments on this clause, and specifically on motion No. 28. For the benefit of those who read *Hansard* and may wonder what this debate was about, as we have been dealing with other matters for the past week, I wish to read from the order paper. The motion reads:

"(2) Every order in council, regulation or form made under this act shall be laid before parliament within fifteen days after the order in council, regulation or form, as the case may be, is made or, if parliament is not then in session, within fifteen days after the commencement of the next ensuing session thereof and every order in council, regulation, or form shall be subject to affirmative resolution of parliament and shall not come into force until published in the *Canada Gazette*."

I realize that the mover of this motion, the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams), and other speakers from this party have indicated very clearly the motion and some of its ramifications. However, sometimes repetition produces the desired results. Stating my support for this motion will add one more voice to the crescendo of requests for the adoption of this amendment.

As we look at the history of this legislation, we see that many amendments have been proposed by the government. A great many were proposed by the opposition parties, but very few of any consequence were accepted by the government. I hope this one in particular will receive the support of all in this House, because it is a very reasonable and logical request when dealing with the Criminal Code of Canada.

If Canadians are to be held accountable, it is imperative that they be made aware of the provisions of the law. Under our system of government it is almost impossible for any person to know whether he or she is living completely within the law as enacted by federal, provincial and municipal governments. Therefore, it is imperative that to the very best of our ability they be made aware of the law and the regulations. I say this because of the complexity of the system under which we operate. I believe the law should be as clear and concise as possible and, as I have said, every effort should be made to acquaint the public with its requirements.

In response to comments by the hon. member for Calgary North, the Minister of Justice (Mr. Basford) stated it is imperative that police officers and customs officials know and understand the regulations so that in dealing with the citizens

they are fully aware of the law and the regulations. It is not only important for those applying the law and calling on citizens to account for their actions relative to the law, but it is very important for those who are affected by the law. Law enforcement agencies should be fully cognizant of their responsibilities under the law.

I do not think ignorance is an acceptable defence when a person is charged. I think of a young man who was driving along a highway. He had been driving that highway for a considerable number of years. He was stopped. A few days before, the speed limit on the highway had been reduced. It not only caused this person some inconvenience, but if I recollect correctly it cost him a fine of $30. That was only a minor infraction. However, when dealing with the Criminal Code of Canda, the Minister of Justice and all concerned must ensure that the law is known by as wide a section of the population as possible under the circumstances.

This amendment, which requires that regulations made under this act be laid before this parliament within 15 days, is perfectly legitimate and reasonable. As has been pointed out, when regulations are presented to parliament for consideration and decision, it adds greatly to the knowledge of the law right across the country. The very fact that this subject is being debated will at least enable others to understand what it is we are considering here. I believe this is a very reasonable recommendation. All too often the government bypasses parliament. Indeed, the passing of orders in council has become a usual method of doing so. Even though the intention is to set out regulations, I would remind hon. members that regulations are an extremely important part of legislation.

• (1520)

The opposition has been complaining because on far too many occasions when legislation has been laid before the House, much of the detail is left to be regulated by order in council, with the result that we have no say, as representatives of the people, with regard to provisions which have an important bearing upon the laws we pass. I would, therefore, ask the Minister of Justice to accept the amendment moved by my hon. friend from Calgary North. We are not asking that all orders in council that are passed should be referred to parliament. This is one of the defences the minister has put forward: he has suggested it is not practicable for parliament to undertake responsibility for considering all orders in council. I must say, though, I think it might be a good idea, if time permitted. Realizing that this is not possible, we are asking that only those orders in council passed under the bill before us should be so referred to parliament for consideration.

As I said earlier, these arguments may have been placed before the House on other occasions, but I want to express my support for them in the hope that after repetition of these submissions the minister might finally accept the view of the opposition and make the legislation more palatable; or, perhaps I should say, less abrasive, since I do not think anything which might be done to the bill would make it palatable. But at least it would not be such an imposition upon the citizens of Canada.

Mr. Arnold Peters (Timiskaming): Mr. Speaker, these amendments go well together, because if you have one you may not need the other. If a public officer is designated, you probably would not need a regulation setting up the designation. In the absence of such designation it would obviously not be necessary to pass a regulation setting out who these people were going to be. I am sure there will be instances when the department might wish to make the factor of a Hudson's Bay post a peace officer for the purpose of this legislation. Or it might be the intention to appoint those who run radio or weather stations in some of our remote areas as peace officers for the purpose of this act. But if this is the case, we should say so specifically and spell out these intentions.

I see no reason why the government should not accept some of these very sensible amendments. It would seem reasonable, to me, that the government should let us know what it has in mind with regard to the delegation of authority. If gun clubs are to be given this authority, let the government say so. As long as this is done by regulation, without the public being told what the government has in mind the only persons who will know what the regulations are will be those authorized to perform these control functions. At some point, obviously, they will have to make this information available to the public with whom they are dealing, since otherwise the entire operation would fail.

The previous speaker said he did not see much reason for not agreeing with the government that not all regulations should be made public. Mr. Speaker, I cannot think of a regulation that should not be made public, if it involves people in their relationship with the government. There is, obviously, no point in putting it under a bushel some place. I know this is a poor metaphor, but it seems to me there is no reason to hide it.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): You are getting more biblical as you get older.

Mr. Peters: It is obvious that when you are making a regulation it should be known to those of the public who are concerned. The motion does not recommend that parliament has to approve. All we ask is that parliament should know of it. I believe that if parliament knew about these things, it might sometimes make a bit of a fuss and certain regulations to which objection was taken would be withdrawn or revised.

I cannot understand the minister's desire to designate these public officers by order in council and then express unwillingness to publish the regulations. It seems to me there is no great security aspect here. Surely it is not in the interest of national security that we should keep these regulations from the general public, since without public involvement the regulations will not mean a thing. It might well be that the regulations could be referred specifically to the statutory instruments committee. Maybe they should get them all and put out a public document

which would call attention to the nature of the regulations which have been passed.

Mr. Basford: They do.

Mr. Peters: Then what is the argument against making the designation of these officers available to parliament?

Mr. Basford: They are.

Mr. Peters: The minister says they are to be made available. It is true some orders in council appear in the *Canada Gazette*. I suppose we sell some 2,000 or 3,000 copies of the *Canada Gazette*, but it would surprise me very much if more than five copies were read north of the sixtieth parallel where many of these pseudo peace officers are likely to be needed. I do not think many of the people up there are likely to be reading the *Canada Gazette*.

I should like to see this information brought before the House once a year so that we might consider the choices the minister has made and express our approval or otherwise. The hon. gentleman says he wishes to be known as the law and order minister of justice. Members of parliament might help him, possibly, by suggesting a reduction in the number of categories of people who are to be given these limited powers of peace officers for the purposes intended in the bill. Members of parliament should know who is to be given these powers and who is not. A similar point arose in our consideration of an earlier bill.

• (1530)

This legislation affects people very directly and personally, so I see no reason why the regulations should not be made public. There may well be some legitimate reason why they cannot be. For example, what happens in the Northwest Territories may be different from what happens in the Yukon, or what happens in northern Ontario may be different from what happens in other parts of Ontario. It may be necessary to have different categories. But I do not think there should be any objection to anyone knowing what the categories are and expressing their opinion on them.

I am not suggesting that we get bogged down in approving regulations, orders in council, treasury board minutes, and so on; but I think we should at least know what they provide. I do not see why the government is reluctant to be more specific in the third clause and to spell out that it will be a peace officer, a notary public or somebody else. Are police, detachment officers in the RCMP, storekeepers above a certain level, going to be given this power? If so, it should be spelled out. Whoever drafted the legislation must have had someone in mind. I am shocked by the position taken by the Minister of Justice. There have been ministers of justice before who were not practising lawyers and had no such experience. But this minister has.

Mr. Basford: Mr. Speaker, would the hon. member permit a question?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Would the hon. member for Timiskaming (Mr. Peters) permit a question?

[Mr. Peters.]

Mr. Peters: Sure.

Mr. Basford: Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether the hon. member realizes that all of the regulations we are talking about will, under the act, be made public and will, under the laws of parliament, be permanently referred to the standing committee on statutory instruments. The amendment he is debating provides, not that they be made public and referred to the standing committee but that they must be approved, each one of them, by an affirmative resolution of parliament, which is something which he just said he was not in favour of.

Mr. Peters: No, Mr. Speaker, I was not aware that we would have to affirm them, and I appreciate the minister's bringing that to my attention. The minister says they are going to be made public. Why could the regulations not be attached to the report that is made to parliament, so they could be examined in terms of this legislation? It is true that very few members ever read the *Canada Gazette*, a piece of literature which we receive but which very few of us read. I suggest that only those who subscribe to the *Canada Gazette* or to reports of the statutory instruments committee would be made aware of that information.

My point is that if the matter is left to regulation, and if we do not know what the regulations are, then they should be attached to the annual report to parliament, in which case they obviously will become known. I think it is going too far to say that we have to approve them, because if that were the case we would be doing nothing but approving regulations. The government makes thousands of regulations every day, and we would soon become bogged down. Most of the regulations which are tabled, along with reports affecting individuals, do not become known until, as a previous speaker said, someone is charged under a section of the legislation or one of the regulations. This seems unfair since they were not aware of the existence of the regulation.

Rather than leaving it to regulation, I would prefer the legislation to spell out definitely who will exercise this authority under the act. The drafters of the bill, as I say, must have had someone in mind and I should like to know who it is. Otherwise, they are deciding on my behalf at a later date.

Mr. Dan McKenzie (Winnipeg South Centre): Mr. Speaker, I am rising to speak in support of the amendment of the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams) which asks that when regulations are made they should be tabled in parliament within 15 days and then debated. This is very imperative in such matters as gun control. My support for the amendment arises from my deep concern that this government has consistently eroded the parliamentary system in Canada. The Liberal government has constantly abused the power to govern outside of parliament by regulations and orders in council. Many years ago an eminent British judge called government by orders in council the "new despotism". Since that time England has restrained itself in regard to government by regulation, but in Canada this sneaky, undemocratic and all-embracing method of pushing people around has become the Liberals' favourite method of abusing parliament.

On various occasions the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) has shown his contempt for parliament, and nowhere is it better illustrated than with the abuse of orders in council. In 1976, Mr. Speaker, there were 3,327 orders in council passed and none of them was later brought before parliament for discussion. For the same time period there were only ten orders in council in England, all of them later introduced into parliament for approval. That is a clear indication of the decline of parliament in Canada. It has been proven without a shadow of doubt that certain elements in the federal bureaucracy have used orders in council and regulations for their own convenience, without regard to public rights. The second report of the Joint Standing Committee on Regulations and Other Statutory Instruments contains carefully documented proof that Canada's parliament is being seriously weakened by orders in council.

Since this issue was first raised in parliament over 12 years ago, Mr. Speaker, parliament has been frustrated and inhibited by these abuses. In blunt terms, the Trudeau government has helped parliamentary democracy turn into an order in council dictatorship, with power firmly fixed in the hands of the executive. If we are to make a serious move to restore the right of parliament as a meaningful body to defend the rights of the public against imperial prime ministership, then we should pass the amendment moved by the hon. member for Calgary North. As we all know, an order in council can seriously alter the law within days. Since the vast majority of Canadians are not aware of these changes, it makes common sense that all regulations should be brought back to parliament within 15 days and debated. In that way the people of this country would have a better opportunity of knowing exactly what is going on.

With regard to gun control, Mr. Speaker, you will note that Bill C-51 proposes that new laws be put into effect by order in council. When you look at Bill C-51, it is surprising how vague it is with regard to gun control. Gun control should be aimed at the criminal element; but Bill C-51 could make criminals out of many responsible gun owners in Canada. In a short time, gun dealers, gun owners and even the police are not going to know which guns are restricted. That is a concern which many of my constituents, and indeed responsible gun owners from all over Canada, have been writing about to all members and especially to the Minister of Justice (Mr. Basford).

● (1540)

I seriously wonder why the government is so reluctant to draft these regulations and present them to parliament for approval. Why must they be forced on Canadians? Parliament should make laws for Canadians, and not bureaucrats. Gun control is supposed to be aimed at those who deliberately are out to break the law. Bill C-51 is on its way to making criminals out of law-abiding Canadians who will suddenly find themselves in possession of illegal weapons because they do not read the *Canada Gazette* and since this government has no intention of bringing these matters before parliament.

To govern is a trust and, like any trust, there must be an accounting. The bureaucrats who will draft the gun control regulations are not accountable to the people. Unless there is a serious change, we shall see the advent of government by regulation at the whim of a handful of people. I should like to quote from a couple of letters I received from Winnipeg residents with regard to Bill C-51. A young man who has never written to an elected member before summed up the feelings of many by writing the following:

> Bill C-51 would make many voters feel like second-class cirizens and a bit like a criminal because of their sport and hobby.

Yes, responsible gun owners are being hindered by this bill. They are very concerned about the intent of the bill. Another Winnipeg constituent wrote the following:

> Another unacceptable provision of this legislation is that it gives the governor in council power to formulate law without reference to parliament, in other words, this is open-ended legislation which could be used by individuals in power in government for many purposes completely unacceptable in our society.

Many law-abiding gun owners want to know what the purpose of using regulations through orders in council is all about. The Manitoba Association of Gun Owners stated the following:

> At the present time Bill C-51 appears to be aimed at depriving and restricting the honest law-abiding citizens of their right to enjoy legitimate ownership and use of firearms.

I contend that the time has come for the government to come clean with the Canadian people and to cease government by regulation. The motion presented by my colleague, the hon. member for Calgary North, would be a step in the right direction. It was interesting to note this afternoon during the question period that the Prime Minister was concerned about when the House was going to recess. We will not be able to recess for some period of time. The Minister of Justice must be going through a very uncomfortable period when he goes home each evening and his children ask him, "Daddy, when are we going to go back to Vancouver? I would like to have a swim at Kitsilano beach". Maybe the minister's wife and his children will have some effect on him, in which case we can all have a holiday this summer.

I should like to quote from a letter I received from Mr. L. Martynec, president of the Association of Automatic Firearms Collectors and Shooters, which outlines the concern they have. Today I received approximately 150 letters from my riding. I am here to speak up for Canadian people when they are concerned about pieces of legislation like this. Returning to Mr. Martynec's letter, it reads as follows:

> We decry the injustice of medieval witch-hunts and persecution of "heretics", yet the same principle applies in this case. Unwillingness to understand or tolerate the innocent and lawful activities of others is typical of the dark ages and should have no place in our enlightened and just society.
>
> I am therefore appealing to you, as a Canadian legislator, to give this issue judicious consideration and at the same time urge you to do everything in your power not to allow such wanton mistreatment of innocent human beings. I sincerely hope that as a result, you will influence adoption of amendments to Bill C-51 to reflect justice and common sense, thus allowing legitimate, law-abiding owners of automatic firearms to continue enjoying their innocent and harmless activity without further unnecessary harassment.

That letter expresses the feelings of thousands of Canadians. It is amazing to realize the depth to which many Canadians have studied this piece of legislation. It is commendable that they are studying various bills going through this House, particularly this one. I received a letter from Mrs. Stella Ferguson, a lady from Lethbridge, Alberta, which reads as follows:

1. The Criminal code is much too important to have any portions thereof left to order in council.

2. Why should law-abiding citizens be subject to another high-cost bureaucracy in order to obtain a fire-arms' acquisition certificate which will have little effect on crime control.

3. Competency courses in the handling of firearms should be made available before any such requirement is implemented.

4. The U.S. safety council indicates that over 72 per cent of all violent deaths—auto, falling, drowning, shooting, etc.—are related to the misuse of alcohol and drugs. Although not stated by our justice department we have reason to believe the percentage in Canada is even higher. This problem should be looked at before we consider gun control.

5. Bill C-51, despite the government propaganda, will in no way make sentences any more severe because of all the summary conviction, provisions and the leniency of our justice system that makes a mockery of any crime committed.

6. I can see no way that Bill C-51 will change our present situation by preventing suicide as any fire department or emergency service will state that prescription drugs are used in more suicide attempts than all other known means.

7. Homicides in family disputes where firearms are not handy would still occur. A majority would use other weapons, which today are used as much if not more than the firearm in this type of homicide.

8. The reasons for making a firearm restricted or prohibited are too vague. These reasons should be spelled out.

I urge you to do whatever is necessary to protect my freedom and heritage.

The minister seems to be adamant and stubborn in regard to this particular bill. It is not wanted by the people. It is not the answer to crime. I hope he will give serious consideration to accepting this amendment and let us get on with the summer recess.

Mr. Stan Schumacher (Palliser): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be able to participate in the debate surrounding these motions by the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams) concerning the regulations to be made under the proposed amendments to the Criminal Code dealing with gun control. In the first place, I find it very distasteful that we should give the government any authority to make regulations under the Criminal Code. When people think of the law, the Criminal Code is probably the prime example of law in the country because it sets out most of the crimes that have been declared to be such by the parliament of Canada. By its very nature, the crimes that are declared to be such should be very public, and before the people, so they can understand what they are not to do. They should be publicized at least in the statute books.

I am very concerned about the growing tendancy in this country, which I suppose is worldwide—or at least in all western countries—to give more and more power to the executive to make regulations governing the daily affairs of citizens, without any reference to their representatives to see whether the citizens actually approve of those actions. It is particularly important in this area dealing with criminal law. As I have pointed out, that is the prime example of law in the country.

● (1550)

Lately I have been dealing with crimes created under other statutes, and I would like to give the House an example of what can happen under the delegated authority we have given the government in many pieces of legislation passed by this House. I think it is time we stopped being so free and easy about giving the executive of this country that kind of power. I have been involved in defending the manager of an elevator in my town against charges levied against him at the instance of the Canadian Wheat Board.

These charges resulted from a change in policy adopted by the government without reference to this House. As a result of that change of policy, which was not publicly disclosed to the people involved, apparently in the view of the Canadian Wheat Board many managers of country elevators are now guilty of crimes they did not think they were guilty of when they did the things they are alleged to have done. Under the Canadian Wheat Board Act, the governor in council or the Canadian Wheat Board can make regulations. The Canadian Wheat Board does this periodically under the guise of something known as "instructions to the trade." The board sends out letters. They are not even under the seal or letterhead of the government of Canada: they are not on anybody's letterhead, not even on the letterhead of the Canadian Wheat Board. These letters are very innocuous documents, but as a result of them, if people are judged guilty of what they are alleged to have done, it can be very costly.

I submit that we should stop permitting this delegation in all areas, but we should start with the criminal law. When we deal with the Criminal Code, the law should be stated within the statute. We should not be forced to go to some other source to find out what crime may have been created by some minister of justice somewhere down the line. I suggest that the government does not really want to tell us what the regulations are. If the government was honest about this bill, it would.

I agree with what the previous speaker said. This bill is unnecessary. It is a reaction to something which has received the government's attention. There is an outcry in the country against the rising forces of lawlessness and against what has been happening under the administration of this government over the past number of years, and the government is reacting by producing this legislation. This bill is a watered-down version of legislation we had last session. That legislation was totally unacceptable. Even though it took several months of discussion in this House to convince the government that it was unacceptable, the government finally got the message. I suggest that this legislation is unacceptable primarily because it is unnecessary.

It has been my observation that most of the crimes committed with firearms have been committed with hand guns, and hand guns are not even affected by this bill. Our present controls on hand guns go back to the thirties; they are now some 40 years old. They are among the most stringent in the

world. Yet we have an ever increassing number of crimes committed with hand guns. Where in this legislation is there anything which would lead us to believe that this government—or any government of any political stripe—could be any more effective in dealing with crimes related to hand guns?

We should not be pursuing the problem with this type of legislation. I do not think the problem can be solved by legislation which purports to regulate only the honest, law-abiding citizens of the country. If gun control is so effective as a means of dealing with the abuse of firearms, why are we having more and more hand gun-related offences when we have very stringent measures on the books? This bill in no way purports to deal with that problem.

Be that as it may, we have this legislation before us. It looks innocuous in many respects, but it contains a blank cheque which the government can sign at any time and in any way it wishes. If the government were honest in what it proposes to do, I suggest it would put its intentions into legislation so that we could all see them now. Failing that, it would at least provide us with the regulations it says it is going to pass. We would like to know the government's attitude and what it is going to do with those regulations.

The amendment proposed by the hon. member for Calgary North, that the government at least lay the regulations before the House prior to their coming into effect, is reasonable. I do not understand why the government refuses to accept such an amendment. If the government's intentions are so great, why does it resist this amendment? That question should be answered. Why does the government refuse to allow this chamber to examine the regulations it wants to bring in in the future? If the government says the regulations are going to be reasonable and effective, surely it should not be afraid to bring them before this chamber prior to their affecting the population at large. I find it hard to understand the attitude of this government. The way it is behaving makes me very suspicious. I feel we should not give the government what it wants, when it will not take us into its confidence with regard to what it proposes to do.

As I pointed out earlier, there are many examples of abuses by the regulatory authorities of this country. I referred to what the Canadian Wheat Board has done. I am sorry to say that many of us do not catch everything which passes through this House by way of legislation. Until 1972 the Canadian Wheat Board Act was subject to the general law relating to summary conviction offences. There was a limitation. The Crown had to bring charges against offenders under the act within six months of infractions. Unfortunately, in 1972 this House amended that act. I must confess that I was a member of this House then. This House gave the government the right to wait up to two years before laying charges. I was not aware of that change until recently when I became involved with the case to which I referred earlier. I cite that merely to show that even those of us who are members of this House are not aware of every change in the substantive law. By extension, how can anybody be aware of what the bureaucrats are doing and what regulations they are turning out? Those regulations do not really get any publicity at all.

● (1600)

It is because of the experience I have had with the Canadian Wheat Board Act that I am very anxious to see this House compel the government to refer all proposed regulations made under the Criminal Code to the House for its consideration before they become binding on the population at large. I hope there will be support from all sides of the House for this proposition because, as I said earlier, if there is nothing to hide, why not let us see it? I certainly hope that before the debate is over the Minister of Justice (Mr. Basford) will explain to us why we cannot see the proposed regulations now, before the bill is finally accepted by the House.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Eudore Allard (Rimouski): Mr. Speaker, it goes without saying that most, if not all, fish and game associations are strongly protesting the adoption of this bill which only aims at imposing on fishermen and hunters very strict controls as to the selling, purchasing, giving, lending, using and storing of guns and ammunitions for hunting. A number of hon. members having already had the opportunity to say what they think of this bill, I shall deal only with the few aspects which I feel are of paramount importance, because they seriously affect the civil rights of individuals.

Mr. Speaker, I received recently a letter from a man who wrote, and I quote:

> This letter deals with Bill C-51 of the House of Commons and more specifically with Parts III and IV, pages 1 to 44, dealing with firearms and other offensive weapons. This bill contains many unacceptable provisions, which were also found in Bill C-83, in addition to a large number of regrettable points whose purpose and text lack clarity.

And here, Mr. Speaker, I should like to quote another letter from another man, one of the large number of letters I have received. This letter is written in English; may I be allowed to quote it:

[*English*]

Dear Sir:

> I object very strongly to Bill C-51 for the following reasons.
>
> No way should I have to pay $10 for a firearms certificate to prove I'm not a criminal or a psycho.

Mr. Woolliams: Hear, hear!

Mr. Allard:

> The law-abiding gun owner did not make the criminal or the psycho what he is. It is the government's responsibility to deal with these people and not make it look like it is my fault.
>
> Do you think just because a criminal or a psycho doesn't have a firearms certificate it will stop him from doing what he had in mind in the first place?
>
> The $10 fee is simply stealing money from law-abiding citizens.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt that this unreasonable bill reveals the centralizing purposes of the right hon. Prime Minister and the ministers who make up the cabinet. So, as some hon. members have already pointed out, while appearing

on the surface to be meant to control firearms, Bill C-51, in fact, is intended to restrict the freedom of the individual. Besides, to realize it, one need but read a few clauses of the bill, for it is more than obvious that the federal government has found nothing better to do than to restrict the civil liberties of honest Canadians. Now, to go back to the quotation:

[*English*]

Trying to sneak unacceptable gun legislation through parliament with other possible good legislation is just plain terrible government, pure and simple.

[*Translation*]

This omnibus bill is somewhat cunning because it contains some fine provisions but on the other hand, the good is mixed with the bad. Indeed, many provisions of the bill authorize police forces to undertake quite arbitrarily not to say abusively searches or seizures on the ground that individuals who are deemed to be undesirable or are suspected of having violated some provisions of the legislation have guns, ammunitions or other offensive weapons in their possession. No doubt, Mr. Speaker, that if such provisions were added to the Criminal Code, police forces could, if they wanted to do so, under the cover of the law, submit all Canadian citizens and establishments to a systematic search. In my opinion, as I said, such a bill has no place in our so-called liberal society and should not even be tolerated. It is really inconsistent with our way of living. In addition, the bill is unacceptable since it authorizes the governor in council to draft legislation without the previous consent of Parliament.

● (1610)

Thus, it could be quite possible that some members, apparently affluent in the government, use such a provision for a great number of unacceptable reasons in our society. In this regard, needless to say I consider that the discretionary powers conferred on the cabinet, through orders in council, constitute a threat, a kind of sword of Damocles over the heads of Canadians, against the freedom of the Canadian public in general.

As a matter of fact, last year, if my figures are right, out of 3300 orders in council promulgated, only approximately 600 were brought to the attention of the public in the usual way, that is in the *Canada Gazette*, the others having been kept, as far as I know, from the public. As a result, I could unknowingly commit a crime offence ignoring that such an act has just been declared illegal by the cabinet. This is in part what we, the Social Crediters, have recently done as regards a certain act concerning the financing of political parties.

Mr. Speaker, clause 88 (2) (*a*) reads as follows:

(2) Every one who is an occupant of a motor vehicle in which he knows there is a prohibited weapon

(*a*) is guilty of an indictable offence and is liable to imprisonment for five years.

And further on, we can read clause 89 (3) (*a*) in the following terms:

(3) Every one who is an occupant of a motor vehicle in which he knows there is a restricted weapon, is, unless some occupant of the motor vehicle is the holder of a permit under which he may lawfully have that weapon in his possession in such vehicle, or he establishes that he had reason to believe that some occupant of the motor vehicle was the holder of such permit,

(*a*) guilty of an indictable offence and is liable to imprisonment for five years.

This clause demonstrates the total nonsense of this piece of legislation. In fact, as we have noticed, Bill C-51 provides that "Every one who is an occupant of a motor vehicle in which he knows there is a restricted weapon is liable to imprisonment for five years". So, if someone gets on a bus with a firearm, I presume that the fifty persons aboard are all liable to imprisonment for five years. That is, Mr. Speaker, the kind of legislation that the government is offering to the population.

Besides, it should be pointed out that provisions concerning the right to appeal are really inadequate in such a bill. As a matter of fact, in many cases the accused is presumed guilty until he proves his innocence. In fact, as I have said throughout my speech, Bill C-51 contains many provisions which are altogether inconsistent with the kind of society in which we are living, let alone with our jurisprudence.

As an example, I will quote one passage of the work of Sir Guy Prowles entitled *The Citizens Rights Against the Modern State and its Responsibilities to Him*. It says that:

[*English*]

"One of the most important responsibilities the State has to the individual citizen is to provide adequate, efficient and effective mechanisms for the enforcement of his rights, even if this enforcement must be sought against the state itself."

[*Translation*]

In another work entitled *Administrative Laws*, one can read the following:

[*English*]

"The greater the power given to the executive, the greater the need to safeguard the citizen's rights against its arbitrary or unfair exercise."

[*Translation*]

And may I also be allowed, Mr. Speaker, to quote the words of Mr. Henry Puget in *The Control of the Administration*, as follows:

[*English*]

"The administration must be controlled. Its agents are subject to human weakness, to error, to bias; on some occasions they submit with too much ease to the will of the government and on other occasions, they wrongly thwart policy; the administration makes, willfully or not, mistakes in the application of laws, in the interpretation of laws or decrees which apply to it."

[*Translation*]

As one can see, Bill C-51 goes directly against what I quoted a few moments ago. Nobody will deny that it is more than necessary to control crime. May I be permitted to say that no country, and particularly Canada, has the right to pass such legislation with regard to firearms and other offensive weapons. That is unacceptable because it is inconceivable in a free and democratic country such as ours that the pursuit and punishment of culprits should come before the respect of citizens' private lives.

Before concluding, I would like to add that this bill is only going to create a number of problems for sportsmen and honest citizens in general. Indeed, the proposal to give officers

the power to determine who may or may not own a firearm is an alarming example of a philosophy of prohibiting all that is not mandatory. If this bill which I think is ill-conceived were to be passed, firearms in Canada would quite simply be limited to an elite. As I already heard some people say, it would then be easy, even child's play, for a government with delusions of grandeur to confiscate all firearms on the pretence of emergency and thus ascertain, whether people want it or not, the docility of the people. Well, Mr. Speaker, I do not mean by that that this government is already on the road to dictatorship but it is, admittedly, a beginning because every time we take a step in the direction of greater government control, we move toward a future where our children and grandchildren will have no hope.

[*English*]

Mr. Don Mazankowski (Vergreville): Mr. Speaker, I want to say a few words on the motion advanced by my colleague, the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams). I wholeheartedly support the principle of the motion. What bothers us on this side of the House is the growing propensity of government to bring forth legislation in carte blanche form which gives it blanket powers to do anything, incidental or otherwise, with that legislation. The bill before us affects every Canadian, so it is important that in this case the law be clearly defined. In his remarks, the hon. member for Calgary North pointed out that when this measure was introduced in 1976, 3,326 orders in council were passed, and of those 653 were published in the *Canada Gazette*. That makes it very difficult for those who want to live within the limitations of this law to be sure what the law is at any given time.

As I said, the government has brought many pieces of legislation into this House which point up the increasing amount of power delegated to the governor in council in terms of the proclamation of regulations and taking decisions within the framework of the legislation. There is, for example, Bill C-33, to amend the National Transportation Act, which is currently before the House. It puts a tremendous amount of power in the hands of the governor in council, to the point where it can almost dictate the modal integration of the transportation system in this country. It can almost dictate what sort of freight articles will move by which mode to a given place.

Bill C-17, to amend the Air Canada Act, is another example of legislation which places broad discretionary powers in the hands of the governor in council. In many cases the provisions of the bill are so broad that they fortify the powers of the agency, in this case the Canadian Transport Commission. We see similar legislation in the field of communications, and are told that such legislation is to be brought forward in connection with the National Energy Board. This is very disturbing to those who want to live within the law and makes it very difficult to provide a sense of stability and continuity of regulations as they apply to various sectors.

It is interesting to note that at this time when we have a serious energy crisis in this country people involved in energy, particularly oil, tell us they have to comply with 375 pieces of provincial and federal legislation in order to carry on business. The proliferation of order in council proclaimed regulations makes it all the more difficult for industry to know the state of the law under which it operates.

● (1620)

Undoubtedly the Minister of Justice finds it difficult to obtain acceptance of this bill. Its predecessor, Bill C-83, last year found little favour with rural Canadians and urban dwellers. Bill C-51 is a watered-down version of C-83, and the minister has campaigned vigorously in the hope of securing its passage during the present session of parliament.

Mr. Woolliams: He ought to have been in Camrose recently.

Mr. Mazankowski: Yes, he should have been in Camrose last Saturday to see how vigorously some people object to the bill. I understand his colleague from Crowfoot (Mr. Horner) does not view the bill with favour. I am surprised he has not spoken out against it, for the people of his constituency are not unlike the people in mine and they do not view this bill with favour. Although Bill C-51 is not quite as harsh as Bill C-83, some people still think it is an unknown quantity. We do not know what the regulations will say. As the hon. member for Palliser (Mr. Schumacher) said, at the very least the committee should have been shown the regulations as an indication of what the government had up its sleeve. Many suspect this is but the government's foot in the door.

Mr. Woolliams: The camel's head in the tent.

Mr. Mazankowski: It could lead to wider powers. It is the skeleton, the frame if you like, for orders in council, and perhaps for amending legislation in future. Therefore, we must consider this bill carefully and cautiously, especially since many people in rural areas will find compliance with its provisions difficult. The May 10 issue of *Farm and Country* had this to say on the subject in an article entitled, "Farmers fear bureaucratic rules":

> What the urban press has viewed as highly diluted gun legislation, rural Ontario seems unmoved in the thinking the justice minister Ron Basford's new measures are "just the old Bill C-83 dressed up."

Mr. Woolliams: It is a sort of tuxedo bill.

Mr. Mazankowski: Without buttons. I continue quoting:

> Main bone of contention is that the latest proposals leave so much to the whim of bureaucrats and orders in council, none of which are reviewed beforehand by the House of Commons. Wallaceburg hog farmer, Don Crowe, contends that present gun owners are being ignored, but once the skeleton bill gets passed they could be included at the first public outcry in the press.

I repeat, present gun owners are being ignored. What happened to the concept of participatory democracy so much in vogue in 1968? Some groups which wished to tell the parliamentary committee some of their concerns about the legislation and make suggestions were not given the opportunity to testify. Is it any wonder farmers like Don Crowe fear the implications of this so-called skeleton bill the provisions of which could be expanded at the first public outcry in the press? I continue quoting:

Crowe, like many sheep owners and cow-calf owners, thinks that a gun can be legal today and banned tomorrow . . . "done by some faceless Ottawa bureaucrat." He seeks gun legislation with iron-clad guarantees given farmers and other gun owners, and the removal of all orders in council provisions.

The motion before the House would not go quite that far. It would go part of the way to ensure regulations are brought before the House and published and allow gun owners and others who want to comply with the law to know the regulations. The article continues:

The ideal, besides the welcome grandfather clause offered present gun owners, is that would-be gun owners should get a police certificate stating that the applicant has no police record and is not known to be mentally incompetent.

From that point, Crowe says, the applicant is then referred to a registered gun club or group of proficient local citizens (such as off-duty policemen). This would call for the completion of a recognized firearms course, thus constituting the cooling-off period demanded by the anti-gun lobby.

"However, the government would be out of the picture. And so would the bureaucrats. Hasn't Ottawa caught on to the fact that Canadians are utterly sick of officials sticking their noses into everything?" he asks.

The article summarizes what many Canadians feel. The government intervenes too much in our ordinary businesses and lives. Frankly, when the government does not listen to representations people make on legislation, democracy suffers. Parliament faces a crisis, and the public feels ever more that the politicians in Ottawa forget the people they are supposed to serve in their constituencies. The wishes of constituents are not translated into action taken by the House of Commons. That the provisions of this bill were not fully examined in committee is a clear demonstration of that fact. If democracy, parliament and our system of government are to survive, politicians on all sides must listen to the people. Therefore, I regret that those whom this legislation will affect particularly were not given the chance to appear before the committee in order to place their views on record.

The government's manner of proceeding was clearly evident in its approach to the metric conversion legislation. Rumour has it that the government will buckle under, come to its senses, heed our suggestions and remove from Bill C-23 the provision concerning hectares. We said in January that this provision should be removed. The government said we were filibustering. We were not. We were fighting for the people of Canada then, and we are trying to do the same at present.

I point out that after the hon. member for Crowfoot crossed the floor of the House, the government tried to force this measure through on three different occasions. I thought the hon. member, on behalf of the farmers of Canada, opposed metric conversion. Be that as it may, I am glad the government, after this long and difficult fight in the House of Commons, is at last willing to sit down and negotiate with the opposition. If they had been wise enough to read and follow some of the first speeches on this legislation, they would have found our acceptance of the bill that time had they withdrawn the provision of the hectare which is very offensive to farmers, particularly those in western Canada.

● (1630)

The amendment advanced by my colleague, the hon. member for Calgary North, is worthy of consideration. Certainly, it would improve the workings of the bill. It would allay many of the fears expressed by Canadians across the country, particularly those who will be directly affected by the legislation. I hope even at this late stage the minister will see fit to accept this motion. Perhaps we might then be able to help him in some way in getting this legislation through. Failing that, we might be here debating this bill until October or even November. Someone in this parliament has to speak out for, I would not say the silent majority but a substantial majority in this country who find this bill offensive in many ways.

[Mr. Mazankowski.]

Mr. Gordon Towers (Red Deer): Mr. Speaker, I cannot understand why the minister who supposedly represents justice in Canada does not recognize it when he meets it face to face. It is inconceivable that a minister would try to railroad legislation through the highest chamber in Canada that not only is unacceptable to a large number of people but is not necessary. It is absolutely unnecessary for the Minister of Justice (Mr. Basford) to act in the unorthodox manner in which he has with this bill and the one previous to it. Members on this side of the House would co-operate with him in bringing in favourable legislation that would be for the good of all people. However, the minister has signified that he has no intention of co-operating. I do not know how he thinks he will get this legislation through the House, when it does not meet with the approval of a large number of Canadians.

I commend the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams) for bringing in this amendment. I am sure it will have the support of all clear-thinking, honest members of parliament who wish to represent their people well. We have to consider whether parliament is here to serve the people or whether the government intends to have the people serve parliament. I must impress upon this House that many governments throughout the world have collapsed as a result of adopting the policies upon which the present government has embarked. I refer to imposing itself to such a degree on large masses of Canadian people that eventually they will revolt. There is much disenchantment and frustration within the Canadian populace today because government is imposing legislation and regulations upon them which they do not want.

There are very few people in Canada today who do not want criminals brought under control. However, when you begin to regulate the law-abiding citizen into a state of frustration, you create problems for everybody, particularly the elected representatives of the people. I hope some members opposite will lend their support to those on this side in trying to bring a little common sense to the Minister of Justice. They should put pressure on him to make him change his mind so that we will not have to deal with legislation such as this.

As the hon. member for Palliser (Mr. Schumacher) stated a few moments ago, people in Alberta are being charged as a result of regulations they knew nothing about. The roof fell in on them under conditions which they were not aware existed. That is what will happen with this legislation unless it is amended as proposed by the hon. member for Calgary North. Unless this amendment is carried, people will be charged under regulations put forward by order in council of which

they are unaware. We must ask ourselves, who is serving what? Is government supposed to serve the people, or are the people supposed to serve government? Unless governments are a little more considerate, the elected officials in this House of Commons will continue to have a lot of problems.

There is a principle involved here that I hope will receive greater consideration from the government than it has up to the present time. There is a great danger in centralized control and power. Society today has only so much freedom. The more legislation and regulation imposed upon the general public, the less freedom the individual will have. The hon. member for Calgary North has spent a lifetime in the courts of Canada. He is to be commended for recognizing that the freedoms of the Canadian people are being eroded. It is the responsibility of each and every one of us to give more cognizance to the obligation of protecting the rights and freedoms of Canadians which are being eroded by regulations and legislation put forward by this government. A great many comments were made during second reading of this bill and in committee. We are, perhaps, getting to the point of being a little repetitious. However, if there is to be any justice in Canada, the Minister of Justice must recognize that the rights of the Canadian people should be foremost in the minds of those in cabinet.

I hope the minister will give greater consideration to this amendment. He should, at least, stand it for a while and consider whether it can be incorporated into the bill. The people I represent do not want any more freedoms eroded.

Mr. J. R. Holmes (Lambton-Kent): Mr. Speaker, I will be very brief in my support of the motion of my colleague, the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams). It is an issue to which I have addressed myself many times in the past. It is a very fundamental principle. I refer to the problem of regulations which in many instances are the operative part of legislation that is not seen by this House of Commons or the standing committees before the bill is passed.

● (1640)

I might say that perhaps the major ground for complaint among my constituents with regard to this measure is the difficulty of assessing its impact in the absence of regulations. This is not a new complaint; I have discussed it on other occasions. I recall specifically the debate on the animal contagious diseases act. When that legislation was before the House and discussion centred on a whole new clause related to transportation, it was impossible for either the House or the committee to arrive at a reasonable assessment of its implications simply because the regulations had not then been promulgated.

Members who read the statements made on that occasion, both here and in the other chamber, will have noted that earnest requests were made by those concerned with the legislation and with the future of the industry to have the regulations brought forward so that a more informed judgment could be reached with regard to the proposed legislation. I remember, too, that while we were dealing with the environmental contaminants legislation a number of hon. members drew attention to the desirability of having the regulations before us so that we might arrive at an accurate assessment of the impact of the measure.

I have noticed very often that legislation brought forward encompasses regulations which have been passed by order in council and were never debated in the House, yet those very regulations have formed part of bills presented to us for approval. I have no intention, Mr. Speaker, of discussing the subject in greater detail at this time, but I wish to object to the manner in which this measure has been introduced and to point out, once again, that constituents in my area are dissatisfied with the restriction which has been placed on the full understanding of the effect of these provisions by virtue of the absence of regulations which will cause them to be operative.

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

Some hon. Members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): The question is on motion No. 7 in the name of the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams), and motion No. 28 also in the name of the hon. member for Calgary North. All those in favour will please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

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

Some hon. Members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): In my opinion the nays have it. Pursuant to Standing Order 75(11), the recorded division stands deferred.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[*English*]

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Order, please. It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 40, to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles)—Transport; the hon. member for Kootenay West (Mr. Brisco)—Communications; the hon. member for Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe (Mr. Marshall)—Veterans Affairs.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

CRIMINAL LAW AMENDMENT ACT, 1977

AMENDMENTS TO CRIMINAL CODE

The House resumed consideration of Bill C-51, to amend the Criminal Code, the Customs Tariff, the Parole Act, the Penitentiary Act and the Prisons and Reformatories Act, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Order. Before calling the next item, I should like to remind hon. members that when the bill was last before us at the report stage, the House gave consent to stand certain items standing in the name of the hon. member for Palliser (Mr. Schumacher). I suggest we now turn to those items and then follow our normal practice of taking the motions in numerical order.

Mr. Woolliams: Mr. Speaker, we have had discussion with the hon. member for Palliser (Mr. Schumacher) and there is agreement that, with Your Honour's approval, we might proceed with motions 12, 13 and 14 and then move along the lines of the suggestion you have just made. I have spoken with the minister, and he has no objection to this being done. The amendments of mine which are grouped together fall into line, in chronological order, with the debate which has been taking place with reference to the regulations.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Is that agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Then we shall now move to motions Nos. 12, 13 and 14.

Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Calgary North) moved:

Motion No. 12.

That Bill C-51, to amend the Criminal Code, the Customs Tariff, the Parole Act, the Penitentiary Act and the Prisons and Reformatories Act, be amended in clause 3 by striking out lines 24 and 25 at page 24 and substituting the following therefor: "without lawful excuse".

Mr. Gordon Ritchie (Dauphin) moved:

Motion No. 13.

That Bill C-51, to amend the Criminal Code, the Customs Tariff, the Parole Act, the Penitentiary Act and the Prisons and Reformatories Act, be amended in clause 3

(*a*) by striking out line 27 at page 24 and substituting the following therefor:

"number on a restricted weapon; or"

(*b*) by striking out line 28 at page 24 and substituting the following therefor:

"(*b*) has in his possession a restricted weapon".

Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Calgary North) moved:

Motion No. 14.

That Bill C-51, to amend the Criminal Code, the Customs Tariff, the Parole Act, the Penitentiary Act and the Prisons and Reformatories Act, be amended in clause 3 by striking out lines 31 to 39 at page 24.

[The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner).]

He said: Mr. Speaker, I intend to direct my remarks today—

An hon. Member: Oh, no.

Mr. Woolliams: I hear one of my hon. friends across the way say something. I always like to hear from him because he speaks so seldom and I know when I hear his voice that it means so much to his constituency.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Which friend is that?

An hon. Member: He did not identify him.

Mr. Woolliams: I never like to identify these people because I want them to retain their deposits even if they cannot hold their constituencies. Seriously, though, in speaking to motions 12 and 14 I wish to deal with what I consider to be another important change in the jurisprudence of our criminal law. The terms of motion 12 will have been recorded in *Hansard,* but I should like to clarify what I have in mind.

Section 102, dealing with offences involving weapons, provides, "Every one who commits an offence without lawful excuse, the proof of which lies with him . . ." Let me say immediately that this is most shocking language to the ears of anyone who has ever done any counsel work as a lawyer particularly in defence of the rights of Canadians.

● (1650)

We all belong to one ethnic group or another, Mr. Speaker, and one thing I think I can say in safety, and indeed with sincerity, is that one contribution that the Anglo-Saxons made to the world was to implement a system of jurisprudence which has not only been appreciated by all Commonwealth nations made up of various ethnic groups, but also by nations that are not members of the Commonwealth. This system of jurisprudence provides that the onus of proof shall always lie upon the state. In the United States a case is referred to as "The State v. Brown," or whoever it is. In Canada it is "The Crown, for example Crown Rex v. Jones," because the Crown is the head of this nation. Whether the charge be murder or a lesser offence, the onus of proof is upon the Crown.

That principle did not evolve easily. If you go back in history and read the law of the Romans, Mr. Speaker, you will find there the beginnings of understanding and appreciation. To adopt any other system would mean that we are trying to adopt—and I say this kindly—the Napoleonic system, which means that everybody is guilty until they prove themselves innocent. Such a system is not acceptable to our party, nor is it acceptable to the lawyers of this nation or to the law-abiding citizens of the nation.

When a person is charged with an offence, it is true he has to sit in the prisoner's dock. The evidence is called by the Crown, whether the evidence lasts for one hour or day after day, as has been my experience in murder trials, and if the Crown fails to prove its case beyond a reasonable doubt, then the jury, if there is a jury, has the right to acquit the accused.

If it is being tried by a judge alone, then the judge will discharge or acquit the accused. Any other system would mean that an accused, as a compellable witness, must come forward and give evidence. A lot of people say, "Well, what's wrong with that?" What is wrong with that, Mr. Speaker, is this. Remember that when the Crown lays a charge against a person, it brings to bear on that person all its resources of money, police forces and bureaucrats against the little person of Canada who has to rely, if he or she stands alone, upon his own ability to answer the charge. Thank goodness we have gone a long way in the last few years to provide legal aid so he can have a counsel.

It is shocking to me, just as it is shocking to my hon. friend who spoke about orders in council, that a person would have to prove his innocence. That is the Napoleonic code. It is certainly not the system of jurisprudence recognized by this nation and appreciated by all ten provinces, including the province of Quebec just as much as the provinces of Ontario and Alberta. That is important. I have many French Canadian friends among the top lawyers in Montreal, and the House can ask them how important that principle of law is. All lawyers and judges in what we in Alberta refer to as our sister province of Quebec will agree that that is a sound principle. I ask the lawyers in this House who sit there in their seats to think about the kind of law which the minister is bringing forward.

I moved motion No. 14 in committee and it did not surprise the minister. I turn to page 24 of the bill, line 31, which provides:

(4) In proceedings under subsection (3), evidence that a person has in his possession a firearm the serial number of which has been wholly or partially obliterated is, in the absence of any evidence to the contrary, proof that such person has the firearm in his possession knowing that the serial number thereon has been altered, defaced or removed.

In other words, the onus would be on that person to prove that was not the case. I was rather surprised to hear the Minister of Justice (Mr. Basford) say this in the House on June 15 last, as reported at page 6716 of *Hansard:*

As I have said a number of times in committee and in this chamber, parliament has a duty to deal with this matter without rhetoric, without emotion and without politics.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I have news for him. I am going to deal with this matter with a little emotion and I am going to deal with it, I hope, with a little politics—or I should not be here. It is a very serious move indeed which the minister is proposing. As Charles Dickens wrote in "Oliver Twist", when referring to how the law reacted to poor little boys in the poorhouse, "the law is an ass".

The answer given by the minister is that this move is necessary. The minister puts me in mind of a story which perhaps I can put in its proper perspective. A few weeks ago an American came to Calgary to buy farmland. He was taken out by a real estate agent and shown a beautiful piece of land. The American said, "This is a lovely piece of land, but it is full of rocks". So the salesman said there was nothing wrong with that. He said that when the sun shines in Calgary, the rocks heat up and this nurtures the wheat. He said, "When it rains, the rocks disintegrate and add fertilizer to the grain, and that is how we get our great crops." Then the American asked, "Why have you got rocks piled up at every fence corner?" The salesman replied, "It is very simple. We have not had time to spread those yet".

This is exactly what the minister has been doing, spreading something across-the-board so far as jurisprudence is concerned.

Mr. Schumacher: He takes off with the rocks, though.

Mr. Woolliams: That could be. I hold in my hand "Cross, on Evidence", fourth edition, and I want to read a few lines from the text at page 88 which deals with the burden of proof:

The most recent English judgment on this subject—

I know our courts will agree with it.

—could be treated as authority for the view that the principle under consideration places the legal burden on an accused with "peculiar knowledge". This is a very drastic consequence where there are no statutory words pointing expressly to such a result and, as the court did not refer to the distinction between the legal and evidential burdens, it may be wise to adhere to the following statement by a New Zealand judge:

"If no evidence is given to prove the affirmative in respect of a negative averment which is peculiarly within the knowledge of the accused, then the finding ought to be against the accused on that fact. However, when the accused has produced evidence the question of the nature of the burden may require further consideration. Whether it is the same burden as that laid down for proof of insanity, or whether it is merely a burden of producing some evidence and thus throwing the burden back on the prosecution—

Then he refers to the famous case with which every lawyer in Canada is familiar, Woolmington v. Director of Public Prosecutions, an old case which says that the burden of proof shall always be upon the Crown and not upon the accused. This is the point I am making. The minister is adopting what I call a sort of slippery way of doing things. I know the farmers will be upset about this legislation. They will have the burden of proof put on them as law-abiding citizens. As the hon. member for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski) stated, we are sorry the hon. member for Crowfoot (Mr. Horner) is not here. With regard to Bill C-83 he came to see me all the time, throwing up his hands and saying it was terrible legislation. Now he has left us and everything he said has been reversed and changed because he has joined the group on the other side in more ways than one.

● (1700)

Mr. Paproski: He does not even show up in the House.

Mr. Woolliams: I don't blame him. I wouldn't show up, either. I should like to quote from page 91, which reads as follows:

There is, however, an overwhelming objection to placing the legal burden on the accused in these cases, even after allowance has been made for the fact that the standard of proof would be that appropriate to civil proceedings; it means that the tribunal of fact may be obliged to convict a person of whose guilt they are so far from being sure as to regard the probabilities of the existence of a lawful excuse as equally balanced. The danger of unmeritorious submissions of no case can be met by placing an evidential burden with regard to lawful excuse, etc. on the accused. This is the recommendation of the eleventh report of the Criminal Law Revision Committee, and it would apply to the common law burden of proving insanity placed upon the accused as well as to existing statutory burdens.

The recommended clause could of course be expressly excluded by subsequent legislation—

That is not good enough, because that is what we are facing today in the House. What are the authorities? What do they say the burden of proof is? It is a question of probability, when dealing with civil rights in civil matters. When dealing with the freedom of an individual on a charge as serious as a criminal charge, where your car or your weapon can be confiscated, as law-abiding citizens the onus is upon you. No member of parliament in this House has not had arguments and confrontations with people in departments who say, "That is the law".

If I may digress for a few moments, one of the most difficult cases I had is when I sued the Queen on behalf of a little settler in Lake Louise, Alberta, because the parks authorities took over his land and he was deprived of his rights. They can expropriate without money and without reason. The hon. member for Palliser (Mr. Schumacher) was in my office at that time and recalls the case. It took ten years to fight it. We dragged them back into court to get them to answer questions on discovery and to get them to produce documents, some of which were never produced. We finally succeeded, after ten years of fighting the state. I have always been proud of the RCMP, but when fighting a criminal case one must remember the sophistication they have in order to turn all their powers and all their technical know-how on a person who must rise in his place and say, "I am not guilty; I will have to defend myself".

Previously I said it cost $500 a day. *Hansard* reported it as $5,000 a day, and I corrected it. You need a psychiatrist to prove you are insane in a murder trial. Try to hire one at less than $500 a day. Because of the law of insanity, the onus is on the accused to prove he is innocent. In a murder trial, the onus is on them. How many people across this nation can afford that technical know-how? The state can afford it. If the state makes up its mind that it is going to lick Mr. Brown, Mr. Brown had better hustle, because he will be faced with counsel who is fearless. He must have the finances in order to afford a transcript of the evidence.

I received a bill the other day for a transcript of the evidence of a murder trial which is being appealed. It consisted of three books. What did it cost? The evidence cost $2,500. That is why I do not want the onus put upon the accused. I hope I have the support of hon. friends to my left, and I say that in the kindest manner. I hope they will support this motion on the ground that we must always protect the people to whom I have referred. It is the weak against the strong, the weak against the all-powerful state, the weak against the executive. Yet we have this legislation.

Some will say that we are paranoiac about guns. I am not talking about guns today. I am talking about legislation which happens to be in the gun section of the bill. I will have a lot to say about the invasion of privacy. Today the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) said he did not know when the Queen could open parliament, because he did not know when it will close.

[Mr. Woolliams.]

All the Minister of Justice has to do is follow the rules of jurisprudence and he will see how fast this party will move to co-operate in every regard. It is unacceptable to put in a section indicating that innocence has to be proven. I see my friend who knows something about income tax has just sat down. That same trick is contained in the Income Tax Act. As soon as they walk in on the fellow, he is guilty. They steal all his books. He cannot get them back. He cannot even give them to his accountant. He is told he has to prove himself innocent.

While I am on this point I should like to refer to a case that is going on in Calgary against a lawyer who happens to be very tenacious. He is a Liberal, and he has taken on the government by making it his life's work. I hope these words do not fall, like the parable in the Bible of the sower of seeds, on rock. I am referring to the fundamental principle of jurisprudence—a man should not be found guilty unless the evidence suggests beyond a reasonable doubt that he is guilty. What do we mean by reasonable doubt? We mean the type of doubt that the average man and woman has in everyday life, and not some airy-fairy thing.

This afternoon I was asked what this is all about. It is about freedom, and it is about liberty. If I have done anything in my life, I am proud to stand here in the House, and sometimes in courtrooms, defending people where unusual things have been going on. The truth is not always created by putting on a uniform. Human behaviour does not change with stripes or pips. Honesty exists with the little people as it does with the authorities. That has to be weighed. When the state moves in, it has an advantage because of the tendency to believe the state over other things unless you have some documentation or very strong evidence.

● (1710)

Putting the onus on the accused is beyond my comprehension. I do not think the Minister of Justice put that in the bill. With the greatest respect to him, I think the bill was drafted by somebody in his department. That was done with the Income Tax Act and it is done with the liquor acts of the provinces. If you have ten bottles of whisky in your cupboard and you are charged with bootlegging, you have to prove that you were not selling that whisky. That goes on, and that is because people became all tied up over prohibition. This law evolved over centuries of trial and error; it has not been worked out overnight. Lately we have been in the habit of making changes, but some things have stood the test of time. Some things are like rocks; they do not melt away like the stones in the story I told. They last. Human behaviour has tested the law. "Cross, on Evidence" says:

Several judgments delivered in the course of the second half of the nineteenth century indicate the existence of two standards of proof recognised by the law. They are proof on a preponderance of probabilities, the standard appropriate to civil cases and proof beyond reasonable doubt, the proper standard on a criminal charge.

How did all this come about? As "Cross, on Evidence", and "Wigmore, on Evidence" say, this did not happen one morning: it happened after centuries of testing the law as it relates to the freedom and civil rights of the individual. Anything

short of that moves us to a dictatorial state, even if we have the right of elections. It is very easy for a government to say it has a majority and, therefore, a mandate to do anything. If we rethink the mandate of the government in terms of what the government said when the election was on, we would find that the government does not really have a mandate. We on this side were damned and blasted across the country, because of our wage and price controls proposals, as people with a new economic policy which had never before been enunciated. Before the Prime Minister got back to Sussex Street, after the election they were implemented. If that was not a flip-flop, there never was a flip-flop.

Mr. Mazankowski: Zap, you're frozen.

Mr. Cullen: Don't lose your cool.

Mr. Woolliams: Don't worry about my cool.

Mr. Cullen: Not your cool, baby.

Mr. Woolliams: I know the minister was talking to the hon. member for Vegreville. The hon. member is a good friend. I know him well, and so does the minister. He is a man who is very cool, and he keeps his cool. "Cross, on Evidence" also says:

In civil cases the preponderance of probability may constitute sufficient ground for a verdict; but, in criminal proceedings which took place some seven years later, the jury were told that they must be satisfied of the accused's guilt beyond any reasonable doubt—

That was the famous House of Lords case, Cooper *v.* Slade. We can go to the Library of the Supreme Court of Canada or to any courthouse and find that the precedents of Canada since the time we became a nation have followed the jurisprudence that the onus is on the Crown and that no one can be found guilty except if guilt is proven beyond a reasonable doubt. I do not know what has come over this country. Do we want to change our parliamentary system? Our system has evolved through the centuries. Our system in Canada gives people of all ethnic origins more freedom than the systems of other countries. That freedom is found wherever we go in the Commonwealth.

Mr. Neil: It's being taken away.

Mr. Woolliams: That freedom is gradually being eroded. As the hon. member for Moose Jaw (Mr. Neil) says, it is being taken away day after day. Why cannot the Minister of Justice stand in his place today and say that we have a point and that he will accept these two amendments. Once the government makes up its mind—

Mr. Schumacher: It is like a rock.

Mr. Woolliams: Absolutely. A former leader of the New Democratic Party (Mr. Douglas) used to tell a story, which I will tell and then sit down. I have never forgotten that story. It is a good story to illustrate the kind of stubbornness we now see. A man owned a mule which would not lead, drink, feed, harness or be ridden. The man's neighbour said he was a mule specialist. The neighbour told the man to put the mule on a truck and bring him over. The first thing the neighbour did when the mule was brought over was hit the mule between the eyes with a club. The mule's knees buckled. The mule's owner said, "I did not bring him over for that kind of cruelty". The neighbour said, "If you are going to teach a mule anything, the first thing you have to do is get his attention". I want the nation to turn its attention to this legislation. I have said my piece on this very important phase of jurisprudence.

Mr. Stan Schumacher (Palliser): Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate myself with the remarks of the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams) in dealing with this group of amendments. I also want to say something about motion No. 13 because it is related. If it were not for the part of the bill which motion No. 13 attempts to correct, we would not have to debate the legal principles which were spoken about so eloquently by my friend on motions Nos. 12 and 14.

As the law presently stands, people cannot be in possession of restricted weapons on which the serial numbers have been altered, mutilated or ruined without some lawful excuse. I agree with the hon. member for Calgary North that to require an accused to carry any kind of onus where a criminal charge is involved is a wrong principle. In committee, the Minister of Justice (Mr. Basford) said the reason for this requirement was that the accused is the only person who has something peculiarly or uniquely within his knowledge, as if nobody else would know anything about a particular mutilation or alteration. I find that a rather lame excuse or justification for this type of law in the Criminal Code.

If one person kills another, and nobody else is present, I suppose in those circumstances the accused has something peculiarly or uniquely within his knowledge, but in a case like that the accused is not required to present any excuse to a court trying him on a charge of murder. Yet in a case relating to firearms, the government wishes to put that onus upon an accused. As the law presently stands, this requirement applies to people in possession of restricted weapons. I would like to have some explanation as to why this has to be broadened. I agree with the hon. member for Calgary North that it is a wrong principle. We should be deleting the provision with regard to restricted weapons that is already on the books. However, an initiative like that would probably be out of order in this debate. In any event, I certainly would not agree to extend this provision to the general category of firearms. This bill deals with restricted weapons and prohibited weapons. Why is it now so necessary to extend this crime to include all firearms, including the lowly Cooey .22 or any other weapon which is in broad, general use?

● (1720)

What is the government trying to accomplish, except to create many new, potential crimes which present no danger or problem to the nation? That is symptomatic of the whole bill. Why does the government wish to create a great number of new crimes, some that are announced in the bill and many of which will be created by the stroke of the pen of some

bureaucrat about whom we do not even know, when there is no clear or present need for the creation of that crime?

The minister did not say anything in the committee. The only thing he said was that we are extending it from restricted weapons to firearms in general. There was no documentation as to why this was necessary. I am getting a little tired of having to deal with measures before the House creating new laws which will result in a bigger bureaucracy for no apparent reason. Don McGillivray of the Southam News Service recently wrote an article stating that about half the population of this country is dependent on governments, primarily those people who are employed by governments at all levels. Of course the federal government is the leader in the explosion of bureaucracy in this country, and unfortunately provincial and municipal jurisdictions, school boards, hospital boards, look at the great example of that wonderful, efficient, federal government!

It is efficient at spending our money and wasting it. Now it comes along with more laws, for less reason. In the process, the government is depriving the citizens of freedom of movement in this country. I am getting sick and tired of this, and I would like to hear some reason for these measures. All they will do is make it easier for the bureaucracy. The government does not even have the courage to tell us what it wants to do.

Mr. Peters: Make it easier for the police.

Mr. Schumacher: But the police seems to have plenty to do now, without our giving them more jobs to do. I am hoping the minister will have something to say about this further encroachment on the rights of ordinary citizens to exercise what they have grown accustomed to as a way of life in this country. I am distressed by the fact that we are becoming more and more regimented for no good reason. Therefore, I urge all members of the House to examine the bill more closely.

In my remarks earlier this afternoon I noted that Bill C-51 is now being sold as a greatly watered-down version of Bill C-83, and because of that we are told should let it go through without any discussion or even examination. Certainly, the committee did not spend much time on this bill. I was fortunate to have attended two or three meetings of the committee, but there was a real steamroller in that committee not to hear witnesses. Certainly, in the clause by clause discussion very little time was allotted by the government to consideration of the various provisions of the bill. There was no justification given by the minister. All he said was that he wanted to amend the provisions to include firearms in general instead of only restricted weapons.

Why can we not deal with restricted and prohibited weapons? The government wants to further regulate the use of weapons. Instead, we find a great expansion of the application of the gun control legislation to include all types and forms of firearms. No evidence has been given as to the necessity of taking such a step. So I urge all members to examine this legislation before giving it quick and easy passage, because I think hundreds of thousands of people in years to come will be pointing their fingers at us if we do not do something to bring the expansionary ideas of the bureaucracy in the Department of Justice under some control at this time.

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, may I just say a word on this? It has been suggested that this clause brings into the law some new and remarkably dangerous concept. May I point out that section 102(3) of the Criminal Code, which has been in effect for many years, provides:

> Every one commits an offence who, without lawful authority, the proof of which lies upon him,
>
> (a) alters, defaces or removes a serial number on a restricted weapon—

That concept has been in the law for a long time. The only change proposed under Bill C-51 is that firearms be included, making it an offence to deface, alter or obliterate the serial number of any firearm. The policy reason for changing the wording from "restricted weapon" to "firearm" is that when the initial section 102(3) was written, many long guns did not carry serial numbers when they were manufactured. Now, in the bill, we propose a provision relating to long guns, in the interest of the safety of the public. It would seem to me wise that long guns also be covered by a section prohibiting the obliteration of serial numbers, as in motor vehicle acts where you have a prohibition against obliteration of engine numbers.

In fact, in a recent meeting with members of a gun club they told me they could not figure out why this clause was limited to firearms. They wondered why there was not a general prohibition against the obliteration of serial numbers on any article, be it a restricted weapon, a firearm, a television set, a refrigerator or anything else, because obviously in those cases—I would imagine in all cases except those involving the repairing of an article where the removal of the serial number may be necessary—the removal of a serial number is done for some criminal purpose. So let us first be clear that the only change in this clause is not the introduction into the Criminal Code of some new concept shifting the onus, but is simply a change from a prohibition against the obliteration of serial numbers on restricted weapons to one covering all firearms.

Second, this is by no means a new concept. I wish the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams) had read the evidence more carefully, because the concept is discussed there and it shows that this provision does not shift the onus to the point that the accused must prove his innocence. Under this clause, and under sections of the Criminal Code where these presumptions are used, the onus is still on the Crown to prove its case against the accused beyond a reasonable doubt. That standard of proof which is common to our criminal law prevails under this clause, as it does in other sections.

● (1730)

Obviously where there is a matter that is uniquely and peculiarly within the knowledge of the accused it falls upon the accused to prove it if it is to be used as a defence. The Crown cannot put forward that excuse. If the defence to murder is insanity or drunkenness, for instance, the Crown cannot put forward that defence; only the accused can. The hon. member for Calgary North cited Cross and a case from New Zea-

land—which I have not read— to the effect that where there is a defence, the accused has to prove that beyond the preponderance of probability. At that point the onus shifts to the Crown to prove its case beyond a reasonable doubt. That is the standard that applies at the beginning of the case and at the end.

To suggest that this is a new concept is wrong. It occurs many times in the Criminal Code. In Section 237, for instance, concerning care and control of a motor vehicle, when the driver's seat is occupied, there is a presumption it is being occupied by the driver who has care and control of the vehicle. Section 254(4), on a charge of bigamy, the accused must establish that the previous marriage was invalid. Section 306(2), in evidence of breaking and entering, where there is prima facie proof of intent to commit an indictable offence; there is a presumption against the accused, as in the case with Section 307(1), relating to entering a dwelling house. Section 197 contains various presumptions against an accused relating to the dependency of women and children where the charge is failure to provide necessities. Section 322(2), fraudulently obtaining food and lodging. Section 233(3), hit and run—failure to stop is prima facie proof of intent to escape liability. Sections 391 and 392, negligently setting of fire. Section 180, relating to disorderly houses and gaming houses—presence of a slot machine leads to a presumption that the place is a common gaming house. Section 195, there is a prima facie presumption relating to living on the avails of prostitution. Section 298(3), the burden of proof is on the accused relating to cattle rustling—and there are many other such sections. They are put into the criminal law where there are matters which are uniquely and peculiarly within the knowledge of the accused.

In each case there is a presumption; in each case there is a defence to be raised by the accused at which time the onus is clearly on the Crown, as it traditionally always is, to prove that the defence is not right and that the accused should be found guilty as charged.

This amendment is not a new concept. All it does is substitute long guns for restricted weapons, for the reason I indicated. Long guns are now made with serial numbers and are used in the commission of crimes, and particularly the crime of murder. In a number of instances the serial number is useful in identification and in the investigation and solution of crime. The concept is not a new one as suggested by the hon. member.

Mr. Doug Neil (Moose Jaw): Mr. Speaker, I should like to associate myself with the remarks of the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams) and the hon. member for Palliser (Mr. Schumacher). I listened with considerable interest to the minister who said that this is not a new concept. There is no question about that, but it is certainly an attempt by the government to extend a concept.

It has always been a basic principle of common law—the law that we use in our courts—that the onus of proof lies upon the Crown and that an individual is considered innocent until proven guilty. A few years ago the concept of reverse onus was smuggled into our law in order to restrict the rights of individuals. It used to be very rare.

I recall when a reverse onus clause was smuggled into the vehicles act in the province of Saskatchewan a number of years ago. It came as a shock to judges and to solicitors practising law that the basic principle of our common law could be altered to make it a requirement that the person charged should prove his innocence. Over the years more and more reverse onus clauses have been written into the law. The result is that the state has been taking away the basic freedoms of the individual citizen. One of the reasons given for this is that it makes it easier for the police to prove their case in court. There is no doubt that is so, but my understanding is, and always has been, that individual freedom is basic and foremost in a democracy, and that this freedom ought not to be taken away.

In most cases the Crown does not have any difficulty proving a case where the burden of proof rests on it. It is required to prove beyond a reasonable doubt that an accused person is guilty, but with the reverse onus, that is not so. That is what disturbs me so much, not only with this particular amendment but with many of the laws on the books today. There has been an erosion of our basic freedoms and if we, as parliamentarians, allow the government to bring in more and more of this type of legislation then we, especially on this side of the House, are not doing our job if we do not voice our concern and let people know what is happening.

I should like to make a few comments on motion No. 13 to amend Clause 102(3), which extends the offence to include what they call firearms. Previously it referred to restricted weapons.

• (1740)

At present there are several million long guns in the hands of people in this country. Many of them are old, without a serial number. Many of them have been in the owner's possession many years and the serial number has worn off or been obliterated, perhaps when the gun hit the side of the car. Often, if you want to mount a telescopic sight on your long gun, you obliterate the serial number or deface it when you screw the mount on. I venture to say you will find hundreds of thousands of guns in this country on which the serial number is worn off, indistinct, or obliterated, possibly because work was done on the gun.

I foresee this situation arising: one may be hunting in the fall and one of those keen game wardens who check your hunting licence, count the number of ducks or geese you have shot, and so on, will ask to see your gun's serial number. If it is worn off or defaced, I can visualize the gun being seized and possibly a charge being laid. If I could see any reason for extending the section to cover other than restricted weapons I might be prepared to consider supporting it, provided there is no reverse onus.

Guns in this country at present are not registered. There is no record anywhere of their serial numbers. If you could trace by its serial number a gun used in a crime, I could see some

point to the exercise. However, since there is no record of the serial numbers of guns, what is the use of this provision? What is the good of the serial number registration provision, unless the government's ultimate aim is to force the registration of every conceivable kind of gun people in this country possess? If it intends to do this I tell you, here and now, the public of Canada will not accept such a system.

In closing I suggest that if members on both sides of the House were to read carefully the clause of the bill we are discussing, the speeches of the hon. member for Calgary North and, of the hon. member for Palliser, and some of the other speeches which will be made on this part of the bill, I am satisfied that they in all good conscience will not be able to support the bill as presented by the government.

Mr. Robert McCleave (Halifax-East Hants): Mr. Speaker, I am emboldened to take part in this debate because the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams) in his remarks dealt with certain principles established in law, and the best the Minister of Justice (Mr. Basford) could do to refute that argument was point to some bad practices which have grown up in the law. Therefore this House, on this question, must decide between principle and practice. I suggest that simply because the government has been able to follow certain courses in the past, perhaps in circumstances which should be judged on their exceptional merits, it does not mean a bad practice is a good precedent to be followed in drafting an amendment to the criminal law or in running the administration of justice. Therefore I must come down squarely on the side of the hon. member for Calgary North with regard to the amendments moved.

In some respects the government has cleaned up its act, as it were. Some of the important powers originally set out in Bill C-83 have been corrected. Nevertheless certain other clauses disturb me, for example the powers to be granted to local registrars, with which I will not deal now. Perhaps we could deal later with some of these powers when we consider the relevant clauses of the bill. Here and now, for reasons eloquently put forward by the hon. member for Calgary North and capably argued by the hon. member who just resumed his seat, and others, I must come down on the side of the angel, principle, rather than that of the devil, expediency.

Mr. Gordon Ritchie (Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, may I speak on the group of motions now being debated, particularly on motion No. 13 standing in my name, which reads:

That Bill C-51, an Act to amend the Criminal Code, the Customs Tariff, the Parole Act, the Penitentiary Act and the Prisons and Reformatories Act, be amended in Clause 3

(*a*) by striking out line 27 at page 24 and substituting the following therefor:

"number on a restricted weapon; or"

(*b*) by striking out line 28 at page 24 and substituting the following therefor:

"(*b*) has in his possession a restricted weapon".

The government apparently wants to smuggle in its registration provisions by the back door. Of course there was such a huge outcry against Bill C-83 exactly for this reason—the government wanted all gun owners to register their guns. Considering all the guns people of this country own, the registration of all guns would be a horrendous job. Apparently the government is looking to the day when it can force all gun owners to register their guns.

The minister says he sees nothing wrong with the clause we are considering. Why include it in the bill if you do not want to cast your net a little wider and make your mesh a little finer? In effect the government says, "If one provision is not effective, perhaps another will be."

I object to the reverse onus which stems from the Napoleonic code. We rejected that code in Canada, for under our criminal law a person is innocent until proven guilty. Obviously, according to the government's thinking, people charged are presumed guilty and must prove their innocence. This reverse onus, this espousing of the Napoleonic code's attitude, is not to my liking.

• (1750)

Why this registration when the minister says that nothing will be changed? I have three guns, a shotgun which I bought 25 years ago, a carbine which was given to me 15 or 20 years ago, and one I bought last summer. I do not know where the serial numbers are on them. They could have been tampered with. Someone may well have filed them off. At various times I have carried them in my car. They could be changed by anyone who wanted to change them.

Anyone who has tried to decipher numbers from farm machinery or other metal surfaces knows that it is possible. Any letter or number can be changed. Many people have made mistakes with a five, three or eight. They can be removed by rust. With a scratch you can easily change a three to an eight, a five to a three, a seven to a one, or a one to a seven. Serial numbers can easily be changed in that way.

Any game warden, game guardian or anyone else who would like to get at a certain person could do so under this clause. That person could always say that the number had been changed. I do not know who could prove him wrong. He could always say that a particular number looks as though it had been changed.

Game wardens and other authorities will be able to increase the number of convictions by merely saying that the Criminal Code has been changed. For what reason is this being done other than to pave the way for gun registration in the future? That has to be the only reason. Crimes are not proved by gun registration numbers, but by ballistics tests. If the minister is sincere, he will say that he intends to institute gun registration some time in the future.

The minister said in committee that he is extending this to all firearms, and there is no new concept here. Instead of only applying to retricted guns, it is extended to all firearms. The policy is that the lawful excuse is something uniquely within the knowledge of the accused. That is Napoleonic code thinking, saying let us make the individual guilty and let him prove his innocence. That is a lot easier than the other way around.

A restricted weapon is a lot different than the so-called long guns. The minister is not letting us in on what he and his department heads are thinking. It is a great deal different trying to compare changing the number on a gun with running a disorderly house or some of the other things the minister suggested the bill is designed to prevent.

The minister has not put forward a very good defence for his suggested change. If he does not intend to have registration, what good is this clause? Obviously it will not help to catch criminals. It will open up the way for a law officer to get at somebody without having to prove some more serious infraction under the law.

I am not a lawyer. I have no training in that field. However, I feel this amendment will help to make the bill a little more reasonable. If accepted, we will not have the situation where a person has to prove his innocence rather than the other way around.

I hope the House will accept my amendment and that the minister will see his way clear to change his thinking. Obviously he is intent on increasing the hold which government has on people, controlling them in this area. I feel that control in this area is far too widespread.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Order, please. It being six o'clock, I do now leave the chair until eight o'clock later this day.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 8 p.m.

Mr. Ritchie: Mr. Speaker, before the supper hour I was speaking to the amendment I have presented. I should like to add that, after reading what the minister had to say in committee, it is obvious he has not taken the House into his confidence. He said then:

> The reason is obviously a practical one in that the authorities, coming upon someone with a firearm on which the serial number has been changed, just as a matter of practical investigation have absolutely no way of determining whether it was in his possession with lawful excuse.

This appears on page 22:40 of the Minutes of Evidence before the Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs on June 16 of this year. He is indicating that somewhere down the road he expects to use this power, and the only way it would be useful to the authorities is through the registration of guns. It would be almost impossible to prove that someone has unlawfully erased a mark or changed a bolt for his own benefit.

The House would do well to consider what the hon. member for Calgary North said, as recorded at page 22:42 of the proceedings of the same committee:

> I think this is the little thing that finally smoked out what the philosophy of the department is. Do you know what most people, the wildlife people and the gun owners, believe? That this Bill C-51 which got watered down after they opposed C-83 so violently, is like the camel in the tent; once he gets his neck in, you are going to have him all in the tent.

I believe the minister intends to press on with gun legislation at some point. I should like to register my objection, and I hope the House will see fit to pass this amendment. At least it will provide some small degree of protection so that if gun registration does come about it will come about in an honest manner, not by way of back-door tactics.

Mr. Gordon Towers (Red Deer): Mr. Speaker, on rising to take part in this debate in support of the amendments put forward by my hon. friends I wish to make a few remarks, a few comments, relative to the statement made by the minister this afternoon. The minister was not very convincing when he tried to argue that when a person was charged he did not have to prove his innocence.

I could illustrate for you an incident with regard to income tax, where the Income Tax Department contacted one of my constituents and asked for information. The information was sent in with regard to the income of the individual, but the Tax Department took no cognizance whatsoever of the reply and went ahead and assessed him for the tax. In turn, the individual had to hire accountants to protect himself and, even though he was not guilty of an offence or any violation of the income tax law—it was just that he had been assessed wrongly—he still had to prove his innocence. The same thing would happen if this provision were enacted. If an individual is charged, unless he wants to plead guilty he has to prove his innocence.

I am not a lawyer, just a layman, but I can see what is going on in our society today. In a great many cases people plead guilty because it is easier and cheaper to do so than to fight a case. To me, Mr. Speaker, that is not justice and it is why, as I said earlier today, I am wondering whether justice has vacated our land entirely, with the Minister of Justice (Mr. Basford) continuing to bring in legislation whereby individuals have to prove their innocence when they are charged with an offence.

● (2010)

It seems to me that somewhere along the line either the House of Commons or this legislation is lacking in common sense. Surely in this day and age of abundant technology we have the intelligence to put in place legislation which will be of benefit to all rather than infringe on the rights of individual Canadians.

As I said earlier, the Minister of Justice was not convincing in his argument this afternoon. I am sure that if he were in one of our courts in Canada and approached the issue in the same manner as today, he would not win many cases. I plead with members on the government side of the House to talk to the minister to try to impress upon him that this is not the way to put forward this legislation.

If the legislation were going to control the activities of the criminal, there would be less opposition to it, but there is no guarantee that legislation such as this will do so. Further, those who are charged, whether law abiding or not, will have to prove their innocence.

At page 24 of the bill section 102(3) provides:

Every one commits an offence who, without lawful excuse, the proof of which lies on him—

It behooves the minister, in fulfilling the commission which has been placed upon him, to bring in legislation which will be beneficial, not detrimental, to the Canadian people. I hope the minister will take a second look at this question. I do not think he has been at all convincing this afternoon; indeed I do not think he even convinced himself. He simply used a little rhetoric in trying to make a case. I urge the minister to stand in his place and accept the amendment put forward by my colleague.

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

Some hon. Members: Question.

Mr. Bob Brisco (Kootenay West): Mr. Speaker, I am sorry I was not in my seat at the time. I would not like the House to think—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Order. Is the hon. member rising on a point of order or to debate the motion?

Mr. Brisco: To debate the motion, Mr. Speaker. I am sorry I was not in my seat at the appropriate moment, and I would not want the Speaker to think for one moment that I was receiving tuition or coaching from my expert and knowledgeable friend, the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams). However, there are a couple of issues I want to clear up.

The concerns being expressed by members on this side of the House in regard to this amendment, or more appropriately these amendments taken together, are virtually the same as those previously expressed on an earlier amendment wherein the question arose of government by regulation. On the one hand we have government by regulation; on the other hand we have, in effect, not government by regulation but guilt by association. A person has to prove his innocence.

Under Canadian and British criminal law, as opposed to the Napoleonic code and as opposed to civil law, there must be guilt beyond reasonable doubt. In terms of reasonable doubt this means that the clinician in reaching a diagnosis bases it on a multitude of facts, signs and symptoms, laboratory tests and so on. In reaching the conclusion that a particular project can proceed, an engineer bases his conclusion on sound engineering principles, the laws of physics and so on.

However, according to this bill a person is guilty first and must prove his innocence second. Regardless of the rhetoric in which this provision is couched, that is clearly the antithesis of what we consider to be proper criminal law according to the British system. If the government is interested in adopting Napoleonic law, as we are to infer from this particular clause, then I suggest that it openly declare that that is where it stands. But as it stands now this is wrong.

[Mr. Towers.]

In addition, the government has, by accident or design, tied in this provision with the firearms legislation or the regulations that follow in subsequent clauses. However, the term "firearm" is very broad. If one takes the trouble to go to the beginning of the bill and reads the broad definition that now applies, we are surely sweeping with a very broad brush; and I suggest that someone who in all innocence may be walking the streets at 11.30 at night will suddenly find himself assumed to be guilty of some offence.

In terms of Napoleonic law, Mr. Speaker, I am reminded of a circumstance that occurred some years ago when W. A. C. Bennett was premier of British Columbia. A deputy minister of one of the government departments had the inclination to walk down a street in Quebec City, minding his own business, out for an evening's stroll. All of a sudden he was set upon by a couple of policemen. In the first instance there was, unfortunately at that very moment, a language barrier, and let us hope that that barrier has been reduced. At that time that barrier was very clearly there. The man had proper identification which proved beyond any reasonable doubt that he was a senior official of the government of the province of British Columbia. Yet, because he had some vague resemblance to a wanted criminal, he was dragged bodily into a police car.

● (2020)

He was beaten, harassed, questioned, and received all kinds of maltreatment and held in jail over night. Finally, he was released some 24 hours later. That is the kind of law I abhor. Whether it is the province of Quebec, British Columbia, Prince Edward Island or any other province in Canada, or any city in Canada, I abhor the manner in which that whole case was ultimately dealt with. The police department did not want to apologize for their conduct. They did not want to acknowledge that they had made a mistake. An apology was dragged out of them. Is that the kind of law we want in this country?

I realize I have digressed, but I have demonstrated a point. If the government is interested in Napoleonic law, let it go on the record and say so and change a few other clauses in this bill to further demonstrate its concern and its desire. Otherwise, let us see the minister develop some common sense and good judgment. Let his officials advise him that he is not going to get anywhere with this bill, with this kind of nonsense.

Before I sit down, I should like to say that similarly this minister is not going to get anywhere with this bill until he sees some reason with reference to wiretapping legislation.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Elmer M. MacKay (Central Nova): Mr. Speaker, I just wish to add my voice to those of my colleagues on this side of the House in regard to this particular motion by expressing a great amount of dismay concerning the language used by the people who drafted this clause. Subclause (3) reads as follows:

Every one commits an offence who, without lawful excuse, the proof of which lies on him

(a) alters, defaces or removes a serial number on a firearm; or

(b) has in his possession a firearm knowing that the serial number thereon has been altered, defaced or removed.

It has been very alarming in recent years to see the encroachments which have been coming forward on the doctrine of reasonable doubt. We have seen it more and more in provincial statutes where a quasi-criminal law has been changed by legislators to exclude the traditional safeguards of a person not being forced to prove his innocence. It has always been up to the Crown—he who asserts must prove, type of thing. It was alarming enough when we saw it in provincial statutes or in municipal bylaws or some other less than criminal jurisprudence. But to see it in a piece of legislation which is causing such consternation across the country, is a very, very regressive step in criminal law jurisprudence.

When looking at this particular language one can only assume the proof of innocence has to be beyond reasonable doubt. In other words we have a complete reversal of the traditional safeguards for the individual. It is not the balance or probability standards which one sees in civil litigation; it is a complete perversion of the British criminal law tradition. Any person is innocent unless he is proven guilty beyond a reasonable doubt. To take this kind of Draconian measure and to reverse or completely change such a fundamental precept of criminal jurisprudence, with the object in mind of simply punishing someone who has in his possession a firearm knowing that the serial number thereon has been altered, defaced or removed, and then to say the only way to satisfy the authorities that this was not done in a culpable way, has to be accomplished by the person charged proving beyond a reasonable doubt his innocence—I do not see how any member of parliament can sit in this place and allow this legislation to be passed by this hallowed institution. As has been said by the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams) and my other colleagues, this particular provision alone would justify any member of parliament, who has the most commonplace respect for some of our legal traditions in this country, in voting against this piece of legislation.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Arnold Peters (Timiskaming): Mr. Speaker, I have listened to the argument put forth by the minister and by a number of other hon. members. It would be very simple to change this argument by removing this business that the proof of innocence lies with the person charged.

I remember an incident which happened to me not too long ago. I had a flat tire and I was having difficulty getting the tire off my station wagon. I do not know what the problem was. Perhaps it was because it had been on for years. The provincial police stopped and assisted me to take the tire off with a crowbar. In doing so, they noticed the tire was stamped "DOT", which is the Ontario government department of transport. One is not supposed to have those tires on these cars. They were suspicious of where I got the tire. I was able to inform them the whole car came from DOT. I had bought it from them at an auction sale. The other tires on the vehicle were stamped "DOT" as well. It is true, therefore, that in many cases you have to prove you are not responsible for something.

Someone mentioned that you should know if the numbers are changed on your motor vehicle. I do not imagine there is a member of parliament who has ever looked at the serial number on his car to see whether it has been altered or not. In fact you have to look in the book to tell where the serial number is.

An hon. Member: Look just under your windshield.

Mr. Peters: That is not the serial number of the motor and it is not the serial number of your frame. That is the registration number. Those who are very, very wealthy members, like the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles), and who have reasonably new cars—

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Order, order!

Mr. Peters: That has only been put on very recently.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) on a point of order.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. My car is two years old.

An hon. Member: And a Cadillac at that.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): It is a Chevy Nova.

Mr. Woolliams: You were the first one to buy a Seville.

• (2030)

Mr. Peters: That is brand spanking new compared with some of the vehicles I have.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): How many have you?

Mr. Peters: Five or six, but—

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): As you were saying—

Mr. Peters: As I was saying, most people have not looked at that. It may be true that you should know whether you are buying a stolen car because usually stolen cars are sold at bargain basement prices. However, if you buy it from a reputable dealer, it might be the same price as any other car, and you will not know—you may even drive it for a long time—that it was stolen. I do not really think you should get into very much trouble if you bought the car without knowing it was stolen and had no reason to believe it was stolen. You did not make the disfigurations on the numerical designation of the car, so it can be proved that you are innocent.

I think there are shotguns on which there are not yet numbers, and I do not believe any of the old Winchesters have numbers. Some certainly have not, but I do not think most people look to see whether there are serial numbers. I know it is important to collectors that the serial numbers on all parts

of a gun be the same, but whether the numbers on the parts are the same as the serial number of the gun, I am not sure.

In many cases people will not look for those numbers. Gun may change hands many times, and when a person is accused of having an illegal gun because numbers have been erased, that will come as a surprise because that person will not have looked. People look to see how straight the barrel is, they look at the sights, they look to see whether the gun fits the shoulder and so see if the face plate is in the right place. They look at a number of things, but as a rule I do not believe they look at the serial number to find out whether it has been changed.

While the minister is right that much of our legislation falls into the same category as this, that does not make this legislation right. If someone wishes to lay charges against someone for having changed numbers, that fits into a different category. That is usually done for a fraudulent reason, to cover a theft or to do a number of other things, but it does not seem to me to relate to whether a person has a gun or not. While the minister is right that this has been fairly commonplace in a number of other bills, I do not think it makes it right in this case. A police officer should be required to tell an alleged offender: "You have committed some kind of an offence, and we are going to prove it".

An alleged offender should not have to say that he bought his gun from a little old lady who was handy with a file, or something of that nature. That can be established by the person laying the charge. That is the way most law works. That is the way most Canadians think it works, and it seems to me that everything we are trying to do in this bill is going to make it easier for the police to harass people. Even if they harass people only to get them to prove that they did not commit offences or that they did not know they were committed, that is still harassment, and that will really not help the police very much. This bill would allow the police to make everyone prove that they are innocent.

How are police officers going to examine guns in the first place? Are they going to go around looking at everyone's guns? That would be an immense harassment. They really should have some reason for doing that, and if they have a reason for doing it, the reason should not be harassment. It seems to me that everything in this bill is as much for harassment as it is for people who believe in law and order, or for people who believe we should take guns away from everybody in this country.

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

Some hon. Members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

[Mr. Peters.]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

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

Some hon. Members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Pursuant to Standing Order 75(11) the recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

Mr. Woolliams: Mr. Speaker, if it is all right with the House, it is my understanding that we are now going to proceed in chronological order. We did get out of chronological order because there was an agreement a week ago Thursday with reference to two amendments, the one on orders in council and the one on notice, which we have now covered. However, we will now go in chronological order according to the members, if that is agreeable to the House.

Mr. Schumacher: Mr. Speaker, I think motions Nos. 13 and 14 should be called because they were grouped and debated together with motion No. 12.

Mr. Basford: They have been called.

Mr. Schumacher: They were called together?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): They were called at the beginning. Motions Nos. 12, 13 and 14 were grouped.

Mr. Stan Schumacher (Palliser) moved:

Motion No. 2.

That Bill C-51, An Act to amend the Criminal Code, the Customs Tariff, the Parole Act, the Penitentiary Act and the Prisons and Reformatories Act, be amended in Clause 3 by striking out line 16 at page 4 and substituting the following therefor:

"collection of a".

Motion No. 21.

That Bill C-51, An Act to amend the Criminal Code, the Customs Tariff, the Parole Act, the Penitentiary Act and the Prisons and Reformatories Act, be amended in Clause 3 by striking out line 4 at page 32 and substituting the following therefor:

"the applicant who is a gun"

Motion No. 22.

That Bill C-51, An Act to amend the Criminal Code, the Customs Tariff, the Parole Act, the Penitentiary Act and the Prisons and Reformatories Act, be amended in Clause 3 by striking out lines 19 to 22 at page 32 and substituting the following therefor:

"collection of the applicant who is a gun collector".

He said: Mr. Speaker, these three amendments have to do with the position of collectors of firearms. The amendments are designed to permit continuation of gun collections. The intention of the government in this bill is to phase out gun

collections which contain certain types of firearms, primarily those of the automatic variety.

When the matter was discussed in committee there was some concern that it is not quite proper for those who have collected certain types of firearms to be unable to pass on those collections by way of bequest or otherwise unless the collections went to something called a bona fide gun collector. The minister said in committee that that was going to be a judicial interpretation but he did not enlighten us as to who a bona fide gun collector was. I suppose that would be something that would grow with the common law. There would be decisions by a judge or a series of judges as to who a bona fide collector was. My submission is that there should be a possibility for people to continue to collect these guns if they wish to do so.

● (2040)

The purpose of our law is to ensure that guns are not used improperly. The minister suggested that while these gun collections should be left to a bona fide gun collector or sold to one, he was not very forthcoming as to who that was. He admitted that over the years probably all the existing collections of automatic weapons would end up in museums or be exported from the country because, as a matter of public policy, the government in its wisdom has decided that Canadians were not fit people to collect automatic weapons. I take exception to that. I reiterate what I said earlier this afternoon: let us find a need for these measures before we pass laws right, left, and centre.

The government seems to think that in order to react to a passing phase in our life it has to bring in a rigid system of regulations in order to satisfy somebody's concern which, I submit, is unenlightened. In any event, I have not seen any example of guns from gun collections having been stolen by criminals which were then useful in the commission of crimes. I would have thought that if there were much of that going on, some evidence of it would have been produced by the government in justification of this amendment to our criminal law, but it has not.

The minister says that he will do it this way as a matter of public policy. I do not think that is good enough. I would think that the government's own experience would be that the facts are otherwise because, while I have not heard of private collections being stolen, I have certainly heard and read about armouries being broken into and large numbers of military weapons being stolen. Armouries are places with a concentration of weapons. If the minister is going to fill up the museums in the country with private gun collections, he will create an enticement for criminals to find a bigger haul. As things are now, there is a sort of decentralization of guns—many small collections all over the country. But the minister in his wisdom, and his advisers in the Department of Justice, seem to think that all these weapons should be concentrated in one spot. My argument is that that is not a sensible way in which to approach the situation.

Many people collect various things for various reasons. One of the reasons that people collect things now is that they are something to hang on to because the dollar in this country, under the administration of this government, is dropping in value, and it is more important for people to invest their money in tangible things than in the Canadian dollar. I think it is a gross invasion of property rights in the country for the government to adopt such a policy because it thinks, for some undefined reason, that it is a good thing for people not to have collections of automatic weapons. Therefore I submit that the House should give some consideration to deleting that part of the bill which would in effect outlaw private collections of certain types of firearms on the basis that no evidence has been provided that such a provision is necessary.

Mr. Arnold Peters (Timiskaming): Mr. Speaker, I did not have the advantage of attending the committee meetings and therefore I do not know who the minister said was a bona fide gun collector.

An hon. Member: That is an advantage.

Mr. Peters: The provision goes on to say that the local registrar of firearms will provide him with a registration certificate and will make a decision. In talking about the bona fide part of the expression, I suppose it means an actual gun collector. I do not know whether it means someone who has three, four, or half a dozen guns. Some people do not have too many guns but what they have is of a specific class. Incidentally, most of the collectors of restricted guns whom I know are members of the police force. They have a very good way of getting them. When they seize one, the gun disappears and it goes into a collection. Sometimes they build up a fairly large collection of restricted guns.

Other people buy guns such as an M-15, an American gun. In my area the gunsmith told me that most guns are fully automatic or have parts to make them fully automatic. One of the difficulties is that many of the people who bring him a gun for repair do not know that the gun has the potential to be a fully automatic rapid fire gun.

I am quite aware that there is a legal dictionary definition of the expression bona fide, but how does it apply to gun collectors? Does it means someone with six guns or someone with 50 guns, a selection of both restricted and other guns? Most of the collectors in northern Ontario whom I know do not specifically collect one kind of gun. They will pick up any gun. Some guns they keep for the purpose of trading. These guns are called traders. If this provision is passed, these people will be in considerable difficulty to make sure that the man from whom they are buying a gun, they themselves, and their collection are licensed. It seems to me that we should spell out exactly what we mean by bona fide collector.

I do not agree with the mover of the motion with regard to Clauses 2 and 21, and probably Clause 22 as well. I do not believe that if you take out the expression "bona fide" and leave the words "a gun collector" that the provision will be any clearer. I myself probably own three, four or perhaps five guns.

I am rather indefinite about how many I own because I am not exactly sure where they are. I have not looked at them for some time. I am quite sure a couple of them are in my son's collection. I would not classify myself as a collector, but if I had five Lugers then I would consider myself a collector of Lugers, or if I had a number of Winchesters of the 98, 87 or 84 class then I would consider myself a collector of Winchesters.

● (2050)

I think what a collector is should be spelled out in the bill. Removing the words "bona fide" does not correct the situation. It is not often you come across a gun collector, because of the cost involved in becoming one. I understand that the value of some Winchesters would be as high as four figures, so you would not need too many of those to become a bona fide collector, in my estimation.

The bill could be strengthened if it indicated just what a collector is. Some people may collect guns in general and others concentrate on one type such as machine guns or Sten guns, yet all consider themselves collectors. Unless the bill specifies what a collector is, there is a danger of people being harassed because they do not know what category they should fit into.

Mr. Gordon Ritchie (Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, I should like to add my support to this amendment. The government obviously hopes to do away with gun collectors in time by means of attrition. I think the operative phrase in the clause is "bona fide" but the bill does not define what a "bona fide" gun collector is. Presumably it would apply to a person who is already collecting guns, but no provision is made for people who may begin collections in the future.

Collecting is very popular nowadays. Not long ago a lady in Great Britain wrote her banker asking what she could invest her money in in order to preserve the value of her savings. He said he did not know, but he thought antique furniture was as good as anything. Today many newspapers carry advertisements and extolling the wisdom of buying such things as Kruger rands, which are gold. Apparently the Russians are showing interest, and a Canadian company is getting into the business as well.

Of all the things people collect in order to guard their investment, guns are amongst the most popular. People who served in the armed forces have often become interested in guns and started collecting them. As with stamp collecting, they sometimes have managed to make wise investments—sometimes even better than if they had invested in government bonds, particularly when this government is running the economy. Yet this government seems determined to phase out gun collectors as a group.

The government has not defined what a gun collector is; is it someone who has one gun, three, 50 or 100? As the hon. member for Palliser (Mr. Schumacher) said, thefts of guns and ammunition most often occur from an armoury or a sporting goods store, rarely from a private collection. Someone who steals an automatic will surely have difficulty finding ammunition for it.

To say there is a danger of theft of guns from a bona fide collector is like saying there is likely to be an earthquake in Ottawa today; it could happen but it is a long shot. Presumably there is more chance of criminals finding automatic weapons in military establishments than in any private gun collection.

Mr. Gordon Towers (Red Deer): Mr. Speaker, I should like to say a word on behalf of the collectors in my constituency, especially one who has one of the most beautiful collections you could ever see. The guns are very clean and are kept locked in a glass cupboard.

It is evident from the minister's comments that he hopes gun collections will be a thing of the past. As the hon. member for Dauphin (Mr. Ritchie) said, such collections are rare and are likely to become very valuable. Does the minister have the right to take a collection away from a family that is very proud of it?

● (2100)

We do not know the effect of this legislation. Let the minister say how many criminal acts have been committed with the use of gun collector items. I suspect there are few such incidents, and therefore do not think weapons classified as collectors' items are much of a danger. Why should the minister use the government's majority to take away the rights of Canadians with gun collections? By trying to establish the rights of one group, the minister would infringe on the rights of another. Surely we should not pass legislation which, under the guise on protecting one set of rights, infringes on another.

Mr. Bob Brisco (Kootenay West): Mr. Speaker, I shall begin my remarks by speaking of gun collections, particularly of collections of automatic weapons, and in this regard I share the minister's concern. However, if one reads what the minister said to the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs on the clause we are debating, it becomes clear that the minister's remarks made sense up to a certain point, after which they went off into never-never land, into limbo. Two hon. members opposite expressed some genuine concern about the legal aspects of some of this bill's provisions. The minister's reply shows he does not understand the basic interest of the gun collector. I do not expect the minister collects guns. I do not know what he collects—butterflies, perhaps.

Mr. MacKay: No, it's aerosol tins.

Mr. Brisco: The minister cannot be ignorant of the subject. The debate on the previous bill, C-83, broadened his understanding. Perhaps I can do no better than quote something the minister said on June 16 to the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs as reported on page 22:25 of the transcript of the proceedings. He said:

No one is taking those guns away from them.

In this case "them" is the gun collectors. I continue:

If they want to get rid of them, they can sell or give them to a museum, they can export them to other sellers; or they can sell them to other collectors. I think, rather than what you suggest, that they are suddenly valueless, the effect of this legislation is that those guns will become increasingly more valuable.

True, rare collectors' items, be they guns, antique furniture, postage stamps of 1830 vintage, gain in value with time; to that extent the minister is correct. But as the bill is written, the bona fide gun collector can only dispose of his guns to another bona fide collector. I can foresee that, ultimately, the collector who survives all his contemporaries will end up owning some 4,500 automatic weapons, enough to equip his own army. Surely the legislation does not contemplate this? Surely the minister does not intend one or two people to wind up owning, say, 2,500 automatic weapons each? But this, precisely, will be the effect of the bill unless it is changed.

The minister is concerned about the bona fide collector, but what about the fellow about whom the hon. member for Lafontaine-Rosemont (Mr. Lachance) questioned the minister? What will be the position of the heirs of an estate who inherit automatic weapons, or weapons classed as collector's items? Will they be entitled to retain them? The minister said no, not unless they are bona fide collectors. And here the hon. member for Lafontaine-Rosemont, because of his legal training, focused attention on the great weakness of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, you can walk into many homes in this country and hear an owner say, "Look at this beautiful shotgun, or at this beautiful weapon. It has a Damascus steel barrel, was made by James Riley and Sons, of Bond Street, London; is it not made beautifully?" He will tell you it does not take present day shells or bullets, but is a work of art in its own right. Or he may say, to you, "I have here an old Winchester 44-40 with a hexagonal barrel. It's the sort of gun which won the west. My grandfather left it to my father, and he left it to me." What will that man's position be under the law?

Or, what will be the position of the man who does not know the value of the weapon he inherited from his father, who inherited from his father before him? I am not totally satisfied with what the minister has said in this regard?

This bill will encourage a fellow to take his gun to the local police station, run by federal, provincial or municipal police, and turn it in. I assume he will get a receipt for it. That is the end of the story.

● (2110)

Who gets the guns? The minister has not provided an adequate answer to that question. Who falls heir to these valuable antiques? Once they are in the hands of the police, what happens to them? Does the officer in charge pass them to another whom he happens to know is a bona fide gun collector and has an interest in this type of weapon, a gun that may be worth $500, $600 or $1,000?

Is the gun taken out and destroyed because no one in that particular office appreciates the historical value of that weapon? Is it sold into a collection with the Crown receiving the assets? Does the police officer pass it to a friend who sells it to a collection and the police officer gathers the benefits? By making that kind of remark, I am not impugning our police officers. I am just saying it is a possibility. The minister has not extended his arguments into that area.

I recognize the very legitimate concern of the minister when it comes to automatic weapons. Plainly it was demonstrated at committee when the minister had at that time an AR-15. It was clearly demonstrated when we had a representative from CASAL appear before the committee and tell about the difficulty he was having packing an AR-15 in the hills. Why he would ever want to pack that in the hills as a sporting rifle really stretches my imagination. Conversely, there are those who have such automatic weapons which they may wish to add to their collection, and who would not be going into the hills. I hope they would not be going into the hills.

I suggest to the minister, in answering the genuine concerns of these gun collectors, that it might be helpful at this eleventh hour if he met with them to determine whether they are prepared to take some measure of responsibility and collectively agree that in some fashion, acceptable to them and the ministry, they will deactivate those automatic weapons.

The gun collectors would of course present the argument that to deactivate would reduce the value to the collector. It would also reduce the value to the criminal if the home of a collector should be broken into and such a weapon should be stolen. The minister has indicated that has occurred. It was also clearly demonstrated at committee that not one charge of abuse of the regulations pertaining to these weapons has been recorded against a bona fide collector. That is an area the minister fails to take into consideration as well.

I suggest it might be helpful to the minister to seek an accommodation with those particular collectors. It might help to resolve an issue that will otherwise be resolved with some degree of acrimony and bitterness.

Mr. Elmer M. MacKay (Central Nova): Mr. Speaker, I too would like to support the proposition put forward by the last speaker. I say to the minister that I, unlike the government, believe in giving people the benefit of the doubt.

I do not believe the government has yet reached the stage in its great design for controlling the lives of Canadians that it has any objection to Canadians owning property. However, owning guns appears to be a heinous thing for the average Canadian. As has been pointed out, there is something intrinsically valuable about them. I do not see why the government and the minister, at least by implication, feel there is something evil about collecting guns. Unless there is some other reason, they would not be bringing this unnecessarily restrictive provision.

What are the statistics with regard to violence involving breaches of the criminal law by people who have gun collections or own guns on the basis of collecting them, formally or informally? The last speaker indicated there were no known violations. That may or may not be so. I suspect that gun collectors as a group are among the most law-abiding of all the citizens of this country. I also believe that among their ranks,

as suggested by the hon. member for Timiskaming (Mr. Peters), there are many police officers.

It is as fallacious to suggest that gun collectors are prone to break the law because they are gun collectors as to say that antique automobile collectors statistically have more traffic violations than people who do not collect cars, or people who are interested in numismatics, the collection of money, are more prone to currency fraud, or people interested in collecting stamps indulge in post office fraud.

The whole thing boggles the mind. I do not see why this provision is necessary. If it is not necessary, why encroach again on the rights of Canadians or indeed the practice of Canadians which, up to this point, has enabled them to own guns as an investment or something of interest? All this type of legislation does is make lawbreakers out of thousands of Canadians who will not accept this type of restriction and see no logic for it any more than to provide an already swollen bureaucracy with a few more jobs.

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

Some hon. Members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): The question is on motions Nos. 2, 21 and 22 standing in the name of the hon. member for Palliser (Mr. Schumacher). Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motions?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Those in favour will please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. Members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): The recorded divisions on proposed motions Nos. 2, 21 and 22 stand deferred. The House will now proceed to motions Nos. 3, 4, 5 and 6. These will be grouped for debate. If required, a vote on motion No. 3 will also dispose of motions Nos. 4, 5 and 6.

Mr. Stan Schumacher (Palliser) moved:

Motion No. 3.

That Bill C-51, An Act to amend the Criminal Code, the Customs Tariff, the Parole Act, the Penitentiary Act and the Prisons and Reformatories Act, be amended in Clause 3 by deleting the word "five" in line 37 at page 7 and substituting the word "two" therefor.

Motion No. 4.

That Bill C-51, An Act to amend the Criminal Code, the Customs Tariff, the Parole Act, the Penitentiary Act and the Prisons and Reformatories Act, be amended in Clause 3 by striking out line 12 at page 8 and substituting the following therefor:

"not have a registration certificate or who does not have a permit issued pursuant to subsection 106.2(1)".

Motion No. 5.

That Bill C-51, An Act to amend the Criminal Code, the Customs Tariff, the Parole Act, the Penitentiary Act and the Prisons and Reformatories Act, be amended in Clause 3 by deleting the word "five" in lines 14, 26 and 40 at page 8 and substituting the word "two" therefor.

Motion No. 6.

That Bill C-51, An Act to amend the Criminal Code, the Customs Tariff, the Parole Act, the Penitentiary Act and the Prisons and Reformatories Act, be amended in Clause 3 by striking out lines 20 and 21 at page 8 and substituting the following therefor:

"place named on the registration certificate".

● (2120)

He said: Mr. Speaker, this series of amendments is designed to cover a situation in which the maximum sentence recommended appears to have been fixed without due regard for the gravity of the offence. Indeed, the penalty, five years under the indictable procedure, appears to have been chosen by someone putting his finger at random on a series of numbers.

I believe the penalty for offences related to restricted weapons should differ from that related to prohibited weapons. I also believe there should be a distinction drawn between an active offender and an offender who just happened to be in the vicinity—for example, reference is made to the occupant of a motor car which contains a restricted weapon. Surely the major offender is the actual owner and possessor of the weapon, and a different penalty should apply. In my view, five years is a lengthy period of possible imprisonment to impose on offenders concerned with these clauses I am seeking to amend.

A great deal of debate is going on in the country presently about the frequency with which we resort to imposing terms of imprisonment and the length of the sentences handed out. I do not think anyone would accuse me of not being a proponent of law and order. Nevertheless, I believe there should be some moderation shown here, some distinction drawn. I realize there is room for discretion, since the Crown can always decide to proceed in a summary way and judges, after all, are not obliged to impose the maximum sentence, but there is always the possibility that some judge, perhaps influenced by an over-zealous prosecutor, will determine that the maximum sentence should be applied and I, for one, do not believe there are many situations in which members of the House would feel that the imposition of a five-year prison sentence is justifiable in relation to the type of offence envisaged in these clauses.

I should like the House to consider placing a more reasonable upper limit on the maximum term for these offences which the bill proposes to create. It does not appear to me that sufficient consideration has been given to the implication of these clauses.

Hon. members may recall my earlier remarks this afternoon when I was talking about changes which had been made in the Wheat Board legislation, changes about which I was complete-

ly unaware even though I was a member of the House in 1972 when they were made. Among those changes were amendments to the penalties section as a result of which, for certain offences, a minimum penalty of one third of the initial price of the grain involved was applicable. That may not sound very much to some hon. members but it is enough to bankrupt an elevator operator and has to be regarded with great concern, especially when one is dealing with an arbitrary, unfeeling administration, such as the present Wheat Board administration, which goes around the country laying every conceivable charge which it believes it can sustain, even though it is not doing too well in court, subjecting the farmers to a great deal of harassment and expense in the process. Because of my experience with that legislation I made it my business to look at the corresponding provisions in the present bill and, frankly, I do not think a great deal of consideration has been given to this penalties section.

As I say, I believe some distinction should be drawn between penalties relating to prohibited weapons and to penalties related to restricted weapons, which should be less. I hope the House will recognize the distinction between the types of offence with which we are seeking to deal, because if the law does not show this type of sensitivity, this type of responsiveness, I do not believe it will ever be as respected as it should be.

Mr. Gordon Ritchie (Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, I should like to reinforce what my hon. friend from Palliser has said. It does not make sense to me that the maximum penalty should be the same in respect of a restricted weapon as it is in respect of a prohibited weapon.

We have just had a report from the Senate, I believe, on the subject of jail sentences in this country and in North America generally as opposed to Europe. In North America we seem to have gone overboard in sentencing people to jail as opposed, say, to European procedures; it does seem as though we do not always choose the best type of sentencing. I do not pretend to be an expert on penology but I sometimes think things get out of hand in this area.

In this amendment here we are asked to endorse five years for restricted weapons, which does not square with the graver issue of prohibited weapons. Presumably the maximum sentence is so prescribed in order to allow the courts to reduce it at their discretion but I am not convinced that this is a good thing; our sentences are already too severe in certain areas while being lax in others. This is an area where we have gone overboard.

It is as though somebody put in the figure five and the typist kept repeating that figure five without thinking it out. I lend my support to this amendment designed to bring about a more realistic sentencing proposal. Just saying "Make it five years and leave it up to them" does not meet with my idea of justice. The minister could well take another look at this and see whether the judiciary are using it more often than he wants.

• (2130)

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

Some hon. Members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): The question is on motions 3, 4, 5 and 6. All those in favour will please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

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

Some hon. Members: Nay.

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

Some hon. Members: On division.

Motions Nos. 3, 4, 5 and 6 negatived.

Mr. Stan Schumacher (Palliser) moved:

Motion No. 8.

That Bill C-51, An Act to amend the Criminal Code, the Customs Tariff, the Parole Act, The Penitentiary Act and the Prisons and Reformatories Act, be amended in Clause 3 by striking out line 21 at page 12 and substituting the following therefor:

"certificate or signed copy thereof for inspection by the person".

He said: Mr. Speaker, would you just give me a moment to find my notes.

Some hon. Members: Question.

Mr. Schumacher: Mr. Speaker, I am sorry to take the time of the House. I am afraid I will have to let this motion go; I cannot find my papers.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea? All those opposed will please say nay?

Some hon. Members: Nay.

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

Some hon. Members: On division.

Motion No. 8 negatived.

Mr. Bob Brisco (Kootenay West) moved:

Motion No. 9.

That Bill C-51, An Act to amend the Criminal Code, the Customs Tariff, the Parole Act, the Penitentiary Act and the Prisons and Reformatories Act, be amended in Clause 3 by striking out line 46 at page 12 and substituting the following therefor:

"possess the firearm,

(iv) to a person who owns, lawfully possesses or is otherwise entitled to lawfully possess a firearm where, having regard to the purpose for which the firearm is loaned, the loan of the firearm is intended to be for a reasonable time only; or"

He said: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of motion No. 9 is quite simple and straightforward. The bill now provides that any person who owns a rifle or shotgun—a firearm, to use the terms of the bill—and who wishes to loan that gun to his hunting companion, or any person who wishes to borrow a gun from his hunting companion, must first obtain a federal firearms certificate. It may well be that the majority of sportsmen may go for a number of years without acquiring this particular certificate simply because they are quite satisfied with the weapon they are using and do not wish to purchase another of the same type. But the minute they do decide that they want to add another weapon to their gun collection, or replace their rifle with a newer model of the same or of different calibre, they must apply for a firearms certificate.

Why should a person who for years has had a provincial hunting licence be required under the provisions of this bill to obtain such a certificate simply because he wants to lend his rifle to his next door neighbour, or to someone with whom he has hunted before and whom he knows to be a responsible individual? Ninety-nine persons out of a hundred would not lend their rifle or shotgun to a stranger. Certainly at today's prices they are not going to hand over their rifle to someone they do not know, though quite possibly they would be prepared to loan the weapon to someone they know is responsible.

Let me cite a case in point, though I can give the minister 100 examples if he wishes. Take the case of a hunting party going into northern British Columbia, the Yukon, or Northwest Territories for a period of 10 days or two weeks. They are flown in to some remote lake with all their supplies. Is the minister naive enough to think that a hunting party of three or four men will carry only one rifle each? Of course not; there will be at least one spare rifle—

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

Mr. Brisco: Certainly.

• (2140)

Mr. Basford: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the hon. member would take note of section 95(2)(*a*)(i) which is designed to deal with the hunting party situation, where people are hunting together and one may lose or break a gun and may not have one. They can pass them amongst themselves.

Mr. Brisco: Mr. Speaker, that is quite true. I appreciate the minister's particular point. If he reviews the Committee minutes, I am sure the minister will see that it was I who raised that particular issue with him last year when we were dealing with Bill C-83. Let me point out that that is a hunting party which is under the supervision of a guide.

An hon. Member: Do not confuse him with facts. His mind is already made up.

Mr. Brisco: In northern British Columbia a resident does not need a guide. In a circumstance where a group of hunters are going into a remote area, they always provide for at least one spare gun, because a shell blocked in a chamber or some other mechanical failure can certainly happen. The manner in which rifles and other supplies are loaded on to bush aircraft makes damage possible. Because of that, there is usually one spare rifle in the camp.

Is the minister trying to suggest, because it is my particular rifle which has developed a mechanical problem that cannot be resolved at that time without special tools, that I have got to go to the nearest community and get a firearm certificate? Is he suggesting that I have to take my hunting partner with me because it is going to be his rifle that I will be using? If so, that is a little ridiculous. If the minister feels that is an isolated circumstance, then he is out of touch with the people in the hunting fraternity across Canada. Whether it concerns people hunting moose, caribou, duck or geese in the northern part of Manitoba, Saskatchewan or Ontario, the same mechanical problems can occur. Certainly I will not omit Nova Scotia. It is not an isolated thing at all.

An hon. Member: They hunt seals in Nova Scotia.

Mr. Brisco: What the minister is suggesting with his intervention is that we are protecting that isolated situation which can happen in the Yukon or the Northwest Territories. I raised that point last year with the minister. I asked him what would happen when a hunter has laid out $3,000 for a licensed guide trip in the Yukon and his rifle is rolled on by a horse? His rifle can be sitting in its holster and the horse decides to roll for some reason or another, or the horse stumbles and falls, breaking the rifle. The rifle is broken, the stock is smashed, the barrel is bent or the sights are destroyed. What happens then? The minister has made accommodation for that very problem, which I thank him for. But the minister has not made accommodation for the circumstance which confronts hunters every time they are out during the hunting season. I could be out in a goose pit in Saskatchewan and have my gun block on me. I could ask my hunting partner for his gun, and immediately I would violate the law. Surely reason prevails. I am quite sure there is not going to be a police officer or a game warden sitting over my shoulder who will observe that transfer.

An hon. Member: You never know.

Mr. Brisco: Yes, but the chances of that happening are remote. Under the provisions of the bill, the law is broken when that occurs. We know it is broken, and we would rather not operate outside the law. The purpose of this amendment would cover the frequent occurrence of a rifle or a shotgun being borrowed or lent by me if there is a mechanical failure, within the hunting partnership which prevails in the hunting fraternity across Canada.

This amendment is not intended for, nor was it drafted for the other circumstance where the borrower and the lender are strangers, or the borrower and the lender may be bordering on the criminal. That is a rare circumstance. Law or not, if there is criminal intent, it does not make a difference what the legislation says. The law will be violated because that is their intention to begin with.

I do not see the purpose of a law put into place which will materially affect a vast majority of people who are operating in innocence and honesty. We do not legislate against the innocent. Yet that is what will happen unless this amendment is accepted. If this amendment is accepted, those people within the hunting fraternity will realize the minister has an understanding of their genuine concerns, that the minister is responsive to those concerns and is not hard-nosed and determined to get the last inch or the last drop of blood out of this legislation.

It would be my hope that the minister would look with favour upon the arguments which I have presented with reference to motion No. 9.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Arnold Peters (Timiskaming): Mr. Speaker, I have listened with great attentiveness to the remarks of the hon. member for Kootenay West (Mr. Brisco), and I fail to see where this amendment would serve any purpose. As I read it, the transfer of a gun—

Mr. Brisco: Et tu Brutus.

Mr. Peters: Well, I fail to see the purpose of it, unless you have very queer people out there hunting for sheep.

Mr. Woolliams: That was Bert Herridge's constituency for 23 years. It was without a Tory, and now it is represented.

Mr. Peters: Well, God bless him, wherever he has gone. It is a fact that those who have guns now do not have to register them.

An hon. Member: If they borrow or lend them, they do.

Mr. Peters: The hon. member's amendment refers to a person who owns, lawfully possesses or is otherwise entitled lawfully to possess a firearm. It does not mean he has to have a certificate to do that. He may own a firearm or he may own several of them. If this were applied, it would mean someone would have to look over your shoulder all the time. I do not think even this minister is going to insist on inspections which would stop people in hunting parties from trading guns.

• (2150)

I think subsection 2(b) covers the lending of guns, and surely the hon. member is not suggesting that people who go on hunting expeditions do not know how to handle guns, so obviously those people would be able to acquire gun certificates if they were buying or selling. If this clause is amended as suggested, it will be more restrictive rather than less restrictive. People on hunting parties will be able to exchange guns. To be very blunt about it, when an officer walks up and I have a gun, he is not going to know whether it is my gun or somebody else's. All he will know is that I have a gun. I am not about to tell him I have your gun, and you are not about to tell him that you lent it to me.

Mr. Brisco: You are still breaking the law.

Mr. Peters: As long as each of us has a gun, we are not going to help that officer very much. It seems to me that this amendment sets out a condition which would almost make it mandatory for law abiding citizens to feel that they should possess certificates in order to borrow guns from friends. Surely the minister would not restrict a hunting party to having a guide where the guide has the extra gun.

Mr. Brisco: Yes, read the bill.

Mr. Basford: That's right, Arnold.

Mr. Peters: Very seldom in a hunting party do one or two of the people in that party not trade guns or experiment with somebody else's gun. That is fairly normal, and I think it will continue. However, it seems to me that if we pass this amendment we would set up another category which would make it more restrictive rather than less. My total interest in this bill is to make it less restrictive. In fact I would like to get rid of the bill and all the restrictions which are in it, and go back to the sensible way of handling guns in hunting parties which we have now in northern Ontario and in most of Canada, except in those big bad cities where people use guns for other than hunting animals and for protection.

Mr. Doug Neil (Moose Jaw): Mr. Speaker, I would like to make one or two comments with respect to this motion. The minister pointed out to the hon. member for Kootenay West (Mr. Brisco) the provisions of subsection 2(a)(i), which reads:

> Subection (1) does not apply to a person
>
> (a) lawfully in possession of a firearm who lends the firearm
>
> (i) to a person for use by that person in his company and under his guidance or supervision in the same manner in which he may lawfully use it . . .

When I look at that particular subsection, it seems to me that that provides that when a person who owns a gun gives it to another person, the person who accepts the gun has to be in the company of the person who lent it and under his guidance and supervision. If I were out on a goose hunt, my gun jammed, I borrowed one from a hunter who was at the opposite end of the field and I walked back into the pit, it certainly could not be said that I was under the guidance or supervision of the person who lent me that gun. I ask the minister to re-examine that subsection, perhaps with the idea of bringing in an amendment on his own to clarify it.

I can understand the situation where a person takes his son or a young person out to teach him the art of hunting. That younger person would be under his guidance and supervision, but I certainly do not believe that subsection 2(a)(i) accomplishes the purpose the minister believes it does. I support the hon. member for Kootenay West because it is a common situation back on the prairies for a gun to be lent to a friend or a neighbour who is not a regular hunter but who has the opportunity once in a while on a day off and decides to go hunting. He calls his neighbour and asks to borrow his gun. The neighbour, knowing him personally and knowing that he is a reliable individual with hunting experience, lends his gun.

I myself have lent my shotgun to a neighbour on more than one occasion, and I think it is common practice on the prairies.

For example, if a friend comes from outside the province during hunting season and wants to go hunting, I lend him my shotgun or rifle. I make sure, of course, that he has a hunting licence. However, the way this particular act now reads without the amendment, the situation is that you can no longer lend your gun to your friend or your neighbour unless both you and the person who borrows the gun are in possession of a firearms acquisition certificate. Under those circumstances I support motion No. 9.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[*English*]

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 40 deemed to have been moved.

TRANSPORT—ESCALATION OF PENSIONS OF RETIRED RAILWAY EMPLOYEES—GOVERNMENT ACTION

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, June 16, and on Monday, July 4, I put questions to the Minister of Transport (Mr. Lang) regarding the report of Dr. Noel Hall concerning Canadian railway pension plans. In my question of June 16, which is reported in *Hansard* at pages 6742 and 6743, the gist of my question was in this sentence:

Since referring that report to management and the unions does not do a solitary thing for railway workers already retired, both CNR and CPR, will the government take action to make sure those old timers are not forgotten?

The Minister of Transport replied in these words:

Mr. Speaker, my colleague the Minister of Labour is putting what analysis the question may require before the government. In the meantime a good number of matters referred to in the report are, by Dr. Hall's own definition, suitable for negotiation.

In my supplementary question I protested that negotiation between management and the unions would do nothing for those already retired, but the answer to that supplementary question was no better than the answer to the first question.

In my question of July 4, which is on page 7249 of *Hansard*, I again tried to make the same emphasis. It was in these words:

In view of the fact that any action that management and unions might take will not do anything for Canadian National and Canadian Pacific railway workers already retired, and in view of the fact that these pensioners have had no escalation of their pensions at all in 1977, will the minister put pressure on both Canadian National and Canadian Pacific to bring in escalation of the pensions of their retired workers this year?

● (2200)

Again the reply of the Minister of Transport was to the effect that this should be the subject of bargaining between the parties. Again I protested, and again I got nothing that was satisfactory from the minister.

The railway workers of Canada, and in particular the retired railway workers, the older ones, are beginning to think that the Hall Commission was a put-off. Dr. Hall was appointed in July of 1974 to make a study of all Canadian railway pension plans. It took him more than two years to make this study and present his report. That report was presented to the Minister of Labour (Mr. Munro) on September 8, 1976, but translating and printing it consumed considerable time, so we did not get it until January, 1977. We are now in July of 1977. It is three years since Dr. Hall was commissioned to do his job.

I have some doubts about the usefulness of the report. It is a summary of the situation, an accounting of the facts, but it does not contain many recommendations. There are a few, and it is true that, in so far as any reorganization of railway pension plans for the future is concerned, Dr. Hall says that management and the union should sit down and do it by collective bargaining. But Dr. Hall also says that the situation for railway workers who are now retired is urgent, pressing, and serious. Most of them have had very little by way of escalation and none at all in the last year or so.

The point of my question to the Minister of Transport—and to the Minister of Labour when I catch him here to ask him about the same issue—has to do with those who are already retired. I want not to be put off with the line that it is up to management and unions to negotiate. When unions negotiate, they do so for their members, the ones who are working. The retired workers, the railway pensioners, do not have anyone at the bargaining table, and Dr. Hall says it is urgent that something be done for them.

My plea to the government is in the following terms: When is the government going to talk in plain language to CN and CP and to any other railways, including those who are responsible for the old Provident Fund in the Atlantic provinces and so on, about the needs of those who are already retired? Asking them to wait until a new scheme has been worked out is telling them they will die, all of them, before anything is done for them.

I am used to this government being heartless, but surely there is a limit. I hope that the one parliamentary secretary who is sitting over there—it is not his department but maybe he has a heart which the others do not have—will be able to tell us tonight that the government takes seriously the recommendation of Dr. Hall with regard to those already retired and the pleas that we are making from this side of the House that we do not want those who are already retired to have to wait forever for a reorganization of railway pension plans.

We want an adequate cost of living escalation of the pensions of retired CN and CP employees now. By now, I say to the parliamentary secretary, I mean tonight.

Mr. Ross Milne (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Communications): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) puts forward a very persuasive case. In the absence of the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Labour (Mr. Olivier) I have been asked to reply on behalf of the minister.

First of all I would like to state that the government and the minister take very seriously the quite extensive survey and report authored by Dr. Hall. I might take this opportunity to remind the House that on May 31, when the minister announced the appointment of Dr. Hall, he took note of railway employees' dissatisfaction with their pension plan and specified the terms of reference under which the commissioner would operate to deal with those concerns.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): That was in 1974.

Mr. Milne: Yes, May 31, 1974.

To assist these parties in dealing with the complex question of how to protect pensions against the erosion and effect of inflation, the commissioner provided the parties with alternative methods of providing cost of living indexation. The parties themselves, as suggested by Dr. Hall, would be free to make a selection from among the many options according to their own bargaining priorities. I do not think we should take it that it is not a subject for collective bargaining. Dr. Hall said in his report that it should be and the parties have a right to do it.

The commissioner concluded that the existing railway pension plans compare favourably with plans in the public and private sectors. He indicated that while the level of benefits received by recent retirees is adequate, a problem arises for those who have been retired for some time, as the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre so eloquently pointed out.

In so far as the specific recommendations which aim at granting retired CP employees pension improvements comparable to those granted in recent years by Canadian National, the CP pension committee now has this matter under active consideration. The various cost estimates referred to previously, and the concept of a heritage fund whose principal purpose would be to ameliorate the condition of existing pensioners, were among the options proposed by the commissioner for consideration by the parties. The heritage fund would be paid for through a 1 per cent contribution shared equally by employers and employees. To deal with the question of adequacy on a national level, as it affects all pensions, the government has established an interdepartmental policy review committee to examine all aspects of pensions.

COMMUNICATIONS—POSSIBILITY RIGHT OF CITIZENS TO RECEIVE PROGRAMS ORIGINATING IN UNITED STATES TO BE CURTAILED

Mr. Bob Brisco (Kootenay West): Mr. Speaker, on June 29, by way of a motion under Standing Order 43, I indicated to the House a problem concerning the Arrow Lake TV Society of Nakusp and the fact that they had received notification from the CRTC that effective—I believe it was September 30—they would lose their licence to rebroadcast Channel 4 Spokane from a transmitter site located some 9,000 feet up a mountain in the small community of Nakusp, which has some 2,000 people.

As ministers and their officials know, a motion under Standing Order 43 frequently provides notice that a question will follow. My question was put to the minister on July 4. At that time I clearly outlined the problem confronting the Arrow Lakes TV Society and the fact that they were transmitting or rebroadcasting Channel 4 Spokane on air and not by cable directly into Nakusp, and that they had been told they would no longer be licensed to do this.

The answer the Minister of Communications (Mrs. Sauvé) gave to the expression of concern—the same expression of concern that can be repeated across Canada in similar circumstances—was as follows:

> Mr. Speaker, the freedom of citizens is very well protected right now by the regulating process of the CRTC.

Hah! What an asinine, unfeeling response. By way of a supplementary question I then explained the circumstances surrounding the decision. I said it was a decision by the legal brains of the CRTC, that unfeeling body that is not aware of what is going on in the boondocks. After I had clearly provided the minister with an explanation, the minister responded as follows:

> Mr. Speaker, I do not know the details of that decision by the CRTC—

That would indicate that no one had advised her of the motion under Standing Order 43 that I moved the previous week. She went on:

> —but I feel that it concerns the need to protect against undue competition those who hold licences to operate a station.

● (2210)

What utter drivel and garbage!

This community established a co-operative society 20 years before the CBC ever thought of providing service to that small community of 2,000, with a transmitter 9,000 feet up in the mountains. For years the people of Kootenay West watched three different channels originating in major centres, all in the United States. The CBC came in recently, and as a result of three interventions on the part of the member for Kootenay West before the CRTC, the CTV network was also able to provide a service to this community.

This co-operative provides the community with three separate channels. They carry the CBC, CTV, and channel 4, Spokane. They were supposed to receive money from the CBC under the accelerated coverage program. The CBC was supposed to provide a signal for that community, but because the co-operative had done such an excellent job the accelerated coverage program people said, "We don't need to provide service to Nakusp. We do not need to spend federal money to provide CBC service." That community did not put in a cable stretching 9,000 feet up the mountain, did not provide "off-air" programming. Instead, it took the less expensive route of providing "on-air" programs. Consequently, the people of the community are now told that because channel 4 Spokane does not meet Canadian content requirements it cannot be licensed.

If their programs had been carried by cable they could watch Spokane forever and a day and would not need to worry about Canadian content. In that case there would not be any hassle with the CRTC's legal division.

Many people from that community have written to me indicating that if the government will not use its good judgment and be sensible, they will defy the regulations. I cannot blame them. Mr. Donald Waterfield of Nakusp, who wrote the book "Continental Waterboy" a documentary on the Columbia River Treaty, which is second to none, and who knows all about people being trodden on by the bureaucracy, wrote:

The considerable work and cost of our TV enterprise is all local. It has not cost the government a cent. So, as you will readily understand, we are furious with this quite unwarrantable interference with out private lives.

Mrs. Bert Millner of Nakusp wrote:

Surely in a culturally-starved area such as Nakusp and district, we should be adding more stations rather than reducing the number.

Mr. Aalten wrote:

I regard this action as a callous unfeeling act by a government that would deprive us of the entertainment this channel provides in response to some high-toned speeches and opinions put forward in the name of 'nationalism.'

Mr. Bowman of Nakusp says, "It makes us wonder just how free our free society is becoming."

Mrs. Sicotte of Nakusp writes:

The idea of Canadian TV alone is ridiculous. Outside of one or two good children's programs and a few good documentaries, the Canadian programs are an insult to one's intelligence for the most part, particularly CBC.

Finally, Mr. and Mrs. Ron Heppner of Nakusp wrote:

We feel that we are intelligent enough to be able to choose our entertainment without any help from the CBC and the Canadian government.

The CRTC has painted itself into a corner. It has not determined if a cable company broadcasting from its studio is deemed to be on-air or off-air. What will happen in Nakusp?

Mr. Ross Milne (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Communications): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the sincerity with which the hon. member for Kootenay West (Mr. Brisco) tried to make his case, but I suggest that this situation has arisen for reasons other than those he mentioned. I wish to put the background to this case on record and, for accuracy, will follow my notes closely.

The CRTC returned the recent licence renewal application to the Arrow Lakes Television Society. In a covering letter, dated May 25, 1977, the commission stated that it received legal advice that, based on the regulations issued under the Broadcasting Act, it is unable to issue or renew a broadcasting licence for a transmitter which rebroadcasts a non-Canadian signal.

I understand that the licence in question was issued in 1963 by the Department of Transport on the basis that no Canadian television service was available in Nakusp, British Columbia. In the intervening years, the Arrow Lakes Television Society established two other rebroadcasters which provide full CBC and CTV service. In the circumstances the government cannot interfere with the decision of the CRTC which, in light of the responsibilities defined in law by the Broadcasting Act, felt that it was required to take this action.

The Arrow Lakes Television Society operates three low power transmitters located in Nakusp, British Columbia. Each transmitter rebroadcasts a signal of another station, one of which originates from KXLY-TV Spokane, Washington. The Department of Transport originally licensed this undertaking on August 6, 1963. The CRTC has renewed the licence on three occasions, with the most recent renewal expiring on September 30, 1977. This licence was originally issued on the basis that no television service was available to the residents of Nakusp. Subsequently, full CBC and CTV service is provided by the two other rebroadcast transmitters operated by the Arrow Lakes Television Society.

In conclusion, the commission obtained legal advice to the effect that, based on the regulations issued under the Broadcasting Act, it was unable to issue or renew a broadcasting licence for a transmitter which rebroadcasts non-Canadian signals. As a consequence, the CRTC returned the recent renewal application with a covering letter, dated May 25, 1977, indicating the above.

VETERANS AFFAIRS—REQUEST FOR LEGISLATION TO IMPROVE PENSIONS OF WIDOWS

Mr. Jack Marshall (Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe): Mr. Speaker, we who are still here appreciate that the Minister of Veterans Affairs (Mr. MacDonald) will be replying to this question which is of such concern to veterans in this country.

On March 1 the minister replied to my question with regard to pensions for widows of veterans who were in receipt of a disability pension of less than 48 per cent as he has on countless other occasions, indicating that the matter is under consideration. To be very frank, it is becoming a little embarrassing to me, as it should be to the minister, that we keep playing this broken record periodically in the House of Commons and in committee. It is long past a reasonable time when amendments to the legislation with respect to veterans' widows falling within this unfortunate category should be passed.

It is serious to note, and the matter is getting more serious each day as some 60,000 who fall in the category of between 5 per cent and 45 per cent grow older, that the government is forsaking these widows for no humane reason, and is instead festering a bitterness within their hearts which should be embarrassing to the government.

It is obvious from recent replies to the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) and myself that we will not see legislation during this session. Perhaps the minister could again appeal to the unpatriotic hearts of his colleagues in cabinet, asking that they repent for their glaring sins by asking Her Gracious Majesty, as suggested by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre and the right hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker), when reading the new Speech from the Throne in October to include in that speech amendments to the veterans' legislation to overcome this serious inequity.

I might add that the minister may not get the opportunity to take the credit if the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) calls an election for this fall, because my party supports such a move as a first priority in recognition of the sacrifice made by some

900,000 proud veteran Canadians who offered their lives to ensure peace, freedom, and national unity for our country.

The main point I want to make tonight is that a provision presently exists in the War Veterans Allowance Act which could overcome this present inequity for many of the 60,000 veterans receiving disability pensions under 48 per cent. One of the criteria for qualification for war veterans allowance is that the veteran is receiving a disability pension of 5 per cent or over, which at present rates entitles him to $34.78. As long as he is now 60 years of age or over and in receipt of a disability pension, he can now qualify for war veterans allowance, if not receiving any other income, up to a maximum of $481.17 at the married rate. A married disability pensioner at 47 per cent is entitled to only $313.10. It is therefore to the advantage of any disability pensioner receiving between 5 per cent and 47 per cent to transfer to war veterans allowance.

● (2220)

When the disability pensioner at 5 per cent to 47 per cent dies, his spouse is not entitled to a widow's pension unless his death was attributable to his pensionable disability. However, when the married recipient of war veterans allowance or civilian war allowance dies, his wife is entitled to the married rate of up to $481.17 for one year and is then entitled to the single rate, presently $281.07, for life. The widow in the same category is cut off when her husband dies, receiving less than 48 per cent.

This means there is an automatic protection for the widow under war veterans allowance which does not exist under a disability pension, and until the minister and the government decide to amend the Pension Act, veterans falling into the categories mentioned should apply for WVA in order to protect an assured income for their spouses. It is there in the Pension Act now, it is there in the War Veterans Allowance Act now, and it is only a matter of the minister and his staff advising those who fall into this category that they can qualify and can thus protect their wives, when they do not qualify under the disability pension legislation but do qualify and can qualify because of the variation between the disability pension provisions and the War Veterans Allowance Act. I hope the minister will recognize this and will portray it to veterans so that they can protect their widows in the circumstances to which I have referred.

Hon. Daniel J. MacDonald (Minister of Veterans Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for again bringing to the attention of the House the matter he has raised this evening involving widows of pensioned veterans whose disability pension is assessed at less than 48 per cent.

As he knows, widows' pensions have received serious consideration by myself and by my department for some time. I replied to the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) during the adjournment debate on the same subject on April 25 of this year and pointed out that the whole question of veterans benefits, including widows' pensions, is always under constant review by the department and by the Canadian Pension Commission and the other agencies of my portfolio, to determine what changes can be made to improve the lot of veterans and their dependants.

The hon. member does recognize that the WVA Act is available to widows and to married couples and those who are receiving a pension as low as 5 per cent. I should inform the hon. member that most of our clientele are in this respect aware that they are receiving WVA. They apply for it and they receive it and, as the hon. member has already said, it is income tested. Many of our veterans and widows are now in receipt of war veterans allowance; they apply for it and, unless their income stands in their way, they receive it. As the hon. member stated, they get the full rate for the first year and the single rate each year thereafter. Then if they have children or dependants, they also get something.

I am very happy that the hon. member has brought this question up. I have brought it up myself on various occasions. As far as making it more known to our widows and our pensioners is concerned, I certainly agree with his statement.

Motion agreed to and the House adjourned at 10.29 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Tuesday, July 12, 1977

The House met at 2 p.m.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

THE CANADIAN ECONOMY

PROPOSED FIRST MINISTERS' CONFERENCE TO DEAL WITH UNEMPLOYMENT—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Lincoln M. Alexander (Hamilton West): Mr. Speaker, I rise under the provisions of Standing Order 43 on a matter of urgent and pressing necessity related to the unacceptable, frightening and shocking figures on unemployment released this date. Given the fact that, including the hidden jobless, this country now faces an actual unemployment rate of 11.5 per cent, or in other words over 1.3 million Canadians are out of work which in effect costs this country $17 million a day in lost GNP and $6 million a day in unemployment insurance, I move, seconded by the hon. member for York-Simcoe (Mr. Stevens):

That the Prime Minister immediately take steps to convene a first ministers' conference to deal with the critical problems of high unemployment and unsatisfactory real growth, hopefully to reverse the banana republic-like image this country presently enjoys.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The motion can be presented only with the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

SUGGESTED INTRODUCTION OF NEW BUDGET CONTAINING PROVISIONS TO CREATE JOBS—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Sinclair Stevens (York-Simcoe): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a matter of urgent and pressing necessity. In light of today's unemployment statistics showing unemployment levels having risen from last month's crisis levels and that employment in manufacturing has dropped 2.5 per cent in the past year yet government waste continues, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. McKinnon):

That the government create jobs and lessen unemployment by introducing a new budget which should include income tax cuts for low and middle income earners to help stimulate demand for goods and services and in addition it should include a cut in federal sales taxes, particularly building supplies, to help stimulate demand for housing and thus create jobs in the construction and related industries.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: The presentation of such a motion can be done only with the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

PROPOSED FIRST MINISTERS' CONFERENCE ON JOB CREATION—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby): Mr. Speaker, in view of the continuing serious problem of unemployment in all regions of Canada illustrated by a further rise in the seasonal unemployment figures, and given the fact that the June labour force statistics show a decrease in the labour force, in employment and in the participation rate, all of which reflect the growing problem of hidden unemployment with Canadians giving up looking for non-existent jobs, and in view of most economic forecasts indicating that the present level of unemployment will continue throughout 1977 and into 1978, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles):

That this House calls upon the government to hold a federal-provincial first Ministers' conference on job creation to be followed by a new federal budget aimed at reducing the high level of unemployment in Canada.

Mr. Speaker: Such a motion can be presented for debate only with the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

* * *

[*Translation*]

FINANCE

SUGGESTION BANK OF CANADA MAKES LOANS TO PROVINCES AND MUNICIPALITIES AT ADMINISTRATIVE COST—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Eudore Allard (Rimouski): Mr. Speaker, under the provisions of Standing Order 43, I ask for the unanimous consent of the House to move a motion dealing with an important matter of pressing necessity.

Considering that the Bank of Canada is not fulfilling its role, which is to control credit on the basis of the economic needs of the nation; that the Islamic Bank of Development established by 29 Islamic states has applied the concept of the

interest-free loan since 1975; and that it has been shown that it is possible to lay one's capital to advantage without collecting interest, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Beaudoin):

That the House enjoin the federal government to take immediately every necessary step so that the Bank of Canada may play its true role by directing its policy on the issuance of credit for the harmonious development of our national economy, by granting loans or advances at administrative cost in the public field.

Mr. Speaker: Under the provisions of Standing Order 43, this motion requires the unanimous consent of the House. Is there such consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

* * *

[*English*]

THE LATE CONSTABLE DAVID KIRKWOOD

MESSAGE OF SYMPATHY TO WIFE AND FAMILY—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Hugh Poulin (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, I rise according to the usual provisions of Standing Order 43, and as a matter of tragic necessity. Recognizing the daily heroism that police officers across our country are called upon to perform, and in particular to the heroism and devotion to duty of the late Constable David Kirkwood of the Ottawa Police Department who so courageously gave his life last evening in the line of duty and in the protection of society, and in recognition of his fellow officers here and across the country, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Ottawa-Vanier (Mr. Gauthier):

● (1410)

That this House does hereby express its profound grief and sympathy to the wife and family of the late Constable David Kirkwood.

Mr. Speaker: The motion can be put to the House only with unanimous consent. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: The House has heard the terms of the motion. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Motion agreed to.

* * *

THE CANADIAN ECONOMY

SUGGESTED INVESTIGATION OF REASON FOR LAY-OFFS IN INDUSTRY—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Jack Marshall (Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe): Mr. Speaker, I wish to move a motion under the terms of Standing Order 43 concerning a matter of urgent and pressing necessity. Figures from the Department of Manpower and Immigration released in June show that some 22 business firms have laid off more than 6,000 workers due primarily to marketing problems—this was during June alone—and there are indications of further deterioration which will exacerbate the unemployment rate in industry to even more unacceptable figures than presently exist. I therefore move, seconded by the hon. member for Hamilton West (Mr. Alexander):

That this House order the government to take immediate action to investigate problems causing these alarming lay-offs and to direct the expertise of the departments concerned with the object of rehabilitating the firms which are in difficulty and preventing further lay-offs.

Mr. Speaker: The presentation for discussion of any such motion requires the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: No!

* * *

[*Translation*]

HARBOURS

SUGGESTION FORTY SEVEN MILLION DOLLARS OF MONTREAL PORT BE LEFT TO ADMINISTRATION OF THAT PORT—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Roch La Salle (Joliette): Mr. Speaker, under the provisions of Standing Order 43, I ask for the unanimous consent of the House to move a motion dealing with an important and urgent matter. I am sure it will be supported by all Montreal members.

In view of the difficulties experienced by the port of Montreal in terms of financing and equipment; in view of the fact that the Montreal port authorities do have a reserve of $47 million accumulated over the last forty years; and considering that the Montreal port could use this amount to complete the necessary facilities to maintain its importance, and that under the new legislation on national harbours this fund of $47 million might fall into the hands of the federal treasury, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Pembina (Mr. Elzinga):

That this House unanimously urge the minister responsible to accept the proposal made in the memorandum submitted in the last few days by the Montreal Chamber of Commerce to the effect that the reserve of $47 million remain the property of the Montreal port and that it may dispose of it in its best interests.

Mr. Speaker: Pursuant to provisions of Standing Order 43, presentation of such a motion requires the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[*English*]

THE CANADIAN ECONOMY

PROPOSED FIRST MINISTERS' CONFERENCE TO DEAL WITH UNEMPLOYMENT—UNDERTAKING OF PRIOR PRELIMINARY WORK

Mr. Lincoln M. Alexander (Hamilton West): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I should like to direct my question to the Prime Minister, pointing out to him that, including the hidden jobless, there are approximately 1.3 million Canadians unemployed at the present time of whom 46 per cent are breadwinners who have been looking for jobs for the past three months, which means we are losing some $17 million a day in gross national product and $6 million by way of unemployment insurance costs. I ask the Prime Minister in all seriousness, because of the national emergency we face as a result of this peculiar phenomenon, whether he will take steps to convene an early first ministers' conference to deal with rising unemployment and an unsatisfactory real growth rate, problems which have too long adversely affected the optimum economic potential of this country?

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Without subscribing to the fanciful figures put forward by the hon. member when he talks about what he calls hidden unemployment, taking the figures as they are, they do not show a situation with which anybody in this country can be happy. I must remind the hon. member that an increase of one tenth of one per cent this month is in contrast with a decrease of four tenths of one per cent in the previous month and that it is impossible to ascertain a trend from these contradictory figures. The hon. member's calculations are pretty far off. If that is the way he would run the economy—

An hon. Member: You don't care about the unemployed.

Mr. Trudeau: Unemployment is, of course, something about which we do care a great deal. That is why in the budget we brought in substantial tax cuts for consumers and the corporations. We are still hopeful that the long run trend will be in line with what happened last month, and that the budget will continue to produce satisfactory effects if the private sector can take up the tax room which is left to it.

I fail to see how a conference of first ministers at this time, without any further elaboration by the hon. member for Hamilton West, would be a solution. If the hon. member has some suggestions which he would want me to put to the premiers to consider, I will gladly do that. But the federal government is taking its responsibilities, so are the provinces, and at this stage the bringing together of the two would have no effect beyond that of satisfying the hon. member opposite.

Mr. Alexander: Mr. Speaker, let me tell the Prime Minister that the first thing he can tell the first ministers of the country is that the budget of the Minister of Finance is a complete bust and disaster and will do nothing in terms of bringing about long-term, lasting employment. That is the first thing that I can tell the Prime Minister, and if he wants any further suggestions he can ask me after I have put this supplementary question. On June 29 I asked the Prime Minister whether he would convene a first ministers conference in order to deal with this very situation, and the Prime Minister replied, as reported at page 7178 of *Hansard*:

> Mr. Speaker, I have ascertained that I did answer Premier Schreyer's letter to me. The essence of the federal position is that if our officials and eventually ministers of finance and manpower ministers can meet and make some progress with the kind of idea Premier Schreyer has, we then could usefully consider convening a federal-provincial conference of first ministers. However, at this stage I do not think the latter conference should be convened until preliminary work has been done.

Given the fact that the Prime Minister indicated that there should be some preliminary work done before we convene this first ministers conference to deal with this very unhealthy situation, and in light of the fact that we have this enormous rate of unemployment which certainly calls for immediate initiatives on the part of the federal government under the leadership of the Prime Minister, I ask the Prime Minister what steps he has taken to start and finish this preliminary work in order that it will be possible, in his terms, to convene this first ministers conference. Has the Prime Minister done anything since I asked him that question on June 29, given the gravity of this very unhealthy situation?

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, we are attempting to make sure that the private sector does take up the very substantial tax room that the last budget made for it. The purpose of the budget in cutting taxes was this. The hon. member will recall that since the turn of the year something like $2.5 billion to $3 billion have been put into the hands of the private sector, both individuals and corporations. It has been our hope and expectation that this would lead to increased investment and increased construction by the private sector. Of course, if the private sector is not prepared to do that, I fail to see how the suggestion made by one of the hon. members opposite a moment ago would have any effect. In other words, cutting taxes now does not seem to be the right thing to do if the people who will benefit from the tax cuts just save the money rather than invest it. That is why we are trying once again to ensure that the private sector takes up the tax room that we left for it, rather than turn to increased federal expenditures which I am sure hon. members opposite would not want to encourage.

Mr. Alexander: A final supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Why is it that the Prime Minister continually and callously disregards the plight of the unemployed; and when is he going to discontinue fighting inflation on the backs of the poor and the unemployed?

EFFECT OF CONTROLS ON JOB CREATION IN MANUFACTURING INDUSTRY—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Sinclair Stevens (York-Simcoe): Mr. Speaker, my question is also for the Prime Minister. In view of the fact that

the number of people working in Canada in our manufacturing industries today is no greater than at the time the Prime Minister imposed wage and price controls in this country—in short, there has been virtually a stagnant situation in job creation so far as our manufacturing industry is concerned—would the Prime Minister indicate whether he thinks the controls program has in fact had a detrimental effect on job creation in our manufacturing industries?

● (1420)

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I am not prepared to reach that conclusion on the evidence of the statistics. The hon. member knows that there is overcapacity in many of the manufacturing sectors, and that is probably the first reason there is not a very great rush to increase investment. We were hopeful the last budget would create a climate wherein the private sector would want to take up this tax room, but thus far progress has been slight.

DATE RECOVERY IN UNITED STATES WILL HAVE EFFECT IN CANADA

Mr. Sinclair Stevens (York-Simcoe): Mr. Speaker, again my question is directed to the Prime Minister. Representatives of his government, and the Prime Minister himself, have stated on previous occasions that recovery in the Canadian economy would occur as a result of recovery in the economies of our principal trading partners. Now that the economy of our major trading partner, the United States, has recovered to the extent that employment in their manufacturing sectors has grown by 2.5 per cent in the last year, while employment in our manufacturing sector has actually fallen by 2.5 per cent in the last year, would the Prime Minister indicate to the House when he expects the recovery in such countries as the United States will catch on in Canada and lead us out of the wilderness into which his policies have led us?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance has made it repeatedly clear that the effects of the budget he presented would be slow and that the recovery of the Canadian economy, both in terms of unemployment and inflation, would be slow. This is the reality of the situation, and we have never tried to hide it.

ESTIMATED LEVEL OF UNEMPLOYMENT IN DECEMBER

Mr. Sinclair Stevens (York-Simcoe): Mr. Speaker, my final supplementary is directed to the Prime Minister. I should like to discern how slow is slow. Will the Prime Minister indicate what his estimate of unemployment for December will be, bearing in mind that the Secretary of the Treasury in the United States believes that their unemployment, now a point lower than ours, will be down to 6.5 per cent come December of this year? The budget that is now in place, will that ensure a 6.5 per cent unemployment level in Canada by December?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the progress, which I indicated would be gradual, is something which the Minister of Finance will have to assess before making any further statement on budgetary or fiscal positions.

DATE OF ANNOUNCEMENT OF NEW JOB CREATION PROGRAMS

Mr. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister. Having acknowledged that substantial parts of the manufacturing sector are operating in excess capacity, why will the Prime Minister not simultaneously acknowledge that the government's entire strategy of stimulating the economy by giving tax cuts to the corporation was wrong? In the Prime Minister's reply to Premier Schreyer's request for a first minister's conference to deal with unemployment, he said that federal job creation plans are almost complete. This is new to Premier Schreyer and it is new to the people of Canada, that the federal government has some new job creation programs. If these plans are near completion, I should like to ask the Prime Minister when we can expect an announcement about them.

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Manpower and Immigration has repeatedly indicated to the House what new funds were put into job creation programs such as Canada Works and other areas.

Mr. Broadbent: Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister is either sick today or he is asleep.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Broadbent: I should like the Prime Minister to clarify the statement in his telegram to Premier Schreyer of Manitoba to the effect that there are new plans which are almost complete, which is something different from what he has said now. Are there new plans which the government has in mind to produce jobs, or are we going to rely simply on the old ones which we have seen have not worked so far this year?

Mr. Paproski: That was prior to the election this fall.

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, I do not remember having tabled that letter to Premier Schreyer, nor the date of it. If it was referring to plans that the Minister of Manpower and Immigration has already announced, then my first answer is correct. If it is a very recent answer then it has to do with the plans that the Minister of Manpower and Immigration is working on now. I repeat, however, I cannot recall having tabled that letter or making it public. I just wonder where the hon. leader of the NDP got it.

Mr. Broadbent: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. It is no great mystery. It is not confidential and I have a copy of the statement. The premier of that province, who has asked the Prime Minister to organize a conference, issued a statement a few days ago in which he referred to the Prime Minister's commitment for new programs. The question I have following what seems to be Premier Schreyer's very sensible request is this: If there are new programs may we hear what they are? If the government is now working on them, why has it not

consulted the provinces when we know that virtually every province has experienced continual increases in unemployment and would like to coordinate their views with those of the government?

Mr. Trudeau: The hon. leader of the NDP has not indicated the date of the letter.

Mr. Broadbent: June 22.

Mr. Trudeau: In that case I was taking Premier Schreyer into my confidence and I am surprised that he has taken the hon. member into his confidence.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): You cannot trust those socialists.

Mr. Paproski: And you wanted him in your Cabinet. Shame!

* * *

[*Translation*]

SMALL BUSINESS

REQUEST GOVERNMENT FAVOUR SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. Gérard Laprise (Abitibi): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of State responsible for small businesses.

Could the minister tell the House whether his department has defined or will define what small and medium size businesses are? Could he also tell whether the government will introduce legislation to help truly small businesses in Canada, thereby ensuring the conservation of current jobs and the creation of new ones, as well as the recovery of the economy in all regions of Canada?

[*English*]

Hon. Len Marchand (Minister of State (Small Business)): Mr. Speaker, we will be defining what will be termed a small business. We are dealing with the question of a definition at this time but I have no plans for legislation.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Laprise: Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question.

I should like to ask the minister whether he has read the program which was presented on May 26 last to a Senate committee by the Canadian Federation of Independent Businessmen. If so, could he tell the House whether he or the government finds this program interesting and whether it will be used to draft a policy for small and medium size businesses?

[*English*]

Mr. Marchand: Mr. Speaker, we have worked very closely with the Canadian Federation of Independent Business and a number of things they have suggested will perhaps be incorporated in some of the things we are doing.

THE CANADIAN ECONOMY

UNEMPLOYMENT IN ATLANTIC REGION—ALLEGATION DEPARTMENTAL PROGRAMS AGGRAVATE PROBLEM

Mr. David MacDonald (Egmont): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister. In answer to the first question today he referred to the difficulty in making a month by month comparison with respect to the unemployment situation. I should like to direct his attention to the situation in Atlantic Canada. I am sure he is well aware of the serious trend of increasing unemployment there since 1969. It is now an average of 50 per cent higher in the four provinces than in the rest of Canada. Even with the programs of the Department of Manpower, no serious turnaround of the present unemployment crisis has been achieved in Atlantic Canada. Can the Prime Minister indicate whether he has consulted with some of his key ministers with respect to the impact of their programs? I am thinking of the Department of Transport and the Department of Supply and Services which have been criticized recently for in effect adding to and continuing the problem of chronic high unemployment in the Atlantic provinces?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): The hon. member will recall that the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion did bring in very substantial concessions for those industries which would settle in areas of high unemployment, particularly the maritimes and eastern Quebec. Naturally these will take a little bit of time to take effect, but it is an indication of the government's real concern about high unemployment in those areas. Of course, the direct work programs are also geared to areas of high unemployment and proportionately much more per capita is being spent in the hon. member's area than in other areas of Canada where unemployment is lower. As I indicated in confidence to Premier Schreyer, other programs are in preparation, but I think that is the last time I take him into my confidence.

● (1430)

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. MacDonald (Egmont): The Prime Minister may know that repeatedly in questions in the House, both to the Minister of Finance and to the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion, it has been difficult, in fact impossible, to determine the impact of that recent financial initiative. I do not believe there has been any consultation with the premiers as to their appreciation of its importance in their situation. I should like to ask the Prime Minister, in light of the fact that the Department of Supply and Services over the past year has substantially reduced on a proportionate basis its spending in Atlantic Canada, and with a view to the breakdown in recent talks between the Minister of Transport and his provincial counterparts, whether or not the Prime Minister will give new instructions to key ministries which have a definite economic impact in the Atlantic regions in order that not just in the job creation area under Manpower but in large sectors of the economy influenced by these key departments there can be a significant turnaround.

Mr. Trudeau: The hon. member is obviously correct in suggesting that various other areas of action could be envisaged. I am reminded by the Minister of Supply and Services that there are two specific operations of access for businessmen in those regions of Canada so that they can make greater use of the budgetary requirements of the Department of Supply and Services; in other words, they can sell a much higher proportion of goods and services to the federal government.

UNEMPLOYMENT IN ATLANTIC REGION—MEASURES TO INCREASE PRODUCTION IN REGION

Mr. David MacDonald (Egmont): I wonder if the Prime Minister can indicate whether either he or perhaps the Minister of Supply and Services has responded to the recent declaration by the Atlantic provinces chamber of commerce at their annual meeting in Charlottetown last month with respect to a major program to achieve more production in Atlantic Canada, both related to the private sector and the public sector, and whether or not the federal government will give significant assistance to this commendable initiative?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): I do know that the Minister of Supply and Services was meeting a couple of weeks ago in Halifax with boards of trade and chambers of commerce. If the hon. member wants more details of the results of that meeting he might either ask a question or contact the Minister of Supply and Services.

* * *

REGIONAL ECONOMIC EXPANSION

MEASURES TO AID INDUSTRIES IN ATLANTIC REGION

Mr. Jack Marshall (Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion. In line with the figures referred to for Atlantic Canada by the hon. member for Egmont, and in view of the fact that Newfoundland has a rate of unemployment of 15.7 per cent, and more probably of over 22 per cent, and in view of the fact that one of the main industries in the Atlantic region, particularly in Newfoundland, is the pulp and paper industry which is suffering from marketing and cost production problems, what action is the minister taking to pinpoint these particular industries to help them in rehabilitating their operations, and to avoid lay-offs which are occurring causing suffering to the employees in Atlantic Canada?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Marcel Lessard (Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): Mr. Speaker, we have done all we could to help those industries. Surely the trend on the international market is largely responsible for the rather weak economic situation of the pulp and paper industry in particular. Of course, our department is limited in its means of action, but we give those industries the maximum technical and scientific assistance; we are also working with the province to conclude other agreements in other areas in which we can take direct action in conjunction with the province to give a new impetus to its economy and create new jobs. We are now negotiating with the province in two or three areas where we might help and I hope that in the next few weeks we will be able to announce the outcome of our negotiations.

* * *

[*English*]

MANPOWER

GOVERNMENT ACTION TO AVOID LAY-OFFS IN INDUSTRY

Mr. Jack Marshall (Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe): I have a supplementary question for the Minister of Manpower and Immigration. In view of the fact that figures for June show the lay-offs of 6,000 employees in various industries across Canada—the minister referred some time ago to using the emergency response factor in the Canada Works program—what action is the minister taking now in view of the figures released by his own department in order to prevent the lay-offs and to provide alternative employment?

Hon. Bud Cullen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, at the initiative, for example, of the government of New Brunswick, we did in fact provide some $600,000 in that region as an emergency response. Where initiatives are taken or representations are made, we look at them to see if the emergency response factor is applicable to that situation.

* * *

[*Translation*]

THE CANADIAN ECONOMY

MEASURES TO CURB UNEMPLOYMENT IN QUEBEC

Mr. Roch La Salle (Joliette): Mr. Speaker, I would like to address my question to the right hon. Prime Minister. Given the fact that the economic measures put forward by his government did not produce the anticipated results and are largely responsible for the high level of unemployment in this country, would not the Prime Minister believe that this situation has a close relationship with increasing unrest between Quebec and the federal government? If so, would he have new proposals or programs for the province of Quebec he could announce today?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the answers which I have given a few moments ago apply also to the province of Quebec regarding, for instance, the lower taxes in the case of the Department of Regional Economic Expansion as well as the Department of Manpower and Immigration programs and the budgetary measures announced by the Minister of Finance.

I do not see why the hon. member should think that the province of Quebec deserves to be treated differently. Would it be because its government has generated uncertainty among

investors? I would not know. But it seems to me that this is a bad case for the member for Joliette to defend.

Mr. La Salle: Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister lets the House believe that I am defending a bad case but I think that many people in Quebec are seriously concerned about the effect of the unemployment rate. As current forecasts are very gloomy, more particularly in the province of Quebec, I am going to repeat my question.

Does the right hon. Prime Minister intend to go on trying to deceive the Canadian people, telling them that national unity will be achieved through the official languages rather than by restoring a sound economy, more particularly in Quebec?

* * *

[*English*]

INDUSTRY

GOVERNMENT ACTION TO PREVENT EROSION OF SECONDARY MANUFACTURING INDUSTRY

Mr. Bruce Halliday (Oxford): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce, if he can take a minute to catch his breath. In view of the continuing and alarming increase in lay-offs in both the textile industry, particularly in Quebec, and in the electrical products industry in Ontario, as reported by the Department of Manpower and Immigration for the month of June, can the minister tell us what specific steps his department or the government is taking to identify the problem in order to prevent further erosion of our secondary manufacturing industry?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, as far as the textile industry is concerned, in November last we took some measures which are beginning to produce the anticipated effects. I met recently the industry people and the unions and they say that they are satisfied with the policies we adopted in this area.

As far as the electronics industry is concerned, the problem is very difficult to solve at the present time. We took special measures concerning the television industry and if the hon. member wants to raise another area of concern, I shall be pleased to see what we can do.

[*English*]

REASON FOR FAILURE OF GOVERNMENT TO PROTECT INDUSTRY FROM FOREIGN COMPETITION

Mr. Bruce Halliday (Oxford): Mr. Speaker, somehow the U.S.A. has been relatively successful in limiting the penetration of its domestic markets by foreign manufacturers. Could the minister indicate why the Canadian government has been notably less able to protect our Canadian industries and thereby preserve jobs for Canadians?

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): I am very glad that the hon. gentleman raised that question, but I would like him at the same time to tell his friends who are calling me on behalf of importers that I am on the right track in trying to protect domestic markets.

* * *

ENVIRONMENTAL AFFAIRS

POLLUTION OF GREAT LAKES—GOVERNMENT ACTION TO RECTIFY—SUGGESTED BANNING OF PHOSPHATES IN DETERGENTS

Mr. Derek Blackburn (Brant): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Fisheries and the Environment. In view of the damning indictment by the Great Lakes Water Quality Board that the federal and Ontario governments are not taking effective anti-pollution measures on already known pollutants going into the Great Lakes, can the minister indicate to the House whether he is satisfied with the present state of our Great Lakes and whether he will make an urgent statement on motions this week stating what new initiatives he intends to take in co-operation with the Ontario government, since the 47 problem areas in the Great Lakes have shown almost no improvement?

● (1440)

Hon. Roméo LeBlanc (Minister of Fisheries and the Environment): Mr. Speaker, of course I am not satisfied with the condition of the Great Lakes. That is one of the reasons we are having public hearings. We want to find out how the agreement which will follow the present five-year agreement should be reinforced and where possible improved upon. The report, to my knowledge, has not yet been made public, but in fairness, however, the hon. member should read the whole report because there is improvement in some areas. Obviously, in some cases until waste treatment plants come into operation, progress is going to be slow. However, these are being built in Canada and in the United States.

Mr. Blackburn: I would like to know where these improvements are taking place because the St. Lawrence today is just a sludge river. The Great Lakes Water Quality Board suggested in its annual report that one of the real problems in combating water pollution is the lack of adequate funds to analyse toxic pollutants. Will the minister undertake to ensure that sufficient funds are provided so that toxic pollutants can be detected and removed?

In addition, the board noted that Canada has taken no steps to restrict phosphorous to below 2.2 per cent in laundry detergent. As phosphorous is very harmful to water life will the minister consider a total ban on phosphorous in detergents?

Mr. LeBlanc (Westmorland-Kent): Mr. Speaker, obviously there is never enough money to do all the good things we would like to do, but the problem of toxic substances in water is one of the very high priorities of the environmental protection service of my department. We are giving that problem the priority it deserves. On the other hand, the hon. member is a

bit naive when he thinks that in some cases toxic substances can be removed. It takes a long time before they move from the Great Lakes to the ocean and are diluted.

On the matter of phosphates, Canada has been one of the leading nations in their elimination. We are considering imposing more stringent requirements, but we also have to look at the improvement of waste treatment plants to make sure that phosphates do not escape to the ocean by way of the Great Lakes.

Mr. Blackburn: Mr. Speaker, the minister said there were some areas of the Great Lakes which have shown improvement as far as pollution is concerned. Could he be a little more specific? Where are those areas?

Mr. LeBlanc (Westmorland-Kent): Mr. Speaker, I would have to look at the report, which I do not have in front of me, but the shores in certain areas have improved very considerably.

Mr. Blackburn: Where?

Mr. LeBlanc (Westmorland-Kent): In many cases it will take time—and it is taking time—before visible improvements are seen. But there is no increased deterioration in most areas of the Great Lakes.

* * *

[*Translation*]

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY

POSSIBILITY OF ESTABLISHING A BRANCH LINE FROM MONTREAL TO MIRABEL

Mr. Jacques Lavoie (Hochelaga): Mr. Speaker, I should like to put a question to the Minister of Transport.

Since it is possible that the Marathon project could be carried out on the site of Angus shops, a co-operative residential and commercial project, and since the existing railway could become a link between eastern Montreal and Mirabel, could the minister tell the House whether he intends to draw the attention of the Canadian Pacific to the possibility of considering that connection between Mirabel and eastern Montreal which could contribute at the same time to the economic development of that underprivileged area of Montreal?

[*English*]

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I am not looking at this particular project at this point in time, but I would be glad to take the hon. member's representations into account.

[Mr. LeBlanc (Westmorland-Kent).]

TRANSPORT

PROPOSED INCREASE IN TOLLS ON WELLAND CANAL—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Prince Albert): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Transport. It has to do with the negotiations which are going on with the United States in connection with Welland Canal tolls, an increase of which would simply strike another body blow at the western farmer at a time when farm income is going down very materially. Will the minister take a stand on behalf of the western farmer, and of Canada in general, against an increase in these rates at this time?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, we are having discussions about the sensible approach to the handling of the seaway which would allow for the goods moving through it to pay, basically, for the operating and maintenance costs of that seaway and a very marginal return over that. We have cancelled the overdue interest, which was never paid after the arrangement which the right hon. gentleman preferred but was never followed through. The right hon. gentleman should not assume that because of any very marginal impact upon the grain farmer as one of the shippers through this facility there is any lessening of my determination to do all kinds of things to assist him. We are working for him, but it will not necessarily be in a silly way, such as trying to deal with the tolls in a very special manner.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, judging by the minister's answer it is obvious that he is pressing for an increase in the tolls, and the United States is holding back. In an outspoken speech the other night the Minister without Portfolio pointed out that the western farmer had not been protected until he crossed the Rubicon. Has the Minister of Transport consulted his confrere, the Minister without Portfolio, and has he found that the Minister without Portfolio has changed the views he expressed so strongly for so long against increasing these rates?

Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, I think the House will find that all of us on this side share the view that the continuation of and an increase in the number of things which can be done for the west and for the farmer will take place in important areas. We will not quibble and attempt to make it seem that one particular bit of bad management really helps him. I assure the right hon. gentleman that I am delighted to see the 25 per cent increase in our strength between Winnipeg and Kamloops which came about when the Minister without Portfolio joined this government. The right hon. gentleman knows well that that is going to add to our strength now and in the future.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, that will be fine solace for the western farmer, who is being struck another blow by the minister. Did the Minister of Transport read what the Minister without Portfolio said the other day at the Stanfield—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Diefenbaker: —at the Stampede, which is a good description of the actions always taken by the hon. member for Halifax.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Diefenbaker: The Minister without Portfolio was in the parade and, with his hand on a saddle, he said: "This is the only seat I am sure of".

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

* * *

MANPOWER

YOUTH UNEMPLOYMENT—GOVERNMENT ACTION TO RECTIFY

Mr. Paul Dick (Lanark-Renfrew-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I would like to put a question to the Minister of Manpower and Immigration. My question relates to the high level of youth unemployment in Canada and to the fact that as of today one in seven young Canadians are officially unemployed, even though this statistic does not include the hundreds of thousands who are excluded from government statistics. In view of the fact that today's release indicates that one third of these young people have now been unemployed for more than three months, will the minister tell this House what measures he is taking to deal with the failure of his department to find long-term productive jobs to bring an end to this tragic waste of talent and ability?

Hon. Bud Cullen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, my department together with private enterprise and other departments has found employment for the vast majority of young people.

Mr. Fraser: Who are you kidding?

Mr. Cullen: We are concerned about the high level of unemployment among youth. That is why we have placed heavy emphasis on Young Canada Works and the job experience training program which proved, as a summer component, to be very effective. We intend to increase emphasis on that program. We are working with the provinces on apprenticeship programs and on co-operative education programs and on a number of others which would take too long to list in the question period. The hon. member should read the list once in a while.

Mr. Dick: Mr. Speaker, I can assure the minister that I do read it, but I cannot understand why about 45 per cent of our unemployment is among the youth of this country when the government is doing so much for youth. In view of the reference made by the Leader of the New Democratic Party, will there be further plans for young people in the employment field implemented this fall?

Mr. Cullen: Mr. Speaker, instead of letting statistics be the catalyst this party has been working on this operation since last October. Announcements were made last October. We recognize that this is a continuing problem. Instead of relaxing I spent part of my holidays going to other countries and finding out how they are endeavouring to deal with this problem.

Mr. Fraser: How many Canadians are overseas looking for jobs?

• (1450)

Mr. Cullen: Mr. Speaker, we received from all of the countries nothing but approbation for the stance being taken by Canada.

* * *

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

MOZAMBIQUE—UNITED NATIONS MOTION TO SUPPLY MATERIAL ASSISTANCE—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Howard Johnston (Okanagan-Kootenay): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. Can the minister explain whether a recent unanimous vote of the Security Council of the United Nations commits Canada to provide material assistance to Mozambique and will this involve the supplying of arms and ammunition to a Marxist regime?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I apologize to the hon. member, but in view of the noise in the chamber I did not hear the first part of his question. Would he mind repeating it?

Mr. Johnston: Mr. Speaker, I will repeat the question. Can the minister explain whether a recent unanimous vote of the Security Council of the United Nations commits Canada, which is a member of that council, to provide material assistance to Mozambique and will this involve the supplying of arms and ammunition to a Marxist regime?

Mr. Jamieson: Dispensing with the adjectives, Mr. Speaker, obviously if it was a unanimous decision of the Security Council it means that Canada subscribed to it. I will have to look at the actual wording of it to make a direct answer to the hon. member on the second part, but I very much doubt if there are any arms involved in this decision.

Mr. Johnston: I realize there was not too much in the Canadian newspapers, but it was reported rather fully in the New York *Times* of July 1. Considering this government's expressed and understandable reluctance to commit Canadian troops to any peace-keeping proposal for Rhodesia, can the minister explain the unanimous vote at the Security Council, the result of which can only increase the risk of all-out warfare in that area?

Mr. Jamieson: Mr. Speaker, I do not think I can answer in enough detail in the question period to satisfy the hon. member. If he will agree, I will write him in detail, table it or

whatever his wish is once I have had an opportunity to look into the question and the answer in detail.

* * *

FISHERIES

ATLANTIC SALMON—ACTION TO PROVIDE ADEQUATE SURVEILLANCE OF RIVERS TO PROTECT AGAINST POACHERS

Mr. Fred McCain (Carleton-Charlotte): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Fisheries. In view of the depletion of Atlantic salmon stock as a result of massive poaching operations on the Tobique, St. John and other rivers, and in view of the economic importance of this salmon to both commercial fishermen and the tourist industry, what measures is the government planning to take to extend adequate surveillance services for the protection of this valuable resource?

Hon. Roméo LeBlanc (Minister of Fisheries and the Environment): Mr. Speaker, if I could agree with the hon. member's premise, I might be able to give him a more substantive answer. The reality is that the salmon have been late in moving up to the Atlantic Rivers this summer. Just last night about 4,000 units moved to the area of the MacTaquac dam in that area. There is a very substantial improvement. It means that what was at first believed to be the result of excessive poaching was in fact a result of lateness of the biology of the species. As for poaching, we have already had two raids which resulted in the confiscation of nets. I recognize there is some difficulty, especially relating to the native Indians of New Brunswick, but I think that these difficulties can be overcome.

Mr. McCain: In 1976, the Tobique river was closed for all salmon fishing. This appeared to be because the Department of Fisheries was so understaffed that law enforcement was impossible. Since then what I would term a comparable situation has allegedly taken place on the St. John this year. In these specific instances, has the staff been increased and can the laws be properly enforced for the balance of 1977?

Mr. LeBlanc (Westmorland-Kent): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member, like many members of his party, complains when we ask for an increase in the number of public servants and when we cannot do all the tasks they ask us to do, they again complain. However, in the case of the St. John river we have had the assistance of the RCMP in undertaking the operations we have undertaken in the last few days. There will never be a level of surveillance to avoid all incidents of poaching just as there will never be enough policemen to avoid all incidents of vandalism. The officials of my department are doing their very best, including working weekends, to ensure proper surveillance.

[Mr. Jamieson.]

NATIONAL DEFENCE

POSSIBLE ABOLITION OF CERTAIN RADAR CONTROL CENTRES—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Allan B. McKinnon (Victoria): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of National Defence. The *Queen's Quarterly,* a prestigious journal, states that the United States has announced plans for integrating its military and civilian radars and abolishing its SAGE regional control centres such as the one we have at North Bay. Is the minister contemplating doing the same thing in Canada in order to keep in line with the United States policy?

Hon. Barney Danson (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, this relates to our whole North American air defence through NORAD. It is an area under review by the United States in consultation with ourselves. A full report should be in shortly so that these systems are rationalized and observe our concerns and the concerns of everyone else on national sovereignty.

PROPOSED PURCHASE OF FIGHTER AIRCRAFT WITH INTERCEPTOR CAPABILITY—POSSIBLE CHANGE IN PRIORITIES

Mr. Allan B. McKinnon (Victoria): My supplementary also has to do with air defence. President Carter has cancelled the B-1 contract. This calls into question the role of manned bombers. At the present time the minister has invited several companies to bid on the new fighter aircraft with interceptor capability for Canadian forces at a cost of approximately $2.5 billion. Is he now reviewing this decision and is there any likelihood of changing his priority which put the new fighter aircraft ahead of the replacement ships for the navy?

Hon. Barney Danson (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, I do not think it changes the priority on the new fighter aircraft. It certainly does not change the priority on the new ship program, either. Both are moving ahead as quickly as possible. The whole range of North American air defence and our role in NATO were considered very seriously in the consideration of the new fighter aircraft. Hopefully, as I said before, one can serve both roles. It might be necessary to go to two types but the factors raised will be considered.

* * *

ENVIRONMENTAL AFFAIRS

POLLUTION OF GREAT LAKES—POSSIBILITY OF CHANGING TIMETABLE FOR CORRECTIVE ACTION BY INDUSTRY

Mr. P. B. Rynard (Simcoe North): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Minister of the Environment. It is supplementary to a question asked earlier by the hon. member for Brant. The question has to do with the 47 problems identified in 1971. These 47 problems still exist in the Great Lakes basin. As I understood it at that time, there was to be a timetable which industry had to follow. Industry claims that they have been following this timetable. Does the minister now

have to change his timetable or what does he have to do to catch up?

Hon. Roméo LeBlanc (Minister of Fisheries and the Environment): Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member had been a member of the Standing Committee on Fisheries and Forestry, he would understand that industry is in no great mood to have us accelerate the timetable for the elimination of pollution. In fact, their representations were very much to the contrary. I had some of this in the Senate again this morning. In many cases the timetable set out will extend to four or five years while anti-pollution equipment is being installed. I recognize that this is a slow process, but I do not see an alternative in the handling of existing industries. In the case of new industry, obviously the requirements are in the building process and the equipment is installed along with the rest of the machinery.

Mr. Rynard: Is the minister satisfied with the work over which he has control in both the municipal and provincial areas?

Mr. LeBlanc (Westmorland-Kent): Mr. Speaker, I will never be satisfied as long as any pollutant is being put into the waters of this country. That being said, I recognize that the province of Ontario in particular has done a remarkable job in handling its pollution problems and is pursuing that aim vigorously. I do not take anything away from the present Ontario minister of the environment who is an excellent colleague.

* * *

SUPPLY AND SERVICES

REASON FOR SECURITY CLEARANCE FOR CLERICAL POSITION IN DEPARTMENT

Mr. Stuart Leggatt (New Westminster): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Supply and Services. It concerns an ad which the minister placed for a routine clerical job in the Department of Communications. The job required a security clearance by the Ministry of Supply and Services. Will the minister tell the House why it is necessary for a routine clerical job to be cleared by the Department of Supply and Services? Does the minister have a division within his department concerning security clearance and is that division separate and apart from the S and I division of the RCMP?

● (1500)

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean-Pierre Goyer (Minister of Supply and Services): Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of the specific case raised by the hon. member, but it is clear that for a long time the industrial security has come under the authority of the Department of Supply and Services. We act as advisors to Canadian industries that might get contracts from the government of Canada or from foreign governments, which involve security work. So, it is in that sense that we advise private industries. I shall examine the specific case raised by the hon. member in that perspective.

[*English*]

REASON FOR SECURITY SECTION IN DEPARTMENT

Mr. Stuart Leggatt (New Westminster): One supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Since the minister has a security clearance division in his own department, can he explain why the S and I Division of the RCMP is not capable of handling that particular role or function? Why does the minister need his own security section or division if there is an overlap by the RCMP? Further, will he tell us how large that division is—how many people are employed in his own department in this security area?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean-Pierre Goyer (Minister of Supply and Services): Mr. Speaker, I note that the question goes beyond the authorized limits of the debates in the House. It would be necessary to explain to the hon. member the workings of security matters within the government and to remind him that each department is responsible for its own security, and that the security depends in fact on the deputy minister of each department, with the advice of course of the RCMP. As regards industrial security, considering that it is closely related to the execution of contracts, the government always saw fit to maintain a small unity which does not act as a police force, but only as an advisory group to private industry so that the security rules regarding the working requirements be respected. If the government were not acting, I suppose it would be accused of failing to shoulder its responsibilities. In this case, I wish to inform the hon. member that the division does not act as a police force, but simply as an advisory group.

* * *

HARBOURS

ESTABLISHMENT OF PORT AT GROS-CACOUNA—REQUEST FOR PROGRESS REPORT ON NEGOTIATIONS WITH QUEBEC

Mr. Eudore Allard (Rimouski): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Transport.

On November 3, 1975, as reported on page 8778 of *Hansard*, I asked the Minister of Transport some information regarding the important deep water sea port at Gros-Cacouna.

The minister gave me the following answer:

I have taken a special interest in the potential of that particular area and will be endeavouring to ensure that this department is in a position to make recommendations at an early date.

Could the minister tell the House today whether the joint study carried out by the Quebec and federal governments has been completed?

[*English*]

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): I expect that study has now been completed—it was certainly due to be

finished about this time, although I have not seen it. Work has been going on in relation to the various facilities on the assumption that the report would be adequately favourable to them, so there will be little delay in proceeding.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Hamilton West on a point of order.

Mr. Alexander: I would remind Your Honour that the leader of the New Democratic Party, in attacking the Prime Minister almost as vigorously as I did with respect to the unhealthy unemployment situation, referred to a letter which I believe was written by Premier Ed Schreyer, in answer, I believe, to a letter from the Prime Minister. This concerns a serious matter: whether the government is moving toward job creation in the fall, as I believe it is, because the same point was raised by Premier Schreyer in a press conference when he indicated that the Prime Minister had ignored his wishes with respect to the convening of a first ministers' conference, at which time the premier indicated that the government intended to introduce some form of job creation program in the fall.

It is my understanding—I am not an expert on the rules, and Your Honour will check me if I am wrong—that since the leader of the NDP had cited this letter, indicating it was written on June 22 by the premier, that if one quotes at length from a letter such as that, or from any document, as long as its publication would not offend the public interest such a letter or document should be tabled. As far as I can understand, as I look at the Prime Minister, who regards this as a big joke—

Mr. Trudeau: Have you got something there from Beauchesne?

Mr. Alexander: —publication of this letter does not offend the public interest. All we are concerned with is whether the government has the wisdom or the brains to bring about some form of job creation plan in order to relieve those who are suffering from inability to find jobs because the government has failed to create a climate of confidence in which the private sector can play its full part in the economy. I can refer you to Beauchesne, Mr. Speaker—I have in mind the intervention by the Prime Minister just now—and I have found on page 134 a sentence which will be of interest to the Prime Minister, who does not know everything all the time:

> It has been admitted that a document which has been cited ought to be laid upon the table of the House if it can be done without injury to the public interest.

I shall be fair, Mr. Speaker, and I shall read the next sentence, because to be selective in my reading would be taking advantage of Your Honour:

> The same rule, however, cannot be held to apply to private letters or memoranda.

My conclusion is that this is not a private letter. I do not know what the leader of the New Democratic Party has in his hands. He has an ability to be able to get information which others cannot, because Socialists are all alike—they always exchange information.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

[Mr. Lang.]

Mr. Alexander: Perhaps that is how they get it. But in light of the serious situation we face, in light of the fact that the government's economic policies have brought the country to its knees, and given the fact that the Prime Minister may at long last have realized it is time for the government to get off its fanny and face its predicament by bringing in some form of job creation program, I believe it is incumbent upon the leader of the New Democratic Party to table whatever information he may have, for the benefit of all members of this House as well as the people of Canada.

Mr. Speaker: Order. The House ought to be clear about two things. First, that the requirement, according to our precedents, for the tabling of a letter which has been cited or quoted is one which is directed against the ministry for the reason, obviously, that if a minister takes part in a debate in the House and is able to cite documents to his or her advantage, it is only in accordance with fair play and justice that those documents ought to be available to all the participants in the debate. That rule operates against ministers but not against other members.

In the second place, the right to table documents in this House is not one which can be used by members other than ministers of the Crown. I would be prepared to listen to argument that if an advantage has been gained by a member of the House, as a result of making reference to documents, the member concerned ought to be compelled to table those documents, whether he is a minister of the Crown or not, in order to equalize the advantage among all members participating in the debate and so that the discussion could continue on a fair footing. However, the question period has never been equated with debate in terms of our precedents, and surely it ought not to be open to any member of the House simply to refer during the question period to some document and then, by that means, table a document by a procedure which would not otherwise be open to him. For these reasons, I am not able to extend the rule at this time.

* * *

● (1510)

PRIVILEGE

MR. BROADBENT—CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN PRIME MINISTER AND PREMIER OF MANITOBA

Mr. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege related to what the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) had to say and what I regard as a petty, peevish and insulting reference to Premier Schreyer of Manitoba—I say that most seriously—as well as to myself as a member of the House.

During the question period, the Prime Minister said, on the one hand, that the Premier of Manitoba was betraying a confidence in revealing correspondence between himself and the Prime Minister, and that I, in turn, was compounding this by informing the House of some information which was of a confidential nature. I resent that, and I insist that the Prime Minister review the case and offer, in particular, the Premier

of Manitoba and myself an apology for the implication he has made and the inference to be drawn that we betrayed a confidence given by the Prime Minister.

In raising any question earlier in the House today I based it directly on a press statement which came out of the office of the Premier of Manitoba on Friday last. That press statement referred to a telex which was sent by the Premier of Manitoba in mid-May to the Prime Minister of Canada requesting a first ministers' conference to deal, among other things, with unemployment. More than a month later the Prime Minister replied that there would be no such conference held, at least immediately. In reply to that the Premier of Manitoba issued a public statement, and I assume, being a man of integrity, Mr. Schreyer, the Premier of Manitoba, was not revealing a confidential telex or telegram sent to him by the Prime Minister. Having made his own request public in the first place—and if the Prime Minister challenges this contention and I am mistaken, I will apologize to him—I am sure the Prime Minister replied to the premier not in a confidential way at all, but directly, in the normal course of correspondence. At any rate, in a press statement issued on Friday by the office of the Premier of Manitoba, the following paragraph appears:

> The Prime Minister had replied June 22 that a first ministers' conference should be held some time in the coming months to deal with the issues raised by Premier Schreyer, but that such a meeting probably would require careful preparatory work in other ministerial areas. He—

That is a reference to the Prime Minister.

> —also stated that job creation plans for the coming months were already close to completion when Mr. Schreyer's first telex of May 17 was received—

It seems to me very clear, Mr. Speaker, that if Premier Schreyer issued this statement publicly he was not betraying a confidence. Some very important questions have been raised, and I think the Prime Minister owes me an apology for suggesting that I am revealing something which is of a confidential nature. He also owes an apology to the Premier of Manitoba. Beyond that, on the very important issue of job creation, he owes an apology to the members of this House because the answers which he gave today did not make clear whether or not there were new job creation programs, as he suggested to Premier Schreyer there were.

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I am called upon to make a whole series of apologies. I think if I explain the circumstances to the hon. member he might want to reconsider his request for apologies. My understanding, when I asked the hon. member the date of my letter to Premier Schreyer, was that the leader of the New Democratic Party had, indeed, a copy of my letter to Premier Schreyer in his hand. If the hon. member can say that that is not so, that he has not seen a copy of my letter to Premier Schreyer, then of course I will withdraw any inference that he is betraying a confidence.

Mr. Broadbent: Mr. Speaker, on the same question of privilege, it seems to me to be entirely irrelevant—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Paproski: Produce the letter.

RCMP

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby (Mr. Broadbent) has raised, by way of a question of privilege, some remarks made by the right hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) during the question period concerning, firstly, the Premier of Manitoba, which of course in this context, and I doubt in any context, would not constitute a question of privilege concerning the members of this House.

Secondly, in respect of his own participation in the question period—that is to say, the actions of the hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby—he indicated that the Prime Minister had indicated that the hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby was compounding the disclosure of a confidence. The Prime Minister has responded to that point. In any case, it would seem to me that it would not constitute a question of privilege. The point has been dealt with by an equal contribution from both sides, and the matter ought not to go any further.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

FINANCE, TRADE AND ECONOMIC AFFAIRS

Thirteenth report of Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs—Mr. Cafik.

[*Editor's Note: For text of above report, see today's Votes and Proceedings.*]

* * *

[*Translation*]

CANADIAN MOUNTED POLICE

TABLING OF TELEGRAM FROM L'AGENCE DE PRESSE LIBRE DU QUÉBEC

Hon. Jean-Pierre Goyer (Minister of Supply and Services): Mr. Speaker, I would like to table a copy of a telegram—and the English translation—which was attached to a letter from L'Agence de Presse Libre du Québec, the Mouvement pour la défense des prisonniers politiques and the Coopérative des déménageurs du 1er mai, which I tabled in the House on June 30, 1977.

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. This tabling, it seems to me, is a full response to the point of order raised earlier by the hon. member for Northumberland-Durham (Mr. Lawrence), who raised the point that the minister had been compelled to table a letter, but that in the letter was reference to an enclosure and that the enclosure ought to be tabled as well. I am not going to decide at this point the precedents or the practices by which we ought to be bound. It is a very interesting argument as to whether or not it necessarily follows that, since a document can be held to be tabled, the enclosures or documents attached to it, and so on, might be as well. Perhaps that is an argument

which will be raised again when the situation presents itself in the future, but for the moment I am relieved of that obligation by the minister's tabling of the document at this time.

Mr. Lawrence: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, is it in order for me to ask the minister now, through you, why it took him 12 days to table something that was attached to the letter in the first place? Why could not the minister come clean with all these documents in relation to the House of Commons?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

* * *

CRIMINAL CODE

MEASURE TO PROHIBIT MEDIA IDENTIFYING ACCUSED UNLESS CONVICTED

Mr. Paul Dick (Lanark-Renfrew-Carleton) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-434, to amend the Criminal Code (reporting names of accused).

Some hon. Members: Explain.

Mr. Dick: The purpose of this bill is to recognize more fully the time-honoured right of an accused in Canada to be presumed innocent until proved guilty by prohibiting the media from identifying an accused unless and until he is convicted.

Motion agreed to, bill read the first time and ordered to be printed.

* * *

● (1520)

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, the following questions will be answered today: 1, 24, 31, 850, 2,764, 2,772, 2,780, 2,808, 2,813 and 2,826.

[*Text*]

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS DEALINGS WITH WILLIAM TERON ASSOCIATES

Question No. 1—**Mr. Cossitt:**

Since April 20, 1968, what are the details of any government business dealings with William Teron Associates, William Teron Limited, Mr. Teron personally or any other company with which he had any connection in an official capacity and, what amount of public funds are involved in any case that may exist?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): I am informed by the National Design Council, Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation, the Ministry of State for Urban Affairs, and the Department of Public Works as follows: In June 1971, funds totalling $35,000 in the form of a research grant were allocated to Mr. Teron by the National Design Council to develop performance and measurement standards and design criteria for those aspects of living accommodation relating to space division, flexibility, storage equipment and furniture to serve as a basis for improved design of living accommodation. It should be noted that $10,000 of the above-noted sum expended by Mr. Teron went to a research team at the Institute of Urban Studies, University of Winnipeg and that Mr. Teron contributed his time free of charge. On February 2, 1973 the balance of $25,000 was transferred to a research team at the University of Montreal to complete this project. While Mr. Teron was a Director/Officer of Canadian Inter-Urban Properties Limited, from May 31, 1967 to December 15, 1969, there was in effect a lease between that company and CMHC for office premises in Kingston, Ontario—the lease dating back to May, 1958. Leases were in effect as follows between the Department of Public Works and firms with which Mr. Teron is known to have had connection in an offical capacity (subject to the proviso below respecting Retno Ltd.) during the period from April 20, 1968 to June 30, 1973 when, prior to his appointment as President of CMHC, he resigned from every office and directorship in commercial corporations:

Company	Location	Details
*Retno Ltd.	Teron Building, 219 Argyle Ave., Ottawa.	To lease 25,200 sq. ft. at $88,140 per annum for the period from June/68 to May/73.
*Retno Ltd.	Teron Building, 219 Argyle Ave., Ottawa	To lease 530 sq. ft. at $610 per annum for the period from June/68 to May/73.
*Retno Ltd.	Teron Building, 219 Argyle Ave., Ottawa.	To lease 25,730 sq. ft. at $116,948 per annum for the period from June/73 to Jan/74

*During the period June 1968 to April 1970 payments were made to Teron Construction; for the remaining period of the lease, payments were made to Retno Ltd. (c/o W. Teron & Associates) on the instructions of Retno. However, effective February 1974, payments were assigned to N.D.M. Leaseholds who purchased the property from Retno. Although Mr. Teron was not connected with Retno Ltd. in an official capacity, because payments were made to Retno Ltd. (c/o W. Teron & Associates), the leases above have been included.

Etron Limited	Premises at 1404 Scott St., Ottawa.	To lease 15,900 sq. ft. at $52,470 per annum for the period Jan/67 to Jan/74.
Canadian Inter-urban Properties Limited	Premises in the East Mall Shopping Centre, 600 King St., East, Oshawa.	To lease 5,849 sq. ft. at $25,704 per annum for the period Apr/68 to Mar/73.
Canadian Inter-urban Properties Limited	Premises in the East Mall Shopping Centre, 600 King St., East, Oshawa.	To lease 5,849 sq. ft. at $29,280 per annum for the period Apr/73 to Mar/74.

Two leases are currently in effect between the Department of Public Works and firms with which Mr. Teron had a connection in an official capacity prior to June 30, 1973:

Company	Location	Details
Retno Limited	Premises at 273 Argyle Ave., Ottawa.	To lease 3,620 sq. ft. at $21,539 per annum for the period May/75 to Apr/80.
Urbanetics Limited	Premises at 1404 Scott St., Ottawa.	To lease 15,900 sq. ft. at $63,000 per annum for the period Feb/74 to Jan/79.

It should be noted that these two properties were leased following Mr. Teron's resignation from every office and directorship and following the transferral of any shares held to Trustees under a blind trust agreement completed on December 18, 1973. (See the answer to Question 3,046, Hansard, October 14, 1975, page 8176). It should also be noted that the Department of Public Works does not maintain records of the various officers of the many companies with which it deals. If any additional companies with which Mr. Teron had any connection in any official capacity can be identified, the information requested will be provided. In late 1972 and the first part of 1973, Mr. Teron negotiated in trust for the federal government the acquisition of options on various properties comprising the Toronto Harbour Front project. In total, Mr. Teron incurred expenses and advanced deposits for a total of $184,214.84 for which he was reimbursed by the department. Details of these expenditures follows:

Date	Particulars		Amount
Dec 6 & 19/72	W. Teron	Deposit on properties for Toronto Harbour Development Project (applied to purchase price)	$150,000
Jan 4/73	Y & R Properties Ltd.	Negotiations re purchase of Terminal Warehouses Ltd. including drafting of offer, title examinations, meetings with agents, etc.	4,250.00
Jan 31/73	Wilfred Wolman, QC McLean, Lyons & Kerr	In connection with purchase of Terminal Warehouses Ltd.—all services rendered during period Sept 14/72 to Jan 22/73 including correspondence-attendances related to reviewing, revising and finalizing purchasing agreement, etc.	$ 26,963.60
Mar 20/73	W. Teron	Expenses—Air fare, travel, telephone	2,039.59
Mar 21/73	W. Teron	Interest on deposits made by William Teron	961.65
		Total	$184,214.84

The Ministry of State for Urban Affairs has had no dealings with William Teron Associates, William Teron Limited or any other company with which Mr. Teron had any connection in an official capacity. However, Mr. Teron was named Acting Secretary of the Ministry on October 16, 1975 and Secretary on June 15, 1976.

Order Paper Questions

AIB PERSONNEL

Question No. 24—**Mr. Cossitt:**

1. What is the total number of persons that were employed by, attached to, on loan to, under contract with or in any similar way connected with the Anti-Inflation Board (a) as of April 12, 1976 (b) as of the date the answer to this question is prepared?

2. How many additional personnel is it anticipated will be required during the present fiscal year?

3. What is the total annual payroll of the Board as of the date the answer to this question is prepared and how many received (a) up to $15,000 a year (b) between $15,000 and $20,000 a year (c) between $20,000 and $25,000 a year (d) between $25,000 and $30,000 a year (e) over $30,000 a year?

4. On what date was the answer to this question prepared?

Mr. Bob Kaplan (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Finance): 1. (a) As of April 12 the number of persons who are permanent and temporary employees plus persons under contract and Executive Interchange was 617. On October 1, 1976 the number was 684. (b) No date can be stated as the date the answer to this question is prepared.

2. The personnel requirements of the Anti-Inflation Board are assessed on a regular basis to ensure the effective operation of the Board. It is difficult to anticipate future requirements as these are dependent upon a variety of factors including the degree of compliance with the guidelines and the requirement for effective monitoring of prices and incomes.

3.

Anti-Inflation Board
Payroll Report as of October 1, 1976

	Up to $15,000.	$15,000. to $20,000.	$20,000. to $25,000.	$25,000. to $30,000.	Over $30,000.
Permanent	180	77	69	52	50*
Term	242	14	—	—	—

Total Manpower 684
Total Annual Payroll $10,644,089.20
* Includes seven Board Members.

4. The government takes responsibility for the answers it provides to questions and for the process involved in replying to such questions. It is not appropriate therefore, to provide information about internal administration arrangements.

ORDER PAPER QUESTION NO. 1

Question No. 31—**Mr. Cossitt:**

1. With reference to the answer to Question No. 3,573 of the First Session of the 30th Parliament, asking details on government business awarded to Urbanetics Limited which stated: "See answer to Parliamentary Question No. 3,359" of the First Session of the 30th Parliament, for what reason does the government consider this possible since Question No. 3,359 of the First Session of the 30th Parliament has not been answered?

2. Will the government supply details of any government business received by Urbanetics Limited since its creation including details of any contracts and costs involved?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): 1. An explanation was given to an assistant of the hon. member on April 27, 1976.

Order Paper Questions

2. See reply to Question No. 1 answered this day.

FEASIBILITY STUDIES

Question No. 850—**Mr. Rodriguez:**

For each of the past five years, have any government departments or agencies been involved in funding any sort of feasibility studies in Africa and, if so (a) what was the nature and cost of each (b) what department or agency (i) conducted (ii) contracted the studies?

Mr. Fernand E. Leblanc (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State for External Affairs): In so far as the Canadian International Development Agency is concerned, the answer is as follows: In carrying out an African program which has reached a magnitude of approximately $200 million per annum, CIDA conducts numerous feasibility studies to investigate and validate the desirability of proposed investments. In any given fiscal year, therefore, CIDA finances feasibility work in Africa across a broad spectrum of sectors and sub-sectors. To list all feasibility studies carried out in Africa over the past 5 years would necessitate a time-consuming and expensive search of records, including records which are now in CIDA's archives. Such a task, although possible, would probably consume at least two man-years, at a cost to the Canadian taxpayer of not less than forty thousand dollars. For these reasons, it is not possible to answer this question.

IDRC—PUBLICATION "FAMILLE ET DÉVELOPPEMENT"

Question No. 2,764—**Mr. Robinson:**

1. Does the government, through the International Development Research Centre, pay the total cost of the publication *Famille et Développement* and is the cost to the taxpayer some $600,000?

2. Is the government aware that the publication is stirring up third world countries against countries such as Canada and, if so, will the government take appropriate remedial action or withdraw its financial contribution?

Mr. Fernand E. Leblanc (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State for External Affairs): 1. The International Development Research Centre, a public corporation created by the Government of Canada in 1970 and financed through an annual Parliamentary grant, appropriated in December 1974 a sum of $644,000 to cover the preparation and start-up costs and the first three years of operation of the magazine, *Famille et Développement*. It has been published quarterly in Dakar, Sénégal, since January 1975. Actual expenditure to date is $486,900. The IDRC has so far been the sole contributor although it is likely that donor agencies in other countries may now be willing to join in providing additional support if it is required. Revenue from the sale of the magazine (paid circulation has reached almost 22,000, and readership is estimated at 200,000) is becoming a major factor in the financing of future operations and it is hoped that the publication will become self-financing in future.

2. *Famille et Développement* is the only mass-circulated, indigenous publication providing information on family health and development issues for the peoples of French-speaking Africa. The Editorial Committee as well as the editorial and production staff (except for the IDRC local administrator) is entirely African. The publication provides information prepared and/or selected by Africans based on their perceptions of current African interests. The magazine does periodically have articles on the implementation of rural development programs in African and Asian countries; some of these articles refer to countries whose political and economic systems are different from those of the industrialized nations, including Canada, and reflect a concern with the existing economic disparities in the world. The magazine has never contained an attack on Canada or other industrialized nations. In one recent issue, the magazine contained a cartoon on the problems of aid tied to the economic or political interests of donor nations. The IDRC has protested the cartoon to the editorial staff of *Famille et Développement*. Indications are that the publication has been extremely well received in Francophone African countries. Although the IDRC role in the publication is not direct and, therefore, not particularly visible, among those Africans who are aware of this Canadian support, the publication has brought considerable credit to the policies and programs of the Centre and thus to Canada's role in development aid.

SALE OF MASSEY-FERGUSON COMBINES TO RUSSIA AND/OR ARGENTINA

Question No. 2,772—**Mr. Halliday:**

Did any department or agency sell or arrange for the sale of Massey-Ferguson combines to Russia and/or Argentina and, if so (a) what were the model numbers (b) what extra equipment was on the machines (c) how many were sold (d) what was the price per unit?

Mr. Hugh Poulin (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): In so far as the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce is concerned: The Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce has no knowledge of any federal department or agency having sold or arranged for the sale of Massey-Ferguson combines to Russia and/or Argentina.

POST OFFICE PUBLICATION

Question No. 2,780—**Mr. Rodriguez:**

What was the total cost for the production of the 1969 Post Office Department publication *A Blueprint for Change*?

Hon. J.-J. Blais (Postmaster General): According to Post Office records, total cost was $5,600.

EXPENDITURES AT SAULT STE. MARIE

Question No. 2,808—**Mr. Symes:**

What was the total amount spent in Sault Ste. Marie from October 1972 to date by the Department of External Affairs?

Mr. Fernand E. Leblanc (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State for External Affairs): Detailed statistics are not available as departmental expenditure records are not maintained by region or municipality. However, as the Depart-

ment does not maintain an office in Sault Ste. Marie it is estimated that expenditures are negligible.

EXPENDITURES IN SAULT STE. MARIE

Question No. 2,813—**Mr. Symes:**

What was the total amount spent in Sault Ste. Marie from October 1972 to date by the Ministry of State for Science and Technology?

Hon. James Hugh Faulkner (Minister of State for Science and Technology): In so far as the Ministry of State for Science and Technology is concerned: Nil return.

CULTURAL AGREEMENTS

Question No. 2,826—**Mr. Jones:**

1. Is there any agreement between Canada and Great Britain similar in terms to the France-Canada Cultural Agreement of 1965?

2. Is there any Commission with Canada and Great Britain as the sole members, similar in nature to the France-Canada Mixed Commission?

3. Are there any exchanges between Canada and Great Britain similar to those agreed upon at the Eighth Session of the France-Canada Mixed Commission?

Mr. Fernand E. Leblanc (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State for External Affairs): 1. No. It has been mutually agreed between the two governments that no formal agreement is necessary to further bilateral cultural and academic exchanges.

2. No. However officials of both governments meet periodically in formal sessions to discuss programs of cultural and academic exchanges. The fourth such meeting, which will include representatives of the provinces, will be held in London next October.

3. Several proposals in the fields of exchanges of persons, education and cultural promotion will be discussed at this meeting as was the case at the recent meeting of the France-Canada Mixed Commission. These would be in addition to a variety of cultural and academic activities carried out with Great Britain under various Commonwealth as well as private auspices. As with other countries with which Canada has developed programs of cultural exchanges, those with Great Britain include exchanges in the field of the performing and visual arts, exchanges in the field of education including scholarships, youth exchanges and visits of persons prominent in the academic and cultural fields.

[*English*]

Mr. Cossitt: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order concerning the approximately 21 or so questions on the early part of the order paper which have not been answered until just now when the parliamentary secretary referred to three of them. I raise this matter because the answers, whatever they may be, to two of the questions he has just read out become a complete farce due to the fact that they have been on the order paper for a year and a half without answers. Therefore, it serves hardly any purpose in their being answered at this late date.

For example, one asked about the Anti-Inflation Board staff, its size and the number the board anticipated they would hire during the next fiscal year—which was last year and not this year. We are now receiving the answer when, presumably, the staff is being phased out. Thus, we are receiving an answer which is not what I asked for in the first place.

It asked for salary brackets, how many were in certain brackets, and so on. Simply because the parliamentary secretary knew someone on this side of the House was going to move the adjournment of the House today in light of this type of situation, he brought in three answers to early questions, two of which are absolutely redundant and out of place because the situations are long past. Question No. 31 was simply referring to the last parliament, which is when I asked it.

How can the government in answer to my question, refer me to question No. 3,359 of the first session of the thirtieth parliament when that very question was not answered during the thirtieth parliament? It took 1½ years to come up with an explanation today as to why they said a question was answered which was not answered. This is getting to the point of being ridiculous and it is a case where the government is covering up information to which the Canadian people are entitled.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Cossitt: The government is leaving questions on the order paper until such time as public opinion will forget, or until such time as the questions become so far outdated in the time element that the answers do not make any sense. We should have a guarantee from the parliamentary secretary today that the right to information by members of parliament and the Canadian people is going to be adhered to by this government, instead of the procedures which have been going on for five years. There are many members senior to me who have witnessed this type of action since this government came to power.

Mr. Speaker: Shall the remaining questions be allowed to stand?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

* * *

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Speaker, with respect to the following item of government business, it has been suggested that we deal with any votes which have been deferred at ten o'clock this evening. If that is agreeable to members of the House, I would be prepared to accept the notion that the House deal with any deferred votes on the bill at ten o'clock this evening. The report stage of this bill may not be completed, but it might be convenient to deal with whatever votes are outstanding at that time.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, there seems to be excellent progress being made at report stage of this bill. When the government House leader referred to deferred votes, I am sure he was talking about any votes deferred during the course of today which will be dealt with at ten o'clock this evening. If that is the case, we are quite agreeable.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I was informed that these discussions were in progress, and on behalf of my colleagues I can say we are sympathetic to the idea. Apparently the message I relayed did not get back to the government House leader. Instead of taking the vote at ten o'clock, it seems to me it should be at 9.30.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): If we call the votes at ten o'clock—there might be eight or ten of them by then—it will run into a late hour and then the "late show" will be after that. I realize this is negotiating in public, which does not often work. I would suggest 9.30, rather than ten o'clock. We could stop the debate at that point, ring the bells for 15 minutes and start taking the votes at 9.45.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Under the circumstances, perhaps the House would permit the Chair to suggest the obvious compromise—ringing the bells for 15 minutes beginning at 9.45.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. MacEachen: No.

Mr. Speaker: That is one of the dangers when the Chair attempts to enter into discussions. If there is agreement which the House can put into an order at this time, I would be glad to put the question. If there is no agreement, I am not able to put any question whatsoever to the House at this time.

Orders of the day.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

CRIMINAL LAW AMENDMENT ACT, 1977

AMENDMENTS TO CRIMINAL CODE

The House resumed, from Monday, July 11, consideration of Bill C-51, to amend the Criminal Code, the Customs Tariff, the Parole Act, the Penitentiary Act and the Prisons and Reformatories Act, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs; and motion No. 9 (Mr. Brisco).

Mr. Speaker: Pursuant to the proceedings adopted to this point, this vote will be deferred until later. The House may want to have the question put at this time. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

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

Some hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Speaker: All those opposed to the motion will please say nay.

Some hon. Members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

Mr. Speaker: Pursuant to the proceedings we have been following with respect to this report stage debate, this vote will be deferred. Therefore, the House will now move to motion No. 10.

Mr. Stan Schumacher (Palliser) moved:

Motion No. 10.

That Bill C-51, to amend the Criminal Code, the Customs Tariff, the Parole Act, the Penitentiary Act and the Prisons and Reformatories Act, be amended in clause 3 by striking out lines 39 to 42 at page 13 and substituting the following therefor:

"(*b*) a peace officer or public officer, or"—

He said: Mr. Speaker, I suppose it is just fate that Your Honour called my motion next. I must be at the top of the minister's hit parade at the moment, according to reports I have received about a comment he made for the purposes of the media with regard to the debate so far. I cannot take in silence what he is reported to have said. The minister is guilty of very sleazy and underhanded conduct in regard to the debate which is going on in this House, by attempting to blame members on this side of the House who have participated in the debate on Bill C-51 for the killing of a police constable in this city last night. I think that is very reprehensible on the part of the minister.

Some hon. Members: Shame.

Mr. Schumacher: If he wants to put the blame where it should be, he should look at his own administration and reconsider the question of capital punishment in this country.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

An hon. Member: He is not listening; he does not care.

Mr. Schumacher: That is nothing new for him. Returning to the matter at hand, this amendment is designed to protest the parts of this bill which give the governor in council the right to make regulations. As I pointed out earlier in this debate, the law, particularly criminal law, should be abundantly clear to everybody. Matters like this one should be included in the

Criminal Code, not in some collection of rules and regulations written by bureaucrats. In committee, the minister pointed out that the proposed amendments to the Criminal Code result from representations made to him by the attorneys general of some provinces. As he said in committee, they did not think mayors, wardens, reeves, sheriffs' officers, sheriffs, or justices of the peace should fall into the same category as policemen or other peace officers.

● (1530)

If it is the intention of the government and the provinces to correct the definition of "peace officer" or those who are going to be allowed exemption under this section at a later date, a different class of people should be provided for in the Criminal Code. The situation must be improved. As has been pointed out on many occasions, the government is becoming more prone to controlling our activities by regulation rather than by law.

My motion would neither strengthen nor weaken the bill, but is designed to persuade the government to include important provisions in the Criminal Code and not through a hodge-podge of other publications which makes it difficult for citizens to find out what rules and regulations govern them. If this part of our criminal law is to be strengthened, weakened, broadened or narrowed, it should be done through the parliamentary process and not through the machinations of the bureaucracy. That is why I ask members to give serious consideration to amending the bill in the way I have suggested.

Mr. Robert C. Coates (Cumberland-Colchester North): Mr. Speaker, it had not been my intention to involve myself in this debate, but this particular amendment gives me an opportunity to say some things that I think require to be said, not just on behalf of the hon. member for Palliser (Mr. Schumacher) but on behalf of all members of the House. I could hardly believe my ears this morning when I heard on the "World at Six" program certain statements attributed to the Minister of Justice (Mr. Basford) in relation to the sniping incident which took place in Ottawa last evening and about which every Canadian feels a deep sense of grief and abhorrence. It has nothing to do with what any member of this chamber is endeavouring to do as far as this bill is concerned, however. What members are attempting here is to produce good laws that are appropriate for all Canadians, that protect Canadians as much as possible by regulating the ownership of guns in this nation. The great problem with guns and their regulation is that those who commit most of the crimes pay no attention to the law in the first place. Guns do not kill people; people kill people with guns. I could not believe that last night the Minister of Justice would suggest the atrocities committed against human beings in that incident had anything to do with members of parliament.

An hon. Member: He was right on.

Mr. Coates: If the hon. member opposite knew anything about the House of Commons, or had been here a little longer, he would have some appreciation of the rights and privileges of individual members, which he does not appear to have. If he wants to make a speech on this amendment, he can do so; otherwise he should keep his mouth shut.

Mr. Malone: He could not point a slingshot in the right direction.

Mr. Coates: What concerns me is not just what the minister said last night in the course of what I would describe as ambulance-chasing when he arrived at the scene of the sniping incident, although that is probably the most irresponsible act any person could commit. Who knows who might have been killed by a madman with a gun in a house, shooting indiscriminately at people. Yet the Minister of Justice went to the scene and told anybody willing to listen that he is the Minister of Justice and that he is of the opinion that if this bill had been passed by the House—and he has had opportunities to get it through before now if he had wanted to use the parliamentary procedures available to him—the incident would not have happened. Reports I have received indicate that the minister identified certain members of this House as having blood on their hands because of the incident. That was a most shocking and irresponsible statement. It is almost beyond belief that the Minister of Justice of this country would make such a statement, except that these days nothing is beyond belief, as far as I am concerned, about this government's actions regarding legislation that it endeavours to impose upon the Canadian public.

I will put on record the remarks made by the Minister of Justice in an interview, as reported by Broadcast News. The report reads as follows:

> "It's quite clear, for example, in this case that the now accused had a twelve-gauge shotgun, .22 calibre semi-automatic rifle, a 30—30, a 303, and a 30 06. The semi-automatic had been bought within the month in Ontario, and I obviously have to be careful because the man is charged—it is quite clear on the information I have that that purchase would have been restricted or prohibited under the legislation."

The minister is taking a lot upon himself in saying what would or would not be in legislation still being debated in this House of Commons. Apparently the government is imposing legislation and this is not any longer to be a debating institution where decisions are made after due consideration and debate, and when the House arrives at the best possible conclusion in regard to legislation governing guns or anything else. I believe, sir, that this House should be charged with a question of privilege as far as this particular statement is concerned. The minister went on to say:

> What I don't understand is we have a group of members, such as Stan Schumacher, Doug Neil, Ritchie, Towers, Bob Brisco from Kootenay West, who spent all day yesterday and presumably all day today debating such things as the right of people to collect and use machine guns, or amendments reducing the sentences for the use of guns; weakening the provisions relating to safe storage, and what I just don't understand is how many people, how many policemen, how many citizens, have to be shot down in Brampton or Oshawa or Ottawa or Penticton, where they shot a tax collector the other day; or Vancouver, or Montreal, before parliament will react to that public situation and pass the legislation.

● (1540)

Mr. Speaker, I just cannot believe that such a statement would come from the Minister of Justice who is supposed to have some respect for the law and the rights of individuals in this country, and especially for the rights of members of parliament.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Coates: It is obvious that the Minister of Justice has no sense of justice so far as individual Canadians are concerned, or he would not be making such statements to the public and endeavouring to inflame the public against an opposition party which has been completely responsible and has endeavoured to work with the government to produce the best possible kind of legislation for the benefit of all Canadians. I have known the Minister of Justice for a long time, but I have never known him to show this kind of irresponsible approach to legislation. I believe he owes the members he has named an apology in the House. If he is a House of Commons man, as I have always believed him to be, I think he will rise in his place and offer an apology to the individuals in question, because that is what they have a right to expect from any individual member sitting in this chamber.

Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Calgary North): Mr. Speaker, I am very concerned about the statement that has just been read in the House and it seems to me that now is the appropriate time to discuss it. Let me say in my introductory remarks that I assume these words were spoken by the Minister of Justice (Mr. Basford) in haste, or perhaps written by someone in his office, because knowing the minister as I do, I just cannot believe he could have been serious.

I want to bring to the attention of the House and record the fact that the bill was debated on second reading on May 11 and 12. Then it went to committee for eight days. We heard only two groups of witnesses in committee, one regarding the gun control section and one on invasion of privacy. All other witnesses were denied a hearing. The bill returned to the House for report stage and was debated on June 30, July 4, 11 and 12. On one of those days the debate lasted only about one hour and a half. Is the minister going to accuse this party, as he apparently has in his release, in full knowledge of the fact that the murder was committed in Ottawa? I feel deeply, as a Canadian, about this tragic occurrence, not only about what has happened in Ottawa but about the three incidents in Calgary in the last year and a half.

I bring to the minister's attention that one of the fundamental principles of administration of justice is that the Minister of Justice, in leading his department, must at all times show absolute integrity and honesty. In fact, those who have some knowledge of parliamentary history know that in the mother of parliaments the minister of justice is non-partisan because of the position he holds in administering justice.

Is the minister suggesting that the murder which took place last night—a tragic event for the young police officer who was killed, and for his family—as well as the incident in Toronto and the one in Calgary to which I brought the attention of the House of Commons, were all caused because the bill which is now before the House was not passed? If that is what the minister implied, then we have reached a sorry state in the Department of Justice—and I must say, in frankness, that that is not the truth. The truth is that the murder which was committed in Ottawa involved the use of a long gun. As someone said in committee, there are six million long guns in Canada. Another member said there were 11 million. We know there are 2.5 million long gun owners who are not affected by this bill at all.

Therefore, to suggest that because we did not pass the bill yesterday—we debated the question of criminal law regulations and the matter of putting the onus on the Crown, not the accused—a murder was committed, is to place the blame on my friends in this party, something which I can only describe as shameful by the Minister of Justice and I hope he will apologize for it.

Mr. Malone: This House should adjourn.

Mr. Woolliams: I would point out, with reference to the murders in Calgary, that the last one involved the use of a prohibited or restricted weapon. When the minister piloted the bill on capital punishment through the House he should have considered whether it might have been a deterrent. I leave that to him. He knows where I stood in this regard. On this side we had a free vote on capital punishment, but on the government side there was no free vote and every cabinet member lined up, to a man, to a woman. To suggest to us that we have caused crime to increase is shameful. Why will the government not set up an inquiry on crime in Canada, something for which we have asked over and over again?

Why will they not take a hard look at what kind of life a police officer must lead because of the crime rate in this country? Since this motion deals with peace officers and orders in council, we have pointed out that law that is drafted by orders in council, by cabinet or by an unknown and unnamed body, is improper. That is not the way to legislate criminal law. That was our message which rang through this chamber yesterday.

The second point which we argued yesterday was not one dealing with guns. It referred to the fact that in one of the provisions the government placed the onus on the accused. I pointed out that as in the "Cross" and "Wigmore" authorities on evidence, and for generations, our system of jurisprudence has been that a man or a woman cannot be found guilty in a criminal court unless the evidence shows they are guilty beyond a reasonable doubt—and the onus is always on the Crown. That was the argument we put forward yesterday. We put forward intelligent and intellectual arguments concerning liberty and freedom of Canadians. Then we were met with that kind of news release this morning. The only congratulation I can offer the Minister of Justice is that he did not include my name among those he mentioned. He knows I co-operated with him in the committee at every stage of the bill. To suggest that this bill would have stopped the murder in Ottawa yesterday,

or any other murder of a policeman, is utter nonsense and untruthful.

Mr. Arnold Malone (Battle River): Mr. Speaker, I would like to follow on the same theme as that put forward by the two previous speakers who have pointed out that the Minister of Justice (Mr. Basford) has been derelict in his duty. He has been dishonest with the House of Commons and the country in suggesting that members on this side of the House were somehow connected with the most unfortunate murder last night. I would like to state in the House that there is a correlation in western countries between an increase in the rate of crime and murders and an increased rate of unemployment. If the Minister of Justice can say to us, as he did in his comments last night, that we are in some way guilty of the crime last night, then surely, because of the high rate of unemployment in the country at present, both the minister and the government have to accept the same kind of guilt because there is a relationship between crime and unemployment. However, I will not do that because I think we must maintain a higher level of integrity in the House, and to be blaming members for all the murders that are going on is certainly not the crux of the issue. But we must recognize that the minister made a most outrageous statement when he tried to blame members on this side of the House for the unfortunate deed last night.

I say that the amendment before us is one that is very important because it refers to the power to make changes by order in council. What the hon. member for Palliser (Mr. Schumacher) is saying in his motion could be said about many other bills, because the principle is extremely important. Last year over 3,300 orders in council were made by this government, none of which was referred to parliament. In the United Kingdom there were ten orders in council, all of which were referred to parliament. It is absolutely stupid to assume that we have control over our democratic process when in excess of 3,000 regulations can be made but never brought before parliament. We are not saying we oppose this legislation; we want an iron-clad guarantee about what the regulations will contain.

• (1550)

There are gun clubs in my constituency. I live in a farming and ranching constituency where guns are not used to kill people; they are used as tools to get skunks out from under chicken coops, or to kill coyotes coming into calving yards. We know, by the way this bill is being put forward, that right after we pass it the governor in council can change the length of time for which the registration period can exist, and the fees. The governor in council can make it prohibitive to obtain guns and can classify which guns are restricted and which are not restricted.

Every gun club I met did not mind having gun control. We ought to understand that. But we want to know if the gun control we have is one we can live with. Each day in this House there is an overbegging of the question. The Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) tries to point out the differences between Canadians by saying that there are French and English, and English and French. He always focuses on the differences in an attempt to find some common cause in which we as a nation can join together so that we can forget our differences.

The hon. member for Churchill (Mr. Smith) has in his riding many constituents who are trappers by occupation—70 per cent in all. If the Prime Minister understood the development of the west and the use of guns in agriculture, he would recognize that this is a cultural question. The gun is a tool in many ways, but there are many tools which are used for killing people. People can be killed with knives, axes, saws, poisons, and in many other ways. If the government is sincerely interested in having a Criminal Code which would reduce the number of murders, it has to work with the psychology of people. It has to deal with child abuse. The governments of this country have been derelict in that respect. Much more needs to be done. We have definitions of child abuse which include broken bones and extreme bruising, but none of them touch the question of the psychological abuse of children. People have so psychologically degraded children that we find the mentality which causes the kinds of acts we read about in the newspapers today.

There is also a correlation between noise levels and tensions in people. There are some interesting articles dealing with urban development and noise levels. People who live in busy traffic areas and on the lower floors of apartment buildings have more tensions than others. Passing this bill and leaving all regulatory adjustments to orders in council gives no assurance to gun owners, and in fact may or may not have an effect on crime. While I do not subscribe to the conclusion of Judy LaMarsh that there ought to be one television station across the country, I think there is reason to believe that if our children are exposed to crime as entertainment, there will be problems. I think the government has an obligation to do something about that in the hope of preventing crime.

In Switzerland, all males over the age of 18 must own guns. There is in that country a very low crime rate when compared to the crime rates of the western nations. The toughest gun controls in North America are found in the state of New York. I need not comment on the crime rate there; we know it is very high.

Gun control in and of itself is not the answer. I spoke last year on Bill C-83. I detailed at great length many psychological, environmental and cultural changes which ought to be taking place in order to bring about the kind of human change which would give us different attitudes toward guns. We must remember that the gun is a cultural tool which is used in the occupation of many people in this country. If we are going to legislate gun control, the government should have the courage to make a definitive statement as to what the period of registration will be—and that should not be done by order in council. If that were done, our legislation would be far more effective. The legislation might be more effective if people were licensed for life.

That could be done with people who own guns now, remembering that the same restrictive categories could still exist. Every new gun owner should take a course in which he could learn how to handle and properly care for a gun. From there we should work backwards. If a person gets a criminal record, he should lose his licence; if he becomes mentally ill, he should lose his licence; if he becomes addicted to drugs or alcohol, he should lose his licence; if he is careless with a gun and shoots a cow instead of a deer, for instance, he should lose his licence. In that way we could focus on that small section of society which handles guns dangerously.

The law being put forward by this government focuses on some 13 million gun owners and builds up a huge bureaucracy with power to make regulations, to increase fees at any time and in any amount, to shorten the period of registration, and to say to the farmer and the rancher that they may not have guns to get coyotes out of the calving yards. This legislation would allow the bureaucracy to tell northern Canada that the practice of hunting for a livelihood—a tradition which goes back to as far as the recorded history of the Indian and the Inuit—cannot be continued. I submit that that would be very unjust. The government cannot speak about culture in terms of language and forget all the other cultures which exist.

● (1600)

In conclusion, let me say that each and every one of us in this House wants to see the crime rate reduced. The motion we are debating does not say we must control all guns. It seeks to make sure that what we enshrine in legislation remains the law, that we are not voting on a certain provision today only to find it has been totally changed six months after the bill passes.

I have met with gun clubs of my constituency. One is in the city of Camrose, which hon. members may recall is the place of the great "hot dog festival." That gun club said it does not mind regulations so long as they do not infringe upon their right to collect guns, to shoot on a registered shooting range, to apply for a permit or to shoot on someone else's shooting range. They want to be allowed to use guns for sporting purposes. Similarly, ranchers in my constituency do not mind regulations so long as they are allowed to carry guns for the protection of their sheep and cattle and keep predators at bay. It is not as if they disapprove of Bill C-51; they do not trust the government. They are not against this legislation, per se, and I do not know how often I must repeat that. Apparently we must say it often for fear of being misinterpreted.

Let no one say the people of the western provinces are against this legislation per se. They will support such legislation if it is fair. They do not want to see enshrined in this bill some power giving a group of individuals power to change the law by order in council. They do not want bureaucrats alone to have power to put weapons into the prohibited class. Our people want to know the regulations, and if they are changed they want to know how they are changed. That a small group of people should have power to change these regulations arbitrarily is dreadful.

[Mr. Malone.]

Mr. Gordon Towers (Red Deer): Mr. Speaker, when I spoke in the debate yesterday I did not anticipate last night's catastrophe in our capital city. I am sorry it happened and I, too, express my sympathy to the wife and small child of the policeman who lost his life and those wounded in the exercise of their duty. Now you see why I voted for capital punishment, especially for the murder of a policeman. I am satisfied capital punishment is a deterrent, protects our police forces and should be in place for their protection. I do not think the government was right in removing that protection.

Yesterday I charged the Minister of Justice (Mr. Basford) with not knowing what justice is, and I stand by that statement. Unfortunately, the minister saw fit to include my name in the list of names he mentioned in his news release of this morning. I ask the minister—who has just entered the chamber—how long did I speak in yesterday's debate? He knows where I stand, which is why he included my name in his news release. I stand on the side of justice, on the side of protecting people. When criminals use firearms in the commission of a crime, I want to see them punished harshly, for only in this way will we clean up the mess. So long as the cabinet pussyfoots around with the criminal element, crime will remain with us and we shall see a repetition of what happened in Ottawa last night. We must come to grips with the problem.

An hon. Member: Then pass the bill.

Mr. Towers: In his news release, the minister said he did not understand why a group of members—the names appear in the release—spent all day yesterday, and presumably will spend all day today, debating such things as the right of people to collect and to use machine-guns. I point out, Mr. Speaker, that much of the debate yesterday concerned government by order in council and the reverse onus whereby a person is presumed guilty until proven innocent. If a private member issues a news release, it probably remains on the shelves of our newspaper offices; but, if the Minister of Justice issues a news release, its contents go out across the country and we all stand condemned until we prove ourselves innocent. I am prepared to rely on your judgment, Mr. Speaker, and let you decide whether we are filibustering this bill.

The minister also said in his statement—which is misleading—that the young man who did the shooting had a 12-gauge shotgun, a .22 calibre semi-automatic rifle, a 303, a 30-30 and a 30-06. The semi-automatic had been bought in Ontario within the last month. He would say no more because the man had been charged; but he said the semi-automatic weapon had been purchased within the month, within the past two weeks. How irrelevant can a statement be? It was phony, misleading. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I plead my case and leave it in your hands.

Mr. Doug Neil (Moose Jaw): Mr. Speaker, I did not intend yesterday taking part in the debate on this motion because it has to do with regulations. I spoke briefly on legislation by regulation. But the minister having earlier today issued a statement in which he included my name among others, I feel it my duty to speak.

I have been concerned over the years about the freedom of the individual and preserving our democratic way of life. I have seen the government opposite eroding, since 1968, our individual freedoms. Yesterday I spoke of government by regulation and said that regulations are never debated on the floor of the House of Commons. Some civil servant prepares them and a minister passes them. They are promulgated, as the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams) said, in the dark of the night. Mr. Speaker, parliament is the place to debate legislation. Parliament tells the people of this country what laws are in process of enactment. But when you make law by regulation, not only do the people of Canada not know the law but many legislators, many members of parliament, do not know it. How can the Minister of Justice (Mr. Basford) say that because members of the opposition debated this bill they are somehow responsible for yesterday's tragic death of a policeman?

● (1610)

I gather, from reading the statement he made over the air, that the minister is suggesting members of the opposition have no business to debate a bill. The reason I and other members of parliament are here is to debate bills, examine legislation, make amendments and let the people of Canada know what is the law. That is democracy, the right to speak your mind, to say what you think. However, the Minister of Justice, the man who should be concerned about our democratic way of life, is suggesting that members of the opposition should not be speaking in a debate in this House.

I wonder what Canada is coming to, when a responsible minister of the Crown suggests that parliamentarians, opposition members, should not be speaking on a bill. I give the minister notice that as long as I am here in Ottawa as a member of parliament, I intend to debate every bill and every amendment that I believe is important to my constituents and the people of Canada. There is no way the minister or any other member on that side will prevent me from debating legislation.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Neil: If the Minister of Justice is an honourable man, he will stand in this House and withdraw the statements he made over the radio today with regard to certain members on this side of the House.

Mr. Bob Brisco (Kootenay West): Mr. Speaker, in speaking to this amendment I must say that in a strange way I am honoured by the fact that in making his statement over the radio today, the Minister of Justice (Mr. Basford) singled out the hon. member for Kootenay West for particular attention by making reference to my constituency, the only member of the several named by the minister whose constituency was identified. I can only assume that he had some particular interest in that constituency, although he apparently does not have any particular interest for the concerns expressed by members on this issue. If the minister is anywhere in this House, he is certainly not in his seat. If he is doing anything, it is certainly not paying attention to the legitimate concerns of members who have spoken thus far on this issue. If the minister is prepared to single out Kootenay West, I invite him to come to Kootenay West at the time of the next federal election campaign. Let him put his name on the line as a candidate for the Liberal party in Kootenay West. We would be delighted to see him defeated. I assume that is part of his passing interest in my constituency.

The minister expressed concern about opposition members wasting the time of the House. If the minister had not shot off his mouth in such a reprehensible and irresponsible manner, we would today be dealing with the issues before us and not wasting the time of the House by addressing ourselves to the insults handed out by the minister. In his statement the minister made reference to the fact that yesterday we were discussing the safe storage of guns. He said we were weakening the provision relating to the safe storage of weapons. That is a categorical untruth. No reference was made to the safe storage of guns. That was not an issue for debate before this House yesterday.

If the minister would care to take the time to read the minutes of the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs, he would see that I made specific inquiries of him and addressed very genuine concerns to him on the subject of safe storage of guns. I feel qualified to address myself to that subject because I have much greater knowledge of that subject than the minister and half of his people. However, the minister would seek to distort and twist the truth. We went on to say we were concerned about reducing the sentences for the use of guns. He said that without the benefit of any explanation. It was a flat statement, with nothing attached to it. The minister knows that in debate yesterday this House was concerned with only one point of one amendment when dealing with the subject of reduced sentences. That was that the sentence for a person having a prohibited weapon should be greater than the sentence for a person in violation of the law with a restricted weapon. One weapon you clearly cannot have. One weapon is prohibited. The other is restricted. That was the only reference.

When it comes to reducing sentences for the use of guns, I draw Your Honour's attention to statements I made previously in this House at an earlier stage when we were dealing with this bill. I recounted, for the benefit of the minister and hon. members, that at my personal urging two of my constituents preferred charges against a big game outfitter in northern British Columbia who threatened them with an unregistered revolver. I put this on record and I challenge the minister to explain why it would happen. My constituents appeared in court in Fort Nelson, not once but three times, at a cost to the taxpayers of goodness knows how many dollars. There were three separate hearings before the judge. When they finally appeared on the issue of an unregistered gun, having a gun in a place other than a dwelling place, after a severe reprimand from the judge the accused was relieved of any further burden of responsibility. There was no fine, no jail sentence. What possible use can there be to legislation in which we seek out

the criminal, if the courts are not going to impose a sentence that has any meaning?

I have asked the minister to provide this House with statistics as to how many people were accused of contravening the firearms legislation, how many were sentenced in the last year, and what was the manner of the sentence. For example, was it a token fine, or a jail sentence. I have been met with stony silence from the minister. I am certain that if the facts were disclosed to the public we would find that the courts are not carrying out the mandate they have been given. That is the concern of Canadians. It is not the legislation; it is the interpretation of the law and the manner in which it is carried out.

The minister's conduct last night can only be described as ghoulish, callous and macabre. No one in this House regrets more than I do the events that occurred in this city last night. I share, with my fellow members, respect for the law and for the police who carry out the law, sometimes in very dangerous and difficult circumstances. I share that respect and I share that concern. I shared it enough to vote in favour of capital punishment, which the cabinet opposed. But it cannot go unsaid that the minister, throughout this afternoon's expressions of concern by those members he affronted, has failed to address himself to that issue and to make apologies for his statement.

● (1620)

I have said enough on this subject. I am sure the people of Kootenay West will understand my outspoken reaction. I hope the minister will withdraw his comments.

Mr. Leonard C. Jones (Moncton): Mr. Speaker, speaking on this bill may be a pure waste of time. It is obvious to me that those who drafted it have not done their homework. If they had, there would not be clauses in it to say that the most important part would be implemented by regulation. Before going on to that, I want to echo the remarks made by some of the previous speakers. They were all from one party. I do not belong to that party, nor to any party in this House. But for the Minister of Justice (Mr. Basford) to have the audacity last night to make the remarks about members of this House in such a terrible way is certainly unethical and improper.

Parliament is the place where we debate and discuss legislation and where we should be able to discuss regulations. We try to protect the rights of individuals. I am sure every member of parliament sympathizes with the family of the deceased policeman from Ottawa. Also we, as members of parliament, represent our constituents and purport to live as a democratic state. And this place is purported to be a place where we protect that democratic state by the right of debate and the right of free speech. I suggest that the very man who should be most interested in the protection of individuals and their rights, violated one of the most important rights, the right to speak in parliament, last night and this morning by doing just what he did. I and other members of parliament are supposed to express the views of our constituents, and we should express them sincerely, frankly and honestly. I repeat, the remarks of the minister were deplorable; they were unethical.

But orders in council—what are they? They take us back to the days of King John and the Magna Carta. The whole purpose of the Magna Carta was to get rid of orders in council or arbitrary decrees of government. These orders in council permit the delegation of power to the cabinet, in effect to the bureaucracy, to operate and provide criminal law in this country. How much can we belittle parliament? How much can we belittle the sense of our constituents? I recall that 31 months ago, in December, 1974, two policemen were killed in my constituency. I did not hear anyone in this House say then that the death of those two policemen resulted from anything that any member of parliament did here or did not do. They were brutally killed. They were killed by vehement criminals. This bill would not have saved their lives. This bill would not have saved the life of that policeman last night, either.

For the Minister of Justice to leave the impression with Canadians generally and, in particular, with people in the Ottawa area, that anyone who opposes this bill or is not prepared to support it is responsible for the acts of criminals who commit murder, is just not proper; it is unethical. For the Minister of Justice, who holds the highest office of any barrister or lawyer in this country, to make a statement of that kind and to involve members of parliament in statements of that nature, is most improper.

Before coming here I acted as defence counsel. I still practise law, and I am not ashamed of it. I also acted as criminal prosecutor. I had some respect for those who achieved the office of minister of justice, whether under provincial or federal jurisdiction, but after hearing those remarks last night and hearing them again this morning, I have my doubts. It is the type of thing which reduces respect for law and order in our country, to hear a minister of justice make a statement such as the minister made. It should be withdrawn very apologetically.

A good number of my constituents not only oppose the legislation by order in council with respect to this bill, but with respect to any bill. One hon. member drew attention to the fact that in 1976 more than 3,200 orders in council were passed in Canada at the federal level. Only ten went through in Great Britain. This is no way to operate criminal law. The problem with the bill is that it is a catch-all bill; it has everything in it, and not much of any of it is good. I repeat, the Minister of Justice, in presenting this bill, has delegated so much of its powers to order in council that it is, to me, a clear indication that the government is not ready, has not done its homework and is not prepared to tell us what is in the substantive part of the bill.

Gun control is really not the answer to the problems of law and order and crime in this country. My feeling is that the legislation is likely to create more problems, more bureaucracy and more difficulty than we have now. We are taking a backward step, first by introducing gun control; second, by legislating by regulation or order in council. I would suggest that the amendment is quite a proper one, although I am not

sure I would even support the amendment if it meant the bill would go through.

Mr. Peter Elzinga (Pembina): Mr. Speaker, I rise with a certain feeling of reservation to speak on motion No. 10. It deals with regulations, which the government is so good at since it is so hesitant to bring forward its legislation to the House where it can be discussed. However, I am prompted to say a few words, and I shall be brief. When I heard the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Towers) rise to participate in the discussion of this motion, as well as the hon. member for Moose Jaw (Mr. Neil), I was reminded of what we have seen from this government so often in the short period of time I have been in the House. There are so many discrepancies in what they say across the country. We find the Minister of Justice (Mr. Basford) making statements to the media condemning the opposition for exercising its right to express its views in this chamber. We find him putting the blame on us for a very sad event which took place last night in the city of Ottawa. All members of the chamber extend their sympathies to the wife and child of the police officer who was killed, but I think one of the lowest things an individual can do in this society is to attempt to put the blame for an incident like this on a select group of individuals.

● (1630)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Order, please. I deeply regret having to interrupt the hon. member, but it has been the long-standing practice of the House that statements made outside the House are not introduced into the House for debate. It seems to me that since we have started the debate this afternoon we have been discussing a statement made outside the House. I must at this time inform hon. members that motion No. 10 is before the House for debate, and I would ask the hon. member to direct his remarks to that motion.

Mr. Elzinga: I stand corrected, Mr. Speaker, but I must say that I am somewhat puzzled. I sat in my seat and listened to the debate this afternoon, which prompted me to contribute some remarks, and I am puzzled that Your Honour sees fit to correct me when I have not extended my participation to the bounds of some other members. But I will return to motion No. 10.

Here, again, we find that what the government hopes to do is regulate by order in council. We would appreciate these regulations being brought before the chamber. I think that in a good many ways this amendment will correct the hypocrisy which this government so often shows to the people of Canada. The hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Towers) stated that last night's incident probably would not have occurred had this government not seen fit to abolish capital punishment. I believe it to be a deterrent. I would be curious to know the position, now, of the Minister of State for Fitness and Amateur Sport (Mrs. Campagnolo) and whether her position on that very important topic has changed since she entered the cabinet.

Mrs. Campagnolo: Why should it?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Order, please. I regret to interrupt the hon. member again, and I would ask for the indulgence of all hon. members. We are all aware of last night's incident and we all deplore what happened, but again I must remind the hon. member that the House is debating motion No. 10. I would ask him to direct his remarks to that motion.

Mr. Malone: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I have heard your judgment and I have great respect for it. I think members on this side of the House would like to focus upon motion No. 10, but in view of the very serious nature of the charge that was made, whether inside or outside the House, the fact remains that it concerns members who are inside the House. The matter can be dispensed with very simply by the Minister of Justice apologizing to the members he charged, I think in a most brutal way, and then we can go on with motion No. 10.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Order, please. The Chair might explain at this time why it was so tolerant at the beginning. I listened to hon. members making remarks on last night's incident and on the so-called statement, which the Chair has not been made aware of, but having heard several speeches I noted that the matter was becoming a debate. This is why the Chair intervened at this point. I would ask hon. members to debate motion No. 10. On that ground I cannot recognize the hon. member's point of order.

Mr. Elzinga: Mr. Speaker, I will abide by your ruling. I will respectfully sit down, since what I have to say does not pertain to motion No. 10. What I shall do is find a motion to which my comments do pertain, and I shall participate in the debate a little later.

Mr. Gordon Ritchie (Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, I should like to say a few words on this motion which makes reference to a peace officer. I thought the highest peace officer in the land was the minister of justice, at least during the time he holds his portfolio. In deference to Your Honour's ruling, may I say that I was one of those named last night as contributing to the death of the unfortunate police officer. I just want to say that the minister should in the House repeat what he said, so we can debate whether or not the statement he made last night falls within the purview of this legislation. I suggest that the minister was talking about the legislation and was suggesting we should not continue to discuss it because by doing so we will contribute to homicide and other such crimes. I would add that so far as the amendment is concerned it is a modest one which will clarify and make more reasonable the reporting of incidents to peace officers as required under the act.

Mr. Elmer M. MacKay (Central Nova): Mr. Speaker, may I say, on this motion, that it is obvious that the Minister of Justice (Mr. Basford) must have some responsibility for the regulations which will be brought forward pursuant to the legislation. If I may add to what members said earlier this

afternoon, one can only wonder how much responsibility will be exhibited by the Minister of Justice, who holds a very special portfolio by virtue of his office, when regulations are brought in from time to time, in view of the type of incident which has aroused the wrath of parliament and which has been discussed here this afternoon. As far as I and my colleagues are concerned, no member has the right to reflect upon speeches made in this House. For the minister to go outside the House, as he did, and name members and impute motives to them for speaking in the House of Commons on legislation, and on the very type of subject that we are discussing at this moment, is reprehensible.

The minister has talked about taking the advice of the police. I would remind the House, as others have, that when it suits the minister to take the advice of the police for his own political purposes, he does so. The minister says we must have this kind of power in order to facilitate law enforcement. That is fine, Mr. Speaker, but in concluding I would remind the minister that when the police literally pleaded with him not to abolish capital punishment, he did not seek to follow their advice. As a matter of fact, he ignored it. So the minister cannot have it both ways. He follows the advice of the police when it suits him politically to do so. When it does not, he seeks to ignore their advice.

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

Some hon. Members: Question.

• (1640)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

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

Some hon. Members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Pursuant to section 11 of Standing Order 75, the recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

Mr. Gordon Ritchie (Dauphin) moved:

Motion No. 11.

That Bill C-51, to amend the Criminal Code, the Customs Tariff, the Parole Act, the Penitentiary Act and the Prisons and Reformatories Act, be amended in clause 3 by striking out lines 5 and 6 at page 24 and substituting the following therefor:

"or abandoned, does not within a reasonable time"—

He said: Mr. Speaker, this is an amendment of form to make more practical what has been a desirable event, that guns which are stolen or abandoned should be reported. However, to report "forthwith" means "immediately". I presume that could be at two o'clock in the morning or four o'clock in the morning, even if the person is 100 miles from a police station. The person would be derelict if he did not rush for the 100 miles and report that a weapon had been stolen.

Substituting "reasonable time" would be something people would understand. In the long run it would have the same effect. To always present civilians with statements like, "If you do not reply, you are subject to a fine", or, "If you do not do this, you are liable to imprisonment", only breeds in the ordinary person a disrespect for the law, and sometimes fear. The terminology is slightly better and slightly less authoritative. It does not detract from the fact that the reporting should be done. There will be better compliance with the law by individuals if this useful amendment is accepted.

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, the bill as originally submitted to committee used the word "forthwith", as the hon. member for Dauphin (Mr. Ritchie) has pointed out. However, the amendment he has moved was moved by the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams) in committee. I moved an amendment in committee, as well, that it read "with reasonable dispatch". The hon. member for Calgary North, the official justice critic of the Conservative party, withdrew his amendment, which is the amendment now on the floor, in favour of mine. The two phrases, "within reasonable time" and "within reasonable dispatch" in law mean the same thing. The only merit to the phrase "within reasonable dispatch" is that it is consistent with other provisions of the Criminal Code. It seems to me that this amendment should commend itself to the colleagues of the hon. member for Calgary North.

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

Some hon. Members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some hon. Members: No.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: On division.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): I declare the motion lost.

Motion No. 11 (Mr. Ritchie) negatived.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): The House will move to consideration of motion No. 13.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, motion 13 was debated yesterday.

Mr. Gordon Ritchie (Dauphin) moved:

Motion No. 15.

That Bill C-51, to amend the Criminal Code, the Customs Tariff, the Parole Act, the Penitentiary Act and the Prisons and Reformatories Act, be amended in

clause 3 by striking out line 16 at page 25 and substituting the following therefor:

"information, except details concerning the makes or serial numbers of shotguns or rifles of a type, kind or design commonly used in Canada for hunting or sporting purposes, as is prescribed by the".

Motion No. 16.

That Bill C-51, to amend the Criminal Code, the Customs Tariff, the Parole Act, the Penitentiary Act and the Prisons and Reformatories Act, be amended in clause 3 by striking out lines 29 to 36 at page 25.

Mr. Arnold Peters (Timiskaming): Mr. Speaker, I should like to say a few words on motions Nos. 15 and 16. Motion No. 16 relates to section 103(1)(d), which reads as follows:

—mail a copy of the record and inventory relating to restricted weapons to the commissioner or to any person authorized by subsection 106.2(5) to issue a permit to carry on the business in accordance with any request in writing made by the commissioner or any such person.

They are being asked to keep inventories of the number of firearms they have, and to keep a record of transactions which take place. This record and inventory must be produced for inspection at the request of any police officer, police constable or other person authorized by regulation. In addition, it is being recommended that subparagraph (d) be removed. Prohibited weapons would include all hand guns with the exception of some air pistols. This has been a matter of record for some time. As far as registered guns are concerned, the system has been to make a registration, and the registration carries the documentation for the gun which is kept by the person. There is also a record kept by the store, the agent, the gunsmith or whoever may be running the business. This would also involve a collector. He is required to keep in a safe place a record of those guns. If a police officer asks for that record, it will contain such things as the time, the day, the name, the address, the type of weapon and the serial number of the weapon.

● (1650)

This matter was left with the gun shop or the gun agent, and it seems to me it was a fairly satisfactory way of operating as there is seldom any need for this information unless a question arises concerning stolen guns or guns used for an illegal purpose. If we made them restricted weapons, some collectors and museums would still be able to have them, as provided for in other parts of the bill. We would need a larger bureaucracy to deal with the information sent in from gun shops, which would probably be fed into a computer and made available to all police agencies in this country and to Interpol. This clause indicates that a business is not only one that deals in restricted weapons, but also one that is involved in the manufacturing, buying or selling wholesale or retail, or in importing ammunition. The clause requires that records shall be kept of transactions with respect to such weapons or firearms in a form prescribed by the commissioner, and then goes on to indicate that ammunition is included.

In northern Ontario we have a large tourist industry, and it has been one of the perks of good Conservatives who run grocery stores or an outfitters operations to sell licences for hunting partridge, deer and moose. Usually they sell the licences and the ammunition, small shotgun shells for duck hunting, and two or three kinds of shells for bear hunting, as well as .22 ammunition. It is a fairly lucrative business. The goods are easy to store, but if they have to keep records and report periodically, there will not be much advantage.

Mr. Basford: You are misreading the bill.

Mr. Peters: Maybe, but it seems to me that if they have to send in records relative to restricted weapons, they will probably have to do it for other weapons and ammunition as well. None of these small stores has facilities for safe keeping, but I do not think anybody goes in to steal ammunition. I only know of a few instances of theft of ammunition. Usually there is a break-in for another reason, and ammunition is just picked up.

I am concerned when guns are not kept in a safe place in stores. For that reason I am very happy about the regulations which mean Canadian Tire, Eaton's, Simpson's and such stores will no longer display guns on the counter like a bargain in shirts or sweaters. That is just asking for trouble. It is surprising the number of guns that are stolen at Canadian Tire stores—sometimes by the staff, but mostly because somebody just picks them up. I think if you went into a hardware store and asked for centre-fired .38 shells, you would get some pretty strange looks, because they are obviously for a revolver and there is small call for such ammunition as most collectors and gun clubs do their own loading. What we are really talking about is limitation of shotgun shells and hunting rifle shells.

If all this reporting is required, it will put some people out of business. Maybe that is a good idea. I think there is merit in hardware stores selling guns, because they are equipped to do it and have staff who know something about guns. Some time ago I bought a 303 sporting rifle for $25 at Simpson's in Toronto. That can be a pretty powerful gun, depending on the type of ammunition used with it. They had hundreds of them, and anybody could walk out with an armful because, of course, they cannot be wrapped. Maybe we should limit their sale and the sale of ammunition. But we should not limit it to the point that everyone has to report every time they sell a box of shells, shotgun shells or 12, 16 or 20-gauge shot for birds. That should not be restricted. The minister may not even intend to restrict it, but he has left it up to the commissioner and the commissioner will damn well want to do that. He will want to have the whole thing under his jurisdiction, because it will mean more work, more employees and, therefore, a higher grade in the civil service.

● (1700)

I am being realistic. I know that if you get more work, you have more people under you. Hasn't every member of parliament found that out? It seems to me that is what the commissioner will do. So I support the withdrawal of the provision requiring the reporting of ammunition. I would like to hear the minister indicate what he thinks of the system we now use for registering prohibited guns, fully automatic rifles, Thompson sub-machine guns, Bren machine-guns, in operating condition. The gunsmith enters each transaction involving such guns in

his books. He records the time and place of the sale, and he has the signatures. The inspector is allowed to look at the book at any time.

My colleague and I were in a gun shop the other day. I asked the gunsmith how many guns he had sold and he told me that he never counted them. But he showed me the book and asked me how far I wanted to go back, two or three years. If an inspector wanted to see when a certain transaction took place, he would see the time a gun was bought or sold recorded in the book and the serial number of the gun. The information is all down there. If that information were to be sent to the commissioner, he would establish a key punch operator and other people necessary to put the information into a computer. One day we will have computer tapes coming out of our ears. Instead of getting a report, we will get computer tapes.

I honestly believe that we will have problems in registering ammunition. There is no question that ammunition is dangerous, but I have not heard of anybody except very small kids taking gunpowder out of ammunition and making a bomb out of it. I have not heard of other people doing that. Ammunition is only involved in the use of guns. We are establishing control over gun transactions; therefore I do not think we need to control ammunition. If we get to the point where all transactions are made through the commissioner and are registered periodically, we will be heading toward the proposition which I believe is at the back of the minister's mind, that all guns be confiscated and eliminated. Surely that is not what this bill intends, and it is not what I wish accomplished. So I hope the minister can indicate that he does not wish to have all these transactions recorded. I would like him to tell us whether the system used for prohibited weapons has been adequate.

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, I assume that the hon. member for Timiskaming (Mr. Peters) has been speaking with reference to the copy of the bill as introduced to the House at first reading, rather than the bill we are dealing with at report stage, because considerable amendments have been made in this regard in committee. The hon. member referred to the reporting requirements which in the initial bill applied to the sale not only of restricted weapons but of firearms generally. The provision was amended in committee to make the reporting requirement in substance exactly the same as it is at present in the Criminal Code, section 96(1), where a dealer carrying on the business of restricted weapons shall, among other things, send a copy of the record to the commisioner in accordance with any request. So the substance of the provision in the bill before us is precisely the same as in the present Criminal Code.

The point made by the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams) was that the requirement for reporting an inventory of long guns to the commissioner was unnecessary. I and the RCMP agreed with the hon. member, and therefore it seemed that the amendments proposed to correct that situation and return to the existing language in the Criminal Code, which only relates to restricted weapons, was agreeable to all members of the committee and the amendment before us is no longer necessary.

[Mr. Peters.]

The hon. member raised the question of the small dealer. There is no requirement for reporting by a small dealer of ammunition. What is provided is simply that he must report any stolen ammunition. He does not have to report his inventory of ammunition. He simply has to keep his ammunition in accordance with the safe storage requirements as set out. I gather that the hon. member agrees with that. So I suggest that we have met the points raised by the hon. member for Timiskaming.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[*English*]

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 40, to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: the hon. member for Windsor West (Mr. Gray)—Energy—Oil—Suggestion extra revenue be placed in fund to be used only for exploration; the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre (Mr. McKenzie)—Air Canada—Proposed committee investigation of allegation large number of employees want to leave Quebec; the hon. member for Central Nova (Mr. MacKay)—Information—Possibility of legislation to provide citizens with right of access to government files.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

CRIMINAL LAW AMENDMENT ACT, 1977

AMENDMENTS TO CRIMINAL CODE

The House resumed consideration of Bill C-51, to amend the Criminal Code, the Customs Tariff, the Parole Act, the Penitentiary Act and the Prisons and Reformatories Act, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs.

Mr. Gordon Ritchie (Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a word or two about this amendment and to discuss in a general way the problem of the registration requirement on small dealers in particular. I question the value of this registration. It seems to me that we are supporting thereby the concept that everything should be recorded. It seems to me that we must be realistic. As we know, small business is beset with innumerable papers, questionnaires, records, and so on. I suggest that this information does not need to be sent to the commissioner. In my experience, small dealers receive demands from StatsCan and from this and that department. If

you are a professional, you receive demands for information from your professional organizations, so that the problem of keeping records is large.

I would say that most records are not well kept because people get annoyed and do not bother with keeping records. In the United States, President Ford set up a task force to look into the matter of record-keeping and to see if something could not be done for small business in this respect. I see little point in this provision. It is fine on paper, but we forget the great amount of work involved for small business in keeping records.

• (1710)

If there is to be no supervision of these records, how well will they be kept? Records are only valuable if they are properly kept. There is an old saying to the effect that there are three kinds of statistics: good ones, bad ones, and plain lies. I suspect many of the records which will be kept by dealers will fall into the latter category, because there does not seem to be any method of seeing that good records are kept. When a police officer is investigating a case involving a gun, he will want to know where it was purchased and he will probably go to gun dealers, but with changes in personnel, and that sort of thing, I wonder how effective the records of gun dealers will be. I think this is an added burden and probably very little will come out of it.

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

Some hon. Members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Although the two motions were grouped for debate, the votes will have to be separated. Therefore, the question is on motion No. 15. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

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

Some hon. Members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Pursuant to Standing Order 75(11), the recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The question is now on motion No. 16. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

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

Some hon. Members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Pursuant to Standing Order 75(11), the recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

Mr. Doug Neil (Moose Jaw) moved:

Motion No. 17.

That Bill C-51, to amend the Criminal Code, the Customs Tariff, the Parole Act, the Penitentiary Act and the Prisons and Reformatories Act, be amended in Clause 3 by striking out lines 29 to 34 at page 26 and substituting the following therefor:

"(a) handle, store, display any restricted weapon or firearm in a manner that contravenes any regulation made by the Governor in Council pursuant to paragraph 106.8(a); or"—

He said: Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a few comments in connection with motion No. 17. Basically, it would delete the word "advertise" in subsection 6(a) as well as the word "ammunition". The amendment also refers to regulations. I spoke earlier today, as well as yesterday, about regulations so I will not repeat my comments in that regard. I can understand the need for regulations with respect to the handling, storing and displaying of any restricted weapon or firearm, but I question the regulation of advertising for the simple reason that every time a merchant wishes to advertise, both he and the editor of the newspaper will have to examine the advertising very carefully in order to assure themselves that it falls within the regulations. I think this is a burden which should not be placed upon either the newspaper or the merchant. That is why I ask that the word "advertise" be stricken from this section.

I listened with interest to the hon. member for Timiskaming (Mr. Peters) when he spoke about ammunition. Ammunition is handled by many small stores. It never really creates any problems, as the hon. member said. Ammunition is very seldom stolen. If it is, it is usually stolen by youngsters. I can see no need for regulations with respect to the advertising of ammunition or with respect to the handling or storing of ammunition, because if you go into any country store in the west you will find that almost every merchant carries on his shelves ammunition, whether it be .22 ammunition or shotgun shells, particularly in the fall when people go duck hunting, goose hunting or hunting for upland game. I do not believe ammunition should be subject to regulation, because it does not create a hazard. If it is subject to regulation, merchants,

particularly small merchants, will be faced with one more government regulation in the operation of their businesses. For these reasons I ask that my amendment be accepted. I ask that the word "advertise" and the word "ammunition" be removed from subsection 6(a).

Mr. Stan Schumacher (Palliser): Mr. Speaker, I support the motion of the hon. member for Moose Jaw (Mr. Neil). I deplore the continued extension of this government by regulation. But apart from that, there should be some explanation of what is wrong with advertising. Whether restricted weapons have to be treated in the same way as prohibited weapons is a moot point, but even accepting that, some weapons, which are products, may have certain virtues which other products do not have within their class. Restricted weapons are not prohibited. They can be used. They are marketable commodities. Why cannot we have some advertising to make the public aware of the relative merits of these commodities? What harm will that do? Why does the minister think he has to run everything in this country? I know my friends in the New Democratic Party probably do not agree with the idea or the worth of advertising, but surely everybody else in this chamber recognizes its merits and the fact that it can aid in the development of our economy and in the development of better products for the use of consumers.

I also agree with my colleague's remarks about ammunition, because surely the operative thing is the weapon, and if we have proper controls over weapons—not that I believe there is anything in this bill which will improve the situation—ammunition is perfectly harmless without a mechanism with which to discharge it. I believe there is a great deal of merit in my hon. colleague's motion and I urge hon. members to support it.

Mr. Arnold Peters (Timiskaming): Mr. Speaker, I spoke about ammunition. The minister raised two interesting points. The other day he caught me without having read one of the amendments. I have the reprint of the bill as amended and reported by the standing committee, so I have the right one. The minister protests about ammunition not being included, but it is included in this subsection. A gun without ammunition is not dangerous. You cannot use a gun without ammunition, or ammunition without a gun. They are used together.

● (1720)

It is true that the governor in council will impose restrictions by regulation, but I do not think it is accurate to say that restrictions would apply merely to the selling of weapons because you must consider, as well, the sale of ammunition. Proposed section 103(1) concerns people involved in the manufacturing, buying or selling at wholesale or retail, etc., of restricted weapons, and subsection (2) speaks of lost, mislaid or stolen weapons. Clearly, you must report a commercial transaction as well as the lose of a firearm. I raise this point because I am concerned about what will happen to the little store, to the little guy who sells ammunition. These small commercial outlets will need to be licensed and we shall need to go to a great deal of trouble to licence them all. Frankly, I do not think it is possible to control every sale or transaction involving ammunition, because ammunition is bootlegged in hunting caps, and so on. Therefore, we are kidding ourselves if we think we can enforce every such regulation the governor in council will make.

[Mr. Neil.]

I am not particularly worried about the advertising of restricted weapons in magazines. Most magazines devoted to hunting or fishing advertise guns, ammunition, fishing tackle, etc. You will see such advertisements in *Rod and Gun* and *Fish and Game*. The Winchester gun bible advertises guns—

An hon. Member: Do they really call it that?

Mr. Peters: Yes. You will see gun advertisements in various catalogues known as hunters' bibles. I see no objection to weapons being advertised in such magazines. They are mainly sales magazines for hunting buffs. Half of their content is devoted to fishing tackle, to all kinds of rods, worms, flies, and so on. The other half is devoted to guns and ammunition, to what size of shot you need if you are duck hunting, or what equipment you must use on moose, deer, bears and other animals. Magazine articles talk about the number of grains per charge, muzzle velocity and mention all those topics of interest to the professional hunter. Such magazines are aimed at a narrow segment of the public, a segment interested in hunting and fishing. I see no difficulty concerning advertising in such magazines. I suggest it is nonsense to prohibit the advertising of guns but to permit the advertising of ammunition, because the ammunition is no good without the gun, and vice-versa. Therefore, you must control neither, or both. I point out that the last words of the proposed amendment read:

> —any regulation made by the governor in council pursuant to paragraph 106.8(a).

Paragraph 106.8(a) sets out the regulations. Clearly, the governor in council can make any regulation he wishes. Therefore, there will be no great difficulty regulating ammunition or guns. But I fail to see the purpose of restricting advertising if you are going to allow small stores to handle ammunition. Hand guns, of course, are in the prohibited class, but in my area—perhaps it is different in other parts of the country—you will see hardware stores displaying two or three .38s or perhaps a .45 Magnum long hand gun in the window.

There is nothing wrong with this. The stores do not sell those guns to everybody. Before you buy a gun you must get a permit from the police. Then you must get a permit to carry it, and you must get a permit from the attorney general of Ontario to use it for hunting. Frankly, I see no reason for restricting advertising. What difference would such restrictions make? I think we are just kidding ourselves if we think restrictions on advertising will do any good. If we countenance regulations which affect hunting and the sale of ammunition to hunters, we shall eliminate from business a lot of small people who handle ammunition and sell guns. If that is the government's intention, it should say so and give us a chance either to agree or disagree with its position. As things stand, I am not sure what it intends; therefore I shall come down on the side of my inclination and opt for a provision not overly restrictive.

I concede that the regulations will be beneficial. Mr. Speaker, I am not worried about the effect of the restrictions on those who know what they are doing. The restrictions will affect those who sell guns over the counter as bargains, in a totally uncontrolled manner, those who sell guns to any and all, who have no interest in the gun, know nothing about it, and do not care about the intentions of the person buying the gun. I submit this bill already contains sufficient power to regulate. We do not need to be so restrictive as to squeeze out those engaged in the normal course of commerce, especially in northern Canada where people's attitudes to the use of guns are different from the attitudes in urban centres.

• (1730)

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

Some hon. Members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): The question is on motion No. 17 standing in the name of the hon. member for Moose Jaw (Mr. Neil). Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

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

Some hon. Members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Pursuant to Standing Order 75(11) the recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred. The House will now proceed to motions Nos. 18 and 19 which are grouped for debate but which are to be voted on separately.

Mr. Woolliams: Mr. Speaker, I have a record which I am trying to keep. May I ask the numbers of the last two motions on which we voted?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Motions Nos. 16 and 17. The last question put was on motion No. 17.

Mr. Woolliams: The reason I ask is because my motion No. 19 is exactly the same as that of the hon. member for Moose Jaw (Mr. Neil), motion No. 25. I prefer the hon. member for Moose Jaw to speak on it rather than myself because he is more knowledgeable on this subject.

Mr. Neil: Mr. Speaker, I understand and we will deal with motion No. 18, and motion No. 19 is now being withdrawn. Is that correct?

Mr. Woolliams: Yes.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): If that is the wish of the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams), motion No. 19 will be withdrawn. Is that agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion No. 19 (Mr. Woolliams) withdrawn.

Mr. Stan Schumacher (Palliser) moved:

Motion No. 18.

That Bill C-51, An Act to amend the Criminal Code, the Customs Tariff, the Parole Act, the Penitentiary Act and the Prisons and Reformatories Act, be amended in Clause 3 by striking out line 24 at page 27 and substituting the following therefor:

"to the applicant within 15 days of the receipt by the firearms officers of both the aforementioned application and further information required under subsection (8)."

He said: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this motion is to amend the bill in order to require a person receiving an application for firearms acquisition certificate to make a decision within a reasonable period of time. My amendment asks that the official make that decision within 15 days.

The firearms acquisition certificate is the keystone of this bill. It is required by those wishing to purchase certain types of firearms, a much enlarged category as a result of the government's proposal in this regard, and will affect many hundreds of thousands of citizens. It will result in the establishment of a much larger bureaucracy.

We know how the bureaucrats work, if I can use that term. In many cases it is questionable whether they do work. In any event a great number of people are experiencing an ever-increasing amount of delay in having their requests dealt with by governments at all levels.

As long as we have governments like the present one which wants to encroach further and further into the lives and activities of decent, law-abiding citizens, we will have more and more bureaucrats dealing with the reasonable requests of these people. The bureaucrats will say that they are overburdened because there are too many applications to be dealt with. They will make all sorts of excuses for delaying legitimate requests.

Something should be written into this law to require these officials to exercise their duties within a reasonable period of time. When an application for a firearms acquisition certificate is made, it should be dealt with within 15 days. I am open to suggestions of a reasonable nature as to whether that time limit is appropriate. I feel it is. If you require a firearm, you want it before the hunting season is over so that you can enjoy the benefits of that part of the country in which you live. Otherwise, you will have to wait until the next season.

One criticism of this bill is that it is very restrictive for the large majority of Canadians who wish to enjoy the benefits of

this country. That is one of the great advantages of Canada, that it is spacious. There are large recreational facilities for hunting and the like. However, it will be much more heavily regulated by the federal government as a result of its reaction to very emotional concerns.

We are dealing with this as a matter of emotion rather than looking at the practicalities. As much practicality as possible should be built into this legislation. I know that it would be very difficult because this legislation is impractical from beginning to end. Nevertheless, wherever we can, we should try to do this. I suggest a time limit on these people so that the ordinary citizen can exercise his legal right and force them to act within a reasonable time. I urge the House to give serious consideration to accepting my motion No. 18 to amend this particular clause.

Mr. Gordon Ritchie (Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, I wish to say a few words in support of this amendment which deals with a most important aspect of the bill, presuming that the legislation will aid in the prevention of homicides. Most of this prevention would be as a result of control officers being aware of an applicant for a gun certificate who may be unstable, have a criminal record or some such thing. I suspect that a criminal would not apply for a certificate. He would obtain a gun in the same way he has always done.

There may be an occasional applicant who is mentally unbalanced. Speaking from my experience, if I had to decide as to whether such a person should have a gun certificate, I do not know if I could make a very good guess. Many people might be suspected of being unstable, but they get along pretty well in society, staying out of trouble.

● (1740)

If the legislation is to have any value at all, the government will have to depend on the actions and judgment of those who are issuing these certificates. But there is nothing here to specify the time available in which they can make up their minds when a person who applies for a certificate will get one. Suppose these officials are uncertain whether to issue a certificate or not. Will they spin out time by making up some bureaucratic excuse, allowing the applicant to wait indefinitely? There should certainly be some means whereby the officials, or the minister, will be required to make up their minds within a certain period whether a person should receive a certificate or not.

It may be that a period of two weeks is not sufficient. If the case has to be investigated, it might take some time for information to be gathered from outlying areas. Nevertheless, a time limit of some sort ought to be set. My hon. friend from Palliser (Mr. Schumacher) has told us that he is easy about the precise extent of that time limit. The minister might consider some other period. I suspect that in most instances of bureaucratic delay applicants are kept waiting because a decision is not altogether easy to make, because it might turn out badly, because it is in a dicey area and events might reflect on the judgment of those concerned. Nevertheless, somebody has to make decisions, and all this amendment says is that within a reasonable period of time the official must give an applicant a yes or no answer and that, if he does not, the citizen concerned should have recourse to the law to demand that such an answer be given.

[Mr. Schumacher.]

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, this is an issue which was examined very thoroughly in the Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs. There are really two sides to it—whether there should be a legislated minimum period before which no certificate can be issued, or whether there should be a legislated maximum period within which a certificate must be issued, or at any rate within which the application must be decided.

After careful consideration, both points of view were rejected by the committee and the bill was left as it is. The hon. member for Peel-Dufferin-Simcoe (Mr. Milne), who has been active in committee, and in whose riding there have been four impulse murders in the recent past, pushed very hard for a minimum period. Other members pushed for a maximum period. I think things are best left as they are. The design of the scheme is such that the requirements of the scheme act as an effective cooling off period as a means of helping to prevent impulse murders; people would not be able to buy a gun on impulse with the intention of using it against themselves or others. The administrative procedures would be worked out by the chief provincial firearms officers to be responsive to the public need.

In cases where the application form itself or the computer check shows no information which is adverse to the applicant, I am content that a certificate can be issued quickly. But if there is some adverse material in the criminal record to check, or if the applicant has undergone mental treatment in connection with symptoms of violence, it might not be possible to issue a certificate within a 15-day period; there might be a number of factors which the licensing officer would wish to consider and a good deal of information which he might want in his possession before making a decision. If a statute of limitation were placed upon the period I am sure that, in administrative terms, the result would be that if there were any adverse information whatsoever affecting an application, rather than take a risk the licensing officer would simply say no within the required period, though if examined thoroughly the material available would enable the officer, given time, to grant the certificate. I think that would create a hardship for people who might, upon close examination of their applications, be entitled to own a firearm.

Mr. Ritchie: Would the minister permit a question? Is there any way in which an applicant can seek recourse in the event of no decision being reached? Is there any way he can get a yes or no answer to his application?

Mr. Basford: If the licensing officer were refusing to make a decision at all, I think the person affected could make an application for a writ of mandamus to require him to make a decision.

Mr. Arnold Peters (Timiskaming): Whatever that big word may mean, that is not likely to happen to some joker who simply wants to buy a gun to go hunting. He is not likely, I can tell you, to apply for mandamus, or whatever it is.

I do not disagree with what the minister has said. He comes from the city. He goes to his firearms officer—maybe there are two or three of them in Vancouver—and that officer will make a decision because he has access to the computer and to the other records he needs. Maybe he will reach a decision within a reasonable period of time.

But has the minister ever considered what is likely to happen in Frobisher Bay or New Liskeard or in Kirkland Lake? I know where an applicant up there will have to go. He will have to make his application to one of the RCMP officers in the area, probably the only officer there, who has more work than he can handle. He will certainly not be well acquainted with all the firearm regulations, and he is not likely to stick his neck out very far. If anyone files an application, unless there is some provision in the legislation it could take months and months to consider it. After all, there is no computer in the police detachment, so the officer would have to go somewhere else to get the information. Then a letter will have to be written. I see the minister shaking his head, but he has never been to Alert, Frobisher Bay, or other small communities like that.

● (1750)

Mr. Basford: Mr. Speaker, would the hon. member permit a question? Is he aware that both Frobisher Bay and Kirkland Lake have immediate access to CPIC the computer?

Mr. Peters: No, I did not know that. If that is so I still fail to understand why there is a delay when someone registers a gun today. It can take anywhere from two days to months, it all depends. Gun collectors are sometimes able to register guns straight away; on other occasions it takes longer. When it takes longer I assume they have to write away to Toronto and wait for a reply.

In my part of the country, registering a prohibited weapon can take up to two or three months. Sometimes you have to leave the gun when you register, and some of these guns are valuable. I have known guns to be lost in police stations. The guns are not registered under federal law but with the provincial police. Perhaps they register it through the RCMP, but it does take a long time. This is why there should be some indication in the bill whether it will be the RCMP or some other force, and whether they have access to the computer. I agree with the minister about the guy in Vancouver and the guy in downtown Toronto. The firearms officials in those cities will probably be working at their jobs full time.

It is difficult in my part of the country to get a permit when you take a gun which is a prohibited weapon down to the police officer. The permit takes some time to obtain and the gun is left there for a period of time. Perhaps the problem cannot be solved, but it is one that occurs throughout the bill. It is my guess that the way to handle the question in rural areas is not the same as the way it is handled in urban areas. In Kirkland Lake there is one corporal and two staff officers of the RCMP, and perhaps some undercover agents, and they may handle it differently.

Nevertheless there should be some kind of redress, such as an appeal. If the registration is not completed within 15 days, a person should be able to ask why not. I do not believe you should have to apply for a writ of mandamus, or whatever it is; you should be able to ask what the reason is for the delay. Surely the act provides some discretion and the officers should be asked face to face why the application is taking so long. If the officers have reason to suspect an applicant, he should be able to tell them that it was his twin brother who was in jail, not him. This bill does not give any assurance that applications in remote areas will be dealt with expeditiously.

Mr. Doug Neil (Moose Jaw): Mr. Speaker, may I make a few brief comments in support of this motion, which requires the commissioner or the person issuing a licence to make a decision within 15 days. I do not think that is unreasonable. The minister spoke about a cooling off period, preventing murders and so on. It seems to me he also spoke about computers determining whether an individual has a criminal record. I had always thought the purpose of a computer was to make material available speedily; you simply pushed the buttons and out came the information.

If everything is computerized, it seems to me that requiring the issuer of licences to make up his mind within 15 days places no real burden upon him. If an issuer of a firearms acquisition certificate disliked a particular individual but really had no reason to turn down his application, he could delay the licence indefinitely. It seems to me that this is a perfectly legitimate amendment which requires an officer to issue a certificate within 15 days. If he does not do so, then the applicant has the redress of an appeal. However, if we leave the bill as submitted by the government, some people might have to wait for weeks or months before getting a firearms acquisition certificate. As I say, I support this motion.

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Speaker, may I rise on a point of order which is related to a discussion held earlier with respect to the holding of deferred votes on Bill C-51. As I understand it, our consultations have yielded the consensus that we take whatever votes have been deferred as the first order of government business tomorrow.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Agreed.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Agreed.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Agreed and so ordered. Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. Members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

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

Some hon. Members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Pursuant to section (11) of Standing Order 75, a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

It being six o'clock p.m. I do now leave the chair until eight o'clock p.m.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 8 p.m.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): The House will now move to motion No. 20 standing in the name of the hon. member for Dauphin (Mr. Ritchie).

Mr. Gordon Ritchie (Dauphin) moved:

Motion No. 20.

That Bill C-51, an act to amend the Criminal Code, the Customs Tariff, the Parole Act, the Penitentiary Act and the Prisons and Reformatories Act, be amended in Clause 3 by striking out line 33 at page 31 and substituting the following therefor:

"(i) to protect life or property,".

He said: Mr. Speaker, I should like to raise objection to the way this provision is drawn by the minister and suggest to him that by adding the word "property" he will have a better bill. It seems logical that when these permits are issued they are to be issued to people in order that they may be in possession of a firearm in the event of attacks by humans, or in the odd case by animals such as bears and so on.

However the minister has not made a provision for property. For example, a farmer who has a field of grain would not be issued with a licence in order to protect his crop from being eaten by deer. Even though it would be permissible under the provincial games act to protect his property by chasing them off in some way, he would not be able to get a gun because his life is not at stake. The minister seems to have the idea that he will protect him, but that man could starve to death during the winter. Many questions can be raised about this narrow definition of protecting life.

There will be very few permits issued. The farmer's property is his means of income and livelihood. If there is a threat to it, such as some person threatening to burn his place down, under this act he would not be able to obtain a firearm for protection.

[The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier).]

An hon. Member: He cannot get a restricted weapon.

• (2010)

Mr. Ritchie: He still would not be able to get whatever is necessary to protect himself. If it is necessary to have a restricted weapon in order to protect life, then it is just as necessary on some occasions to have a weapon to protect property. In western law it was always said that the worst thing you could do was steal a man's horse—it was worse than murder because without his horse he was doomed.

I think this amendment would give us a better bill. There will be lots of times when it will be difficult to decide between life and property, and if someone wants to adhere rigidly to the provision of "life only" then very few permits will be issued. Maybe that is what the minister wants. If you need to protect life you must also give consideration to whether you want to protect property.

Mr. Doug Neil (Moose Jaw): Mr. Speaker, I should like to make a few comments in support of this amendment. The Criminal Code at present covers the protection of life or property, so I wonder why this bill has excluded the protection of property. I appreciate that this refers to a restricted weapon but, as far as I know, the system has worked well over the years. There has been no problem as far as registration of restricted weapons is concerned. It seems to me that in many cases it is as important to protect property as to protect life.

I should like to ask the minister if he is prepared to explain why Section 97(2)(a) of the Criminal Code reads "to protect life or property" while the proposed revision reads only "to protect life".

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, the amendment proposed by the bill is quite simple. I recognize that the hon. member for Moose Jaw (Mr. Neil) is endeavouring to be constructive but, with respect, I think he misunderstands it.

Formely under the Criminal Code a person could be issued a carrying permit for sidearms for the protection of life or property. Under the proposed bill a permit would only be issued to carry or wear sidearms for the protection of life. Police authorities across the country have said, and we believe, that protection of property with firearms is not a desirable thing. People trying to protect themselves and their property with sidearms are usually more of a menace to themselves than to an intruder. We have all read over and over again the advice that the police give, that if someone breaks into your house the best thing you can do is keep perfectly quiet.

Mr. Neil: And let him shoot you.

Mr. Basford: In certain places it is necessary for people to carry sidearms. I have ordered that permits for sidearms be issued in the Northwest Territories and the Yukon to prospectors, geologists, wildlife inspectors and other people likely to come into contact with dangerous animals.

Where the hon. member is confused, I think, is that this relates to sidearms only and not to long arms. Obviously the person concerned about his crops being eaten by deer or other predators, or someone concerned about trespassers on his property, is better off with a long gun which can usually be shot more accurately and is safer to use and more effective against the predator.

I would ask the hon. member to study this provision rather carefully. It relates only to sidearms and has nothing to do with shotguns or rifles. If one is protecting property or crops I think the long gun is the more desirable weapon.

Mr. Woolliams: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could ask the minister a question.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Order, please. The hon. member for Moose Jaw (Mr. Neil) has the floor, but I will recognize the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams) on a question.

Mr. Woolliams: Mr. Speaker, the minister said this does not relate to sidearms but relates to shotguns and rifles.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Woolliams: I should like to ask the minister if it should happen that someone comes into your home unlawfully, do you then have to decide whether to protect your life or your property?

Mr. Basford: Mr. Speaker, I say very strongly, and every police officer in the country will say very strongly, that people who think they are going to protect themselves in their homes with a sidearm are foolish. They are better off being protected by the police. If they insist on having some arms they are better off with a long gun.

Mr. Woolliams: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the minister would answer a further question. Many crimes have been committed in Calgary that I assume are duplicated in other cities, where a housewife is home alone, perhaps taking a shower before going to a tea or to the hairdresser, and someone breaks in and the housewife is not only raped but in many cases loses her life. Does she have a chance to get the police? Are the police in the front room while she is in the bathroom?

Mr. Basford: Mr. Speaker, in the United States, where hand guns are more readily available than in Canada, statistics indicate that housewives protecting themselves with handguns have a higher incidence of accidents to themselves by having no idea how to use handguns.

Mr. Neil: Mr. Speaker, the response given by the minister would lead one to believe that the intention is eventually to get rid of all restricted weapons. He talks about carrying a sidearm. This section does more than refer to carrying sidearms; it refers to a person being able to have a sidearm in his possession. I have a pistol in my possession and I have a permit, a registration certificate. If I had to establish that the reason that I have that weapon in my possession is to protect my life, I would probably have to turn it in to the police. If the minister is saying that this only refers to people carrying sidearms, then it refers to restricted weapons, which is more than revolvers because it covers automatic weapons as well. I do not think the minister has read the bill.

● (2020)

A restricted weapon, according to the definition in the bill is:

a) Any firearm, not being a prohibited weapon, designed, altered or intended to be aimed and fired by the action of one hand,

b) Any firearm that

(i) is not a prohibited weapon, has a barrel that is less than eighteen and one half inches in length and is capable of discharging centre-fire ammunition in a semi-automatic manner, or

(ii) is designed or adapted to be fired when reduced to a length of less than twenty-six inches by folding, telescoping or otherwise, or

c) Any firearm that is designed, altered or intended to fire bullets in rapid succession during one pressure of the trigger and that, on the day which this paragraph comes into force, was registered as a restricted weapon and forms part of a gun collection in Canada of a *bona fide* gun collector,

I question whether the minister has read the bill and understands what it is all about. We have had regulations and laws respecting restricted weapons for many years. There have been no real problems with respect to restricted weapons. What we ask for here is simply to leave the principle as it exists at present to allow a person to obtain a registration certificate if it is required to protect his life or, as the old code says, "or property".

It seems to me that what is attempted here is a gradual restriction of the ownership and use of firearms. I can see the minister looking at me through the curtains. He seems to be moving in and out as he feels like it. When things get hot, he moves out. I suggest there has been no problem at all with restricted weapons. The minister wants to make some problems with respect to the legislation. What I am saying is that the provisions as they stand right now are adequate. They will not prevent crimes from being committed. If a criminal wants to get a gun, he can get one, and no amount of gun legislation or restriction will prevent him from getting one.

Mr. Stan Schumacher (Palliser): Mr. Speaker, I would like to support the motion of the hon. member for Dauphin (Mr. Ritchie) because I cannot understand the priorities of the minister in this regard. As my colleague, the hon. member for Moose Jaw (Mr. Neil), has asked, what is wrong with the law as it is? I would like to read the clause we are dealing with. Starting at paragraph (3) it reads:

(c) is required by the applicant

(i) to protect life,

We want to add "or property"

(ii) for use in connection with his lawful profession or occupation,

If you can use it to protect your profession or occupation, you should be able to use it to protect your property because, after all, what is the purpose of a profession or occupation except to earn income, and property certainly is also to earn

income. Therefore it should be on the same basis and should be protected by the law.

The clause goes on to read:

(iii) for use in target practice under the auspices of a shooting club approved for the purposes of this section by the Attorney General of the province in which the premises of the shooting club are located, or

(iv) for use in target practice in accordance with conditions proposed to be attached to the permit to be issued in respect of the restricted weapon under subsection 106.2(1),

You can have this restricted weapon in your possession to protect life, to protect your profession or occupation, or to engage in target practice, but you cannot have it to protect your property. Where is the government's sense of priorities there? Why will it not leave the law as it is? Why does it have to take protection away in this area as well as interfere with the vast majority of our citizens' rights to enjoy the country in which they live? For the information of my learned friend from New Westminster let me say that they are not hand guns. They are restricted weapons. Hand guns are prohibited weapons.

Mr. Arnold Peters (Timiskaming): Mr. Speaker, I am really concerned about this clause, and not so much about the explanations which have been very vague.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Peters: That is right. I did not realize we were removing sections from the Criminal Code that affect hand guns because I am one of those who are very much opposed to people carrying hand guns for the protection of their life or property. If I had been on the committee I would have violently objected to the next clause, and I would have used exactly the same argument as used by the minister.

Mr. Woolliams: There were many times when there was no one from your party present in the committee.

Mr. Peters: They should have been there. One of the things that really concerns me is that every Saturday night a chocolate soldier security guard can walk around carrying a gun. You would not hire him to wash your car, but you hire him as a two bit security officer and you give him a gun. He wanders up and down the street looking like a marshal from—

Mr. Woolliams: Montana.

Mr. Peters: —some of the states such as Texas, New Mexico, or somewhere in that area. If the argument the minister has put forward is valid, it sure applies to these chocolate soldiers, Saturday night wonders protecting this and that, because I personally am of the opinion that there is nothing wrong with the protection of hand guns under the Criminal Code. I would be surprised if this only applied to hand guns because I thought it applied to semi-automatics and to some other weapons as well. Whether or not it does, does not make a great deal of difference, but I believe that people should not have hand guns in their possession for the protection of life or property.

[Mr. Schumacher.]

If you have a loaded hand gun in your night table drawer, you are very likely to shoot a member of the family. Every day you would think there would be somebody breaking in, and every day you would be scared of something else. It is my guess that you would shoot yourself in the foot, or you would do something else foolish with that bloody gun before you had it for very long in your dresser. If you want to be secure, throw it out because, in my opinion, it is dangerous, and I disapprove very much of people keeping hand guns. If you are going to carry a prohibited weapon—and that may involve a semi-automatic—and you are used to using a semi-automatic for other purposes, then I see no reason why you should not use that long gun, whether it be a semi-automatic or any other type of gun, to protect your property. This is really where differences of opinions among members show up.

When you are in a city and you possess a gun which you say is for protection, you are really saying it is for protection against your neighbour or against someone coming into your house, in other words it is to protect you against people. In my part of the country—and this applies probably to four fifths of the country—when we talk about protecting property, we talk about protecting cattle, horses or grain.

● (2030)

An hon. Member: Or junk yards?

Mr. Leggatt: Or business premises?

Mr. Peters: I suppose my friend thinks it is all right to protect your junk yard in the city and it is all right to protect your house with Doberman pinschers, which might kill somebody if they get the chance. Those dogs are trained to do that. I do not agree with that. I do not think that is the purpose of guns, and it is certainly not a purpose I support.

However, if you have a number of sheep, you are going to be shooting your neighbour's dog. You will be shooting your neighbour's dog because he will be killing your sheep, and I think you have the right to do that. I am not good at operating hand guns, so I would not be trying to shoot anything at any distance. It is a pretty good shot with a hand gun who could hit a barn door at 20 feet. Anyone else is apt to hit anything but that door, and the police are no exception. They have some training, but they get excited, and they sometimes hit everything but what they are aiming at.

Mr. Woolliams: I don't buy that. Come on!

Mr. Peters: My friend would not buy that, but I think it is a fact. That is why it is now being suggested that we use magnums for crowd control so that we can knock people down and take their backs out without hurting others. However, we will be lucky if we do not hurt others. The hon. member has been watching Kojak too long if he believes this is going to be valuable.

My friend, who is very much in favour of eliminating guns, has said nothing about removing them from every Tom, Dick and Harry who can be hired to protect people's property. That does not seem to me to be different from the grocer keeping a

gun in the till in his small corner grocery store. There are too many small grocers who have guns in their tills. Often it is not money people break into those stores for; it is to get guns. I do not see any difference between that and my going out and hiring a chocolate soldier to protect my property. Many of those people do not have any training, but I can pay them the minimum wage. Their intelligence is such that they cannot do very much other than wear a uniform. In many cases I suppose property would be better protected if these people were not hired.

I can see that there might be objection to the clause that says you can carry restricted weapons for use in connection with your lawful profession or occupation, or that you can hire people to protect yourself or your premises. It must be pure hell in this world if we say it is not good enough for us to have guns to protect our property but that those who have a little money can hire somebody to carry a gun to protect themselves. It appears that a master can hire a servant to be his bearer and to carry a gun and do his master's shooting for him. I do not really see that there is much difference.

Mr. Woolliams: There aren't many bears like that in Jasper.

Mr. Peters: No, but I would not want to use a hand gun on a grizzly bear either. I would want to have something better than that, or I would be making tracks faster than the bear.

The minister has not justified the argument that we should not protect our property with sidearms, and I am one of those who do not believe we should be carrying hand guns to protect our property. On the other hand, the minister is saying that if you are rich enough to have a gun bearer, you can hire him and he will protect your property for you. Our priorities are mixed up, particularly when we claim to be democratic people. It might be better for us to carry our own guns and do our own dirty work than to hire somebody to do it.

We as a society have hired police forces to protect our cities. That is what we call civilization. We anticipate that the police are going to be able to do that job for us. If we hear somebody breaking into our houses, it is very wise to pick up the telephone and to phone the police, and hopefully they will arrive. However, I suggest that it is not in the interests of a modern urban society to have the right to carry guns for the purpose of protecting our lives or our property. If we agree with that, we must also agree that we should not be able to hire people to do what we cannot do ourselves.

Mr. Leonard C. Jones (Moncton): Mr. Speaker, I have listened with a great deal of interest and some amusement to some of the remarks made by the minister and by some other hon. members tonight. On the advice and recommendation of members of the local police department in my constituency I had occasion to carry firearms for a considerable length of time and to be trained in their use. This is so with my wife and daughter as well. I also had a very fierce but precious dog at my home, and no one can tell me that we should change the Criminal Code at this stage and not allow firearms in homes, particularly where there have been incidents which indicate the requirement to protect life and property.

It seems to me that our lives and our property are part and parcel of our possessions in this world and, by golly, by doing this we are taking away a great deal from people who are licensed and who have certified firearms. I say this because of very cruel and desperate experiences. The police stayed in my house month after month to protect my wife and daughter, and all three of us were trained in the use of firearms. The Minister of Justice (Mr. Basford) has the audacity to say that no member of any police department in this country would recommend that. Policemen in my own constituency recommended it, and policemen from other cities told me that they would as well. I would like to hear someone in this House honestly say to the policemen in my city and in my constituency that they are wrong in doing so.

Mr. Stuart Leggatt (New Westminster): Mr. Speaker, I listened with care to the last two speakers, particularly to the hon. member for Timiskaming (Mr. Peters). It took him an awfully long time to tell us that he actually opposed the motion and supported the bill. I am pleased he did, but I do not know why it took so long to make his point because the point he was trying to make was fairly straightforward.

Mr. Woolliams: There is a split in the NDP.

Mr. Leggatt: I would like to correct what seems to be a misunderstanding in this place about the law. You do not have the right to shoot trespassers in this country, and all of the people who think that by having a gun they are protecting themselves should know that the statistics overwhelmingly show that that simply escalates the rate of violence and encourages the criminal element to go to houses with guns. Many people have told me that "nobody is going to come into my house, or they are going to get a bullet between the eyes".

I can give an example of why this particular clause is so necessary. About a year ago in Vancouver a young fellow was trespassing in a junk yard, and he was shot dead by the proprietor of the junk yard. His justification was that he was protecting his property. No one knew whether the youngster was trying to steal anything, or whether he was simply there as a trespasser or a prankster. However, the man who killed him felt justified because the trespasser was coming upon his "sacred" property. The man who killed him felt that he had a sacred right to use his gun to protect that property. As long as that philosophy prevails in this House we will not reduce crime in this country; we will increase it.

As a citizenry are we going to arm ourselves against all of the forces out there to protect ourselves? I plead with hon. members around me to support their local police. They are pretty good. They will come to the rescue. They will protect our houses for us, and we do not need hand guns.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

● (2040)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Is the House ready for the question? Hon. members have heard the terms of the motion. All those in favour will please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

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

Some hon. Members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Pursuant to Section (11) of Standing Order 75 the recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The House will now consider motion No. 23 standing in the name of the hon. member for Palliser (Mr. Schumacher).

Mr. Schumacher: Mr. Speaker, with the leave of the House may I withdraw this motion?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Does the House agree to allow the hon. member for Palliser to withdraw motion No. 23?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion No. 23 (Mr. Schumacher) withdrawn.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): The House will now consider motion No. 24, in the name of the hon. member for Dauphin (Mr. Ritchie).

Mr. Gordon Ritchie (Dauphin) moved:

Motion No. 24.

That Bill C-51, An Act to amend the Criminal Code, the Customs Tariff, the Parole Act, the Penitentiary Act and the Prisons and Reformatories Act, be amended in Clause 3

(*a*) by striking out line 44 at page 33 and substituting the following therefor:

"are located;"

(*b*) by adding immediately after line 3 at page 34 the following:

"(*e*) for the purpose of display at a showing or exhibition of restricted weapons; or

(*f*) in the case of a rifle or shotgun, for use connected with or incidental to hunting or other sporting activity,

and without restricting the generality of the foregoing, such permit authorizes the holder thereof to transport a restricted weapon for the purpose of having it repaired, maintained, altered or appraised."

He said: Mr. Speaker, I hope the minister can see his way clear to accepting some of the changes I propose in my amendment. I suggest the minister has not produced evidence to show that the displaying of restricted weapons leads to difficulties. Most gun collectors act responsibly and can be trusted to act responsibly when transporting a restricted weapon for the purpose of having it repaired, maintained, altered or appraised. It seems that the bill will cover almost all firearms under its restricted weapons definition.

If the bill says gun owners must obtain a permit every time they want to repair their guns, or have them repaired, I do not think gun owners will observe the provisions of this bill. In a practical way this bill will tend to make such owners and collectors transgressors, if not law breakers. I suggest the clause we are considering provides for unnecessary restrictions, under which it will be possible for people's guns to be taken away from them.

Many years ago I talked to someone from Germany who told me what life was like before Mr. Hitler came to power.

Mr. Woolliams: Corporal Hitler, you mean.

Mr. Ritchie: This chap said you could not sleep in your bed at night for fear of molestation. After Hitler came to power this was set right. I guess I need not remind anyone what happened. The German people lost their right to possess weapons, but lost many other freedoms, too. Eventually, of course, Hitler dragged them into that calamitous military venture which ended in disaster. We are a free people, and if you make the restrictions too onerous you will defeat their purpose.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Is the House ready for the question? Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Paproski: On division.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): The motion is negatived on division.

Motion No. 24 (Mr. Ritchie) negatived on division.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): The House will now consider motions Nos. 25, 26 and 27, standing in the names of the hon. member for Moose Jaw (Mr. Neil) and the hon. member for Palliser (Mr. Schumacher) respectively. Is it agreed that the vote on motion No. 25 will also dispose of motions 26 and 27?

Mr. Schumacher: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. When I put my two motions down I was not aware of the language of the motion of the hon. member for Moose Jaw. I much prefer his motion to my two motions, and ask leave of the House to withdraw motions 26 and 27.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Is it agreed that the hon. member for Palliser shall have leave to withdraw motions 26 and 27?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion No. 26 (Mr. Schumacher) withdrawn.

Motion No. 27 (Mr. Schumacher) withdrawn.

Mr. Doug Neil (Moose Jaw) moved:

Motion No. 25.

That Bill C-51, An Act to amend the Criminal Code, the Customs Tariff, the Parole Act, the Penitentiary Act and the Prisons and Reformatories Act, be amended in Clause 3 by striking out lines 34 to 39 at page 35 and substituting the following therefor:

"(9) Permits mentioned in subsections (1), (3), (4), (5), (6) and (7) shall be issued without the payment of a fee."

He said: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams) withdrew his motion concerning permits for an individual. My motion covers both permits for an individual and for one carrying on a business. I expect the hon. member for Calgary North will speak about permits for individuals, so I shall restrict my remarks to the fee that someone selling rifles and ammunition, and carrying on business, must pay for a licence or permit.

In my part of the country almost every corner store, every garage, sells rifles, ammunition and shotgun shells, especially when the hunting season is at its peak. You will see .22 calibre rifles in these establishments, shotguns, even rifles used for big game hunting. These dealers are licensed either by the province, municipality or city in which they carry on business. It seems to me that the many forms they are required to fill out, and licence fees they are required to pay, have become a great burden.

Remember, everyone who sells ammunition and rifles must pay a fee for the licence giving him the right to sell firearms or ammunition. Bear in mind as well that the regulations will require such dealers to keep records and submit certain forms from time to time. If this process becomes too onerous, these individuals who make a certain profit from the sale of firearms and ammunition, will say "I simply cannot be bothered", with the result that the large stores will have a corner on the market.

I know some individuals in my constituency who make a living operating a gun shop. They do not make a very good living. They repair guns, sell the odd rifle and some shells. If they are going to be forced to pay a licence fee on top of the business licence fee they are now required to pay, they will have to go out of business. I believe it was indicated by the minister in committee that while the fee would not exceed $1,000—

● (2050)

Mr. Basford: $250.

Mr. Neil: $250. That is still a substantial fee for an individual to pay, particularly when he is called upon to keep all these records. If the government requires an individual to keep records that are not in his own interest, but in the interest of the government, he should not be required to pay a licence fee.

I simply say in this motion that if a man meets the qualifications to carry on business and is prepared to do the necessary paperwork, the government should appreciate that fact and he should not be called upon to pay a substantial fee. As I mentioned earlier, there are many small businesses which will cease to carry rifles and ammunition. The result will be that individuals in the rural areas who now go to their corner store in a small town will be forced to go to the city to buy their ammunition if they wish to go hunting. Under the circumstances, it is an unfair burden.

I am not concerned about the larger stores. I am concerned about the small businessman who today has to spend more and more time completing forms, and paying more and more for licence fees. I therefore ask the House to accept this amendment that there be no licence fees charged to those who carry on the business of selling firearms and ammunition.

Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Calgary North): I will be very brief, Mr. Speaker. I moved this basic amendment in committee. I congratulate the hon. member for Moose Jaw (Mr. Neil) in that regard.

The real problem is not the fee. What we should be considering is the integrity of the merchant. I appreciate that merchants who have small stores in the maritimes, Quebec, and western Canada, do not have the material wealth to afford secretaries to complete all the forms. What is important is the integrity of the individual operating the store where long guns are sold. It was assumed in committee that there are between six million and 11 million guns in existence in Canada, and two and a half million owners.

When this bill becomes law, and I guess it will because the government has a majority, anyone wishing to purchase a long gun will have to obtain a certificate. A certificate will cost $10. Once they get the certificate, they will be able to buy any kind of gun for the next five years.

The point being made by the hon. member for Moose Jaw is that small storekeepers, owners of small hardware stores or corner stores should not have to pay a fee. It is true that the maximum is $250, but why should they have to pay that? If the minister and the government are honest, and that is questionable, particularly with regard to this legislation, they will state that what we should be considering is protecting the public against crime. They should not be charging a fee to the individual who operates a store in the town of Strathmore, Alberta; or Rockyford in the former constituency of Bow River which I used to represent. They should be considering whether the merchant has the integrity to ensure whether the certificate is being properly issued to someone who comes in to purchase firearms, particularly long guns.

This bill does not control guns in Canada. Let us get that straight. There are 11 million guns and two and a half million owners who will not be controlled. In committe I asked the minister to assure me that those two and a half million owners are all sane, none are alcoholics and none are emotionally distressed to the point that they might do something unlawful in a community. Many of these guns have no registration, either on the barrel or elsewhere on the gun. Therefore how will this control crime? This is merely window-dressing.

Does anyone believe for a moment that this bill will control murder and other crimes? It is straight window-dressing to

bluff the Canadian people that the government is doing something about crime.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Woolliams: Yesterday the hon. member for Central Nova (Mr. MacKay) asked for something which I and other members of this party have asked for on several occasions, namely, an inquiry into crime in Canada. The reply was that we do not need one, there was one in Quebec and they only found out about dirty meat. Therefore I say this is complete window-dressing. That is why many members today were annoyed when the Minister of Justice (Mr. Basford) issued a press release after wandering down to an incident which was caused by long guns, which are not covered by this bill.

Mr. Fraser: There was another one in Toronto, exactly the same.

Mr. Woolliams: Yes, and there has been one in Calgary and one in Vancouver. The question we are asking is: why should the small businessman have to pay a price to the federal government with regard to crime? Who pays the wages of the police forces in Canada? Naturally it is the taxpayers. Why should owners of small hardware stores and other stores which sell long guns, that are not included in this bill, have to pay a fee of up to $250? That is the point the hon. member is making. That is the point this party is making. I need not say any more.

Mr. Bob Brisco (Kootenay West): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams) touched on most points I wanted to raise in the context of small business. It is worthwhile mentioning that we have a minister responsible for small business who travels across the country assuring small businessmen that the government is sensitive to their concerns, that the government is going to reduce the bureaucratic load that these small businessmen must shoulder, and that it is going to reduce the paper work that assails them every month for StatsCan, RevenueCan, this Can and that Can—

Mr. Symes: And the trash can.

Mr. Brisco: They then turn around and find another minister introducing more bureaucracy to be placed on the shoulders of small businessmen.

● (2100)

Whether it is $250 or $2,000 the question remains: is that sum going to purchase integrity? My hon. friend from Calgary North has made a valid point. Perhaps there should be some selection, but by and large we can rely on the integrity of the small shopkeeper. I wonder, in light of the statements made about the hon. member for Kootenay West and others, whether we can rely on the same integrity from the minister.

I should like to make a further suggestion. If these fees are to be charged, let them not disappear into the limbo of National Revenue. Let us use these fees for a constructive purpose in the area in which they apply. Let us develop, with provincial agreement, a national program of hunter training. Let us set a national standard and use this money to provide for such a program. After all, there are provinces which use the revenues obtained through the sale of hunting licences for recreational services, conservation, and the improvement of the environment.

I am confident that if this amendment fails the government will accumulate more dollars, saddle the small businessman with another bunch of bureaucratic bumf, and accomplish nothing except to drive small businessmen further away from any sense of belonging. If any government has alienated small business it is this one. I hope the minister will pay attention to the views expressed by the opposition in reference to this amendment.

Mr. Arnold Peters (Timiskaming): I want to support the argument that this large fee should not be levied—and it is a large fee if we are thinking about many of the businesses which sell guns in my area. Though I have said earlier that I should like to see many of them not selling guns it cannot be denied that setting up the bureaucracy necessary to deal with the effects of this legislation will involve these small businessmen in a considerable expense. Every time a customer comes in to buy a gun it will be necessary to ensure that he has a permit, to examine the permit, to take down and enter the serial number of the gun and, no doubt, to send all this information to the firearms registry in the area.

The minister has made the point that this does not apply to ammunition. But here we are certainly talking about ammunition. The small business operator will have to pay $250 for a licence to sell, perhaps, $50 worth of ammunition.

Mr. Basford: No, he will not.

Mr. Peters: It says so here in the bill. It speaks of a permit being necessary to carry on business under subclause (2)(b)(i), and this applies to anyone buying or selling, wholesale or retail, or importing ammunition. So I do not know how the minister can say this does not involve ammunition.

Camp operators are obliged to sell ammunition if they are to carry on their businesses. If they are selling duck licences or moose licences they must at least have a few boxes of ammunition on hand. They do not sell guns but they are expected to keep some ammunition for sale along with the permits they issue. The minister does not seem to know why they sell these permits or this ammunition. They do so because it is a service to those who stay at the tourist camps. The nearest town is often 50 miles or so away.

The minister is not being honest in his interpretation of what a "business" is likely to be under this clause. The little guy will be asked to pay $250 for a licence under this clause though his total sales will amount to less than the fee. Oh, I imagine the minister will probably say there is to be a sliding scale provided for by regulation and that the fee will only be $10 or so. But if the minister is really interested in removing guns from the market, I would be surprised if he does not see this clause as a good way of discouraging people from going into

the firearms business. The clause says that a person engaged in this business must get a licence and that this licence will cost $250.

I repeat that a great many of those who are selling ammunition in my area are not doing so for profit but as a service to customers. Customers rent room and board, they rent airplane service, they rent boats and guides from the operator, and then they go into the bush. The selling of the ammunition is surely incidental. Nevertheless, the ammunition must be on hand. An operator cannot send his customers over to a competitor and say, "Buy your ammunition there, and then come back to my camp." The minister has all along been talking about preventing the sale of guns to people who should not get them, preventing them from being stolen and so on. But it seems to me he is hitting all these little people, and I certainly would not be representing a northern Ontario riding if I were to agree with the minister in the course he is following. In any case, the tourist industry now is not in a good position—

Mr. Woolliams: Because you people opposite drove out the Americans.

Mr. Peters: Most of them are not in a position to put up this $250. They would probably have to hire somebody to look after the bookkeeping involved in selling a few boxes of .22 shells or shotgun cartridges. They are not in the business of manufacturing, distributing wholesale, and so on. What are they going to do? What I would advise them to do is bootleg. They should keep a few extra boxes of shells for themselves and, if necessary, give them to their customers.

Mr. Faulkner: The NDP is in favour of bootlegging.

Mr. Peters: Well, I always enjoyed bootleggers. I lived in Timmins for many years where bootlegging was a very honourable profession, as I expect it was in Nova Scotia and many other areas. And as for young people who haven't enjoyed going to the bootlegger, maybe they have something to look forward to yet.

• (2110)

Why would a guy make this outlay? He could not make $250 profit selling ammunition in my area. I suggest he would do better to give it to his customers and charge them an extra buck for the room or on meals. Certainly he could not make a living out of selling ammunition. He cannot make a living if he does not have ammunition, even in my hon. friend's area which does not have bootleggers. I have been around the Sturgeon Lake area and they had a bootlegger then. The hon. member does have some tourist operators in his constituency and I am sure they will want to sell a few boxes of shells to duck hunters in the fall. But I am sure most will not sell enough to make a profit of $250, and if they do they are only working for the government. If they were in the business of selling ammunition they would have to make a lot more than that.

I do not want to belabour the point but I say the government is being very unfair in this provision to all those people who depend on hunting and fishing for their livelihood.

Mr. Gilbert: We can always refer the bill back to committee at third reading.

Mr. Peters: Yes, perhaps we should refer the bill back at third reading to discuss this clause. However, I think the minister should assure us that he is not out to do in the small entrepreneur. It seems to me that these are not the people who get into trouble. I am not aware that even the most valid anti-gun lobbyists contend that shotgun shells and a few rifle shells in a hunting lodge are dangerous to anyone.

The poeple who run a hunting lodge for a bunch of duck hunters in the fall are a very limited group. They possess gun licences of one kind or another. The hunters from the States will have an American licence, as well as one from the province of Ontario for the hunting season, and they will also have undergone other tests. I suggest that this is an added one which does not serve any purpose or make a great deal of sense. I am very much opposed to it, and I think at third reading the bill should be referred back to committee so this clause may receive further study.

Mr. Paul Yewchuk (Athabasca): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in support of the motion put forward by my hon. friend from Moose Jaw. I support the motion because, since this bill has been brought forward, it has become quite clear that no other legislation that has been introduced into this House recently has raised so much objection among the public at large as this. Other measures which raised a lot of objection were the abolition of capital punishment bill and the change to the abortion law. Those are the only two I can remember which have aroused the public as much as this one.

We have before us an urban oriented minister presenting an urban oriented bill which tries to impose urban views upon many people who are not urbanites. The minister should be flexible enough to recognize that not everyone lives in an urban area and that not all of the laws of this country should be tailored for urbanites only.

It seems to me that one of two possibilities exists so far as the minister is concerned. Either he is grossly misinformed about the use of guns, or he is trying to bamboozle the people of Canada into believing that somehow this legislation will reduce the number of crimes committed with guns. If indeed he believes that, then I am very anxious to hear from him how he thinks this bill will achieve that objective.

This motion is not designed to block the bill. It now appears that with the majority which the Liberal government has in the House it will force through this unacceptable legislation, as it has on many other occasions, against the objections of Canadians everywhere. About the only thing we can do at this stage is to voice our objection on behalf of many Canadians and to try to soften the bill as much as possible, knowing that the Liberal government is going to force it through the House anyway.

A number of my colleagues speaking on behalf of small businessmen have said that the fees which the minister is prescribing will hurt them financially and indeed may cause many to go out of the business of selling guns and ammunition.

I support statements to that effect. We already know there is so much government red tape involved in running a business that it is almost impossible for businessmen to continue in business. The average small business requires one person working practically full time to fill in all the forms the government requires to be filled in, whether it be for income tax, the Canada Pension Plan, workmen's compensation, the Anti-Inflation Board, and so on and so forth. All of this form filling increases the cost of doing business.

Another aspect that concerns me is that those who want to own a gun, or those who have guns and want to purchase a new one, will now be required to pay a fee. It seems to me that they should be relieved of this burden. The minister has in no way offered any explanation of why individuals should be required to pay a fee for this purpose. If he wants to find out whether an individual is mentally suited to owning a gun, then it is not necessary to make that person pay a fee; the information can be provided to the licensing officer without any fee being involved. Therefore I urge the minister to relieve individuals of the burden of paying a fee for a licence to own a gun, as well as businessmen who are in the business of selling arms and ammunition.

I do not think I am any less intelligent than any member on the other side of the House, but I repeat that I cannot comprehend how the minister comes to the conclusion that by requiring a person to buy a licence to own a gun he will reduce the crime rate in this country, or the number of crimes committed with the use of a gun. We know there is no real evidence to suggest that this result will ever be achieved. We can only conclude that the minister is being pressured by those in his urban constituency and he feels he has to appear to be doing something in this regard.

Mr. Fraser: He is not being pressured by anybody; he feels this in his own mind.

Mr. Yewchuk: My hon. friend from Vancouver, who represents an urban riding, says the minister is not being pressured, and perhaps it is the minister's own idea of trying to do something useful in the House. But I doubt that this bill will be useful. The minister is putting the bill forward, as he did as recently as last night, as some kind of measure which will prevent people from sniping from rooftops, or will prevent murderers from using guns, or prevent bank robbers from using guns to rob banks. All of these crimes will continue whether or not this bill passes. If we want to come to grips with this particular problem, some other measures will be required. Certainly these measures will not solve crime in the country but will only impose an unnecessary burden on many law-abiding citizens.

● (2120)

Mr. F. Oberle (Prince George-Peace River): Mr. Speaker, I should like to comment on this particular section of the bill. I made my views on this whole matter of gun control known in committee when it was discussed there. As the hon. member for Athabasca (Mr. Yewchuk) said, it is an urban oriented piece of legislation. When the minister goes out of the urban centres and into what I call real Canada, he seems to wear blinkers and does not understand what goes on there. He looks at the big sporting goods stores, which are part of national chains, in the big urban centres where they display and sell hardware. He assumes this will not create any great hardship to the chain, to take out a licence to sell and display these firearms.

The reality in rural Canada is much different. Often one deals with a small corner grocery store or a co-op store which is unincorporated. A person operates a general store more for the convenience of his neighbours than for profit. He tries to provide a service to his neighbours in a manner similar to that mentioned by the hon. member for Kootenay West (Mr. Brisco) by stocking a few boxes of ammunition and one or two rifles.

I would not have used the time of the House tonight, had it not been for the minister's public comments outside the House against some of my colleagues. I was very much appalled by his particular statement. His statement was city oriented. Of course we have a problem. One can cite a whole series of accidents which have happened as a result of improper use or criminal use of a firearm in a city. After the minister strolled down to the scene last night to take command of a critical situation, to involve himself in the way he did this morning by bringing this debate into the context of his press release and to name members of the opposition, who are exercising their responsibilities by debating this bill, is less than honest. As a matter of fact it is an infringement against the privileges of every member in this House.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Oberle: Frankly, if I was one of the members he named, I would be in contact with my solicitor and I would have this gentleman answer for his actions.

It would have been a greater source of comfort to me if he had assured those of us who are concerned with crime in our country that the kind of person who perpetrated this crime last night will not walk around the streets in the future, and furthermore, if he has been incarcerated today, that he will stay there until we know how to deal with him and until we know he is cured. The minister is not giving that assurance to Canadians today, not to us in the House. He wants society to pay the price of crime. If we find a rotten apple in the box, we have to cure this apple at the expense of all the good apples in the box. Society and the storekeepers have to pay the price because some people in the cities cannot understand that a farmer has to carry a gun around with him because of predators which attack his cattle, and in order to protect his property. The minister cannot understand that.

Once the ultimate is achieved in gun control, in the minister's view, we can open the jails and let the criminals out because there will be no more guns, and thus there will be no more crimes. I suppose knives will have to be taken away from them as well. We will all be a happy society then.

There is a feeling of mistrust and anxiety throughout this land, particularly in the rural areas. As a matter of fact I got trapped into defending Bill C-83 last year, and the minister knows the situation in which I found myself. There is no such thing as the registration of firearms in this bill. We are not asking Canadians to register their firearms. When I met with my constituents I told them that I could not see this provision in the bill. They said they did not trust the minister, that this will be the first step. First they will register firearms and then they will be confiscating them. This is what was said by real Canadians who live in the frontier areas of our country, people who are still people up in the Peace River country and places which I represent. I could not convince them that the minister does not have any other motive. I was chased out of the meeting. I could not convince them. Of course the minister could not convince them either during meetings which he has had all across the country.

One afternoon last winter an opportunity arose for four of my friends—three from this side and one from the other side—to go to the police academy and join some of the officers there in a game of curling, a bonspiel. I am an ardent sportsman and a curler. The other team was not doing too well. We had scored all the points, and we had time to rest. We were talking about gun control and a police officer said: "What utter nonsense. I have been working here for six months setting up a national registry here in Ottawa". I said: "You cannot be serious. The minister has said there is no gun registration". He said: "I do not know what I have been doing for the last six months, but we are going to register every firearm in this country". In committee I told the minister about this and he said that it was not the registration of firearms that was being set up, but a registration of firearms licences. The fact that the firearms licence a person will carry around has the registration number of every firearm the person owns was conveniently ignored by the minister. That is why 2½ million Canadians who possess long guns do not trust the minister. Probably they will not be affected by this paranoiac piece of legislation.

Canadians outside the urban centres consider it to be their right to own a gun or a firearm. They are of the pioneering stock. They feel a man's home is his castle and he has a right to defend it. The minister is telling them that they must surrender some of their rights and privileges to the bureaucrats, to the adjudicators, and to the cabinet who will keep these rights in trust for us. One does not have to go too far off Parliament Hill to find there is very little trust in the guardians of civil rights and those people who are taking these minor rights and privileges away from us in the interest of the common good.

● (2130)

There is no need for this watered-down version of the gun control bill. If the minister were serious he could have negotiated an arrangement with the provinces which would have co-ordinated his efforts and theirs.

Another bureaucracy will have to be established. The storekeeper has to pay another licence fee and keep another set of books. He is already tied up with provincial licences and now he has to fill out a federal form showing how many pieces of ammunition were bought, who bought what rifle and so on and, at the command of some bureaucrat, submit the record forthwith for inspection.

The minister says he does not wish to interfere with those who presently own long guns, mostly for legitimate reasons. It is hard for people who live in concrete jungles to understand the need for these guns. I do not need one in Ottawa, but I certainly do when I ride the range in Peace River country where the wolves are eating my cattle.

The minister could have gone to the provinces and said, "Let's get together. With your hunting licence requirements and the competency test, let's add a requirement that a person buying a new gun needs a certificate." I agree with that, because there have been accidents. Incidentally, the happening last night was not one of these, regardless of what the minister says about a man who walks out of a beer parlour and goes to the hardware store and purchases a gun to deal with a bartender who cheated him out of a round of beer. There have also been accidents when children have misused firearms.

We certainly understand that not everybody should have access to a gun, particularly not criminals. It appears to me that the minister is not too much concerned about those individuals, however, because if he were he would keep them behind bars where they would not have access to guns.

Every province has its own regulations and most of them work quite well as they are tuned to local needs. This bill provides that the minister may negotiate with the provinces to co-ordinate the kind of thing he is trying to achieve here. He does not need an extra bureaucracy at all.

The society that I represent in the northern parts of British Columbia is not prepared to pay the price that the cities of this country are imposing on it with this bill. The people I represent need firearms everyday, some for sport and others for business, but they are not prepared to pay this $10 in order to give the minister peace of mind. Let the user-pay principle not be applied here. The users are the people who live in rural areas, and they are in the minority. It is not fair that the hardware merchant should have to pay $250 as his share of the expense of keeping guns away from criminals. I cannot condone that. My finer sensibilities are aroused, Mr. Speaker.

I had no intention of prolonging this debate tonight, but the hon. minister has taken some liberties in this House today, and he took some liberties last year with Bill C-83. It is rather strange that a man who has been in this House as long as he has and represents the great area he does should be less than honest with the committee, with this House, and with the people of the country.

We cannot support this bill, Mr. Speaker. We do not need it—unless the minister has other motives. It is tied in with other things that we shall hopefully debate tomorrow.

This bill will come home to haunt the minister, Mr. Speaker. I will no longer defend this rather silly and seemingly innocent piece of legislation in my constituency. The minister must have other motives, and I will identify them and tell my constituents what they are. I will not have myself identified as having blood on my hands because there was an incident last night, tragic as it was. In no way will I accept responsibility for that, nor my friends who have been named. Had my name been mentioned in that connection the minister would hear from me through the courts. What a cheap shot at the opposition, because the government is having a hard time with something that should not have been brought before the House in the first place.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Roch La Salle (Joliette): Mr. Speaker, I have been listening for a few moments to some comments which I find extremely interesting. Being from a province which will experience some difficulties with that legislation which is being forced upon us by any means, I do not really understand the objectives of that legislation since we know that the basic objective will not be attained, far from it. There has been some reference to a reduction of criminality. I do not know how many organizations or societies have made representations to that effect and I think that there is not one member in the House who has not received some mail about it. Being a representative from Quebec, I had such correspondence as many others and I think that every Quebec member got some mail asking that pressures be exerted on the government in connection with that bill.

The matter now under consideration, in view of the motion introduced by the member for Moose Jaw (Mr. Neil), is extremely interesting and I wish to support the previous comments made by my colleagues. The problems which have arisen in other provinces are also found in my province, Mr. Speaker. And I am wondering how my friends across the aisle can remain silent when a bill like this appears to us totally unacceptable. I am thinking, for instance, about the good intentions of small merchants who may have to pay $250 for a permit allowing them to offer services to amateurs, to organizations anxious to take advantage of our resources and the government refuses to correct the error put in the legislation in spite of very plausible arguments that have been made.

I do not understand, Mr. Speaker, how it is that government members cannot assess our arguments nor why they take no notice of representations that have been made by their constituents or hunting clubs in their ridings. It is not possible, Mr. Speaker, that government members did not receive representations along this line. But they take good care not to bring these arguments before the House or in committees, to urge the minister to realize how mistaken he is and how the government seems to have lost all sense of responsibility. Mr. Speaker, after listening to the comments made by my colleagues, I cannot remain silent about the businessmen of my riding who are affected and who would rather refuse to buy a permit than pay $250. Once again, all that business will be diverted to the larger stores which will not mind paying the $250.

[Mr. Oberle.]

But I think it is important to remind the minister that it is much more to help hunting enthusiasts that the small businessmen do it, and if they were to make small benefits to keep their business running, no government would have the right, in my opinion, to hesitate any longer before withdrawing its proposition, considering the motion now before us. I think that hon. members, particularly those on the government side, should have understood long ago how important it is to make this correction which seems extremely fair towards those poor businessmen.

In my riding, some businessmen will be affected by this legislation and I realize that some members would rather laugh at what we say, instead of being concerned by legislation which some of their constituents will have a hard time swallowing.

I think I do not have anything to add, only to ask the minister to take his responsibilities, to get out of his office and visit the areas concerned across this country. As my colleagues pointed out earlier, he is certainly not aware of what is going on, how badly this legislation will be received and how it will also bring difficulties. Why trouble those dealers who do not deserve to be penalized because they are indeed being penalized by this legislation. I am still wondering why this government takes pleasure in troubling poor innocent people who, again, go all out to provide Canadians with services in all areas of this country. But they will again choose to be quiet.

I see the young hon. member for Louis-Hébert (Mr. Dawson) who must have received correspondence about that as we did. If he has not I would be surprised but it will come. The people in his riding will get to know him and will probably urge him to help us bring the minister back to reason when we have the necessary evidence. I am talking about the comments and recommendations that we had, the briefs that were submitted. We as members of the opposition have the obligation to do everyting we can to bring this government back to reason and stop the suffering of innocent people like those dealers who will have to pay for a permit. Yet we know that they keep those few items in their stores a lot more as a service to tourists, visitors or citizens living in the area. But you still have to get out of large cities to know that that exists in our areas, in rural areas, in hunting areas. So, I dare hope that those few comments and those that were made before me with a lot more eloquence will make this government and hon. members understand that what we have in mind is the wellbeing of those poor dealers who are again the victims of a totally inadequate legislation.

● (2140)

[*English*]

Mr. Cyril Symes (Sault Ste. Marie): Mr. Speaker, I would like to support the comments of my learned colleague, the hon. member for Timiskaming (Mr. Peters), when he drew to the attention of the House the discriminatory nature of this motion as it applies to tourist operators, particularly in my area of northern Ontario, whereby the tourist operator or the camp operator who is in the business of selling hunting licences

and usually stocks a few boxes of ammunition to sell to hunters will be liable, as we understand it, to a fee which could range from $10 to $250, according to the testimony in the committee. There is nothing that outlines that in the bill and we are at the mercy of the regulations.

I think that we need from the Minister of Justice (Mr. Basford) an explanation in the House this evening as to how the fee structure will apply. Can we get a clarification from him? This will expedite moving on to the other clauses in the bill.

I want to reiterate that I would find it very discriminatory for the small businessmen to have to face a fee of $250 or even more—because it is not outlined in the legislation—when he is selling only two boxes of ammunition during the hunting season. He is obviously not selling the ammunition to make money on it. It is unlikely that he would even make a profit of $250 in a very good year. I find that kind of fee for a permit to sell ammunition most discriminatory and retrogressive in terms of what it will do to small business operators who depend on attracting customers by providing the varied services that hunters want, one of them being the stocking of ammunition.

I would like to put a question to the Minister of Justice. Would he clarify for members of the House just how this fee is to operate? Will it be on a sliding scale based on the amount of ammunition the tourist operator sells in a given season, or will it be a set fee, and what would it be? We have heard figures ranging from $10 to $250. I hope the minister will clarify that for us, otherwise members of the House, and certainly small businessmen, will be left with the impression that the maximum amount will be charged, and I do not think members of the House would agree to that kind of discriminatory fee for small business. Can the minister answer that?

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Justice): I will be happy to repeat the explanation I provided in the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs that the fee under this subsection, which is a permit to carry on business, which will be set in the regulations, will range from $10 to $250 depending on and totally related to the volume of business of the dealer.

Mr. Woolliams: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I put this to the minister, and I know he would not want to mislead the press or the House, that there is nothing in the bill that sets the limit at $250. We have to rely on his word, or that of some unknown minister who might get into the cabinet in the shuffle in October, to set that fee. Where does it say in the bill that the limit will be set at $250?

Mr. Basford: If I may be allowed to complete my remarks, Mr. Speaker, in answer to the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams), let me say that I indicated very clearly in the committee, because we had an amendment on the subject, that the fee is not set down in the statute. As I was saying earlier, the fee will be set in the regulations. I indicated to the committee that the fee would range from $10 to $250 depending on the volume of business of the dealer. The largest dealers, such as Eaton, Simpson or Hudson Bay Company, would obviously be in the top range.

● (2150)

The cost for the local gunsmith and the local sporting goods store in a small community obviously will be set at $10. The range from $10 to $250 is designed to be explicitly related to the volume of business of the retailer. We have consulted various organizations on this proposal. We consulted the Retail Merchants Association, the Association of Hardware Dealers, and the association of sporting goods stores. I have forgotten the precise name of that latter association.

Mr. Brisco: Did you talk to the Minister of State (Small Business) (Mr. Marchand)?

Mr. Basford: These various associations have not registered objections with me either as to the form of the statute or the form of the proposed regulations.

In response to allegations that the fees are intended to be revenue generating, they are intended to cover solely the cost of the dealer's records, the cost of inspection and the cost of seeing that safe storage facilities are maintained. It is simply a cost recovery scheme with fees ranging from $10 to $250.

Mr. Stan Schumacher (Palliser): Mr. Speaker, I really did not intend to debate this motion, but I am moved to participate because the minister said this is not a revenue-producing scheme. We know that this government operates very expensively. We know that passports are not supposed to be revenue-producing either, but their term was reduced from ten years to five for the same fee. That was quite an increase when it was instituted, and then within two or three years, in spite of the Anti-Inflation Board's being in operation, the government went well beyond the guidelines set for everybody else in the country. Many examples of the government's not obeying rules and regulations could be cited.

Mr. MacKay: Post office boxes.

Mr. Neil: And stamps.

Mr. Schumacher: The hon. member for Central Nova (Mr. MacKay) cites the case of post office boxes. Those were not supposed to be revenue-producing either. The only protection the ordinary citizen has—and it has been mentioned before that two and one half million people are affected—will cost more all the time.

The hon. member for Moose Jaw (Mr. Neil) and others have pointed out that the government is placing an onerous and heavy burden on businessmen by compelling them to keep complicated records to maintain the gun registration which is going to be put into place under this legislation, although the government protests that it is not going to do so.

Reference has also been made to all the other reports which will have to be made by small businessmen. That will be dealt with by regulation as well. The fee is not going to be fixed at any level. There is no guarantee that it will be fixed at $10,

$250 or anything else. Here we have another example of the law being regulated by bureaucrats under the name and hand of the governor in council. We will find that this is the camel's nose in the tent. We will have another form of taxation introduced under the guise of some type of license fee. I do not think this is the time to increase the cost of doing business or the cost of living. I urge the House to consider seriously this very reasonable motion of the hon. member for Moose Jaw and to support its passage.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Armand Caouette (Villeneuve): Mr. Speaker, I have carefully listened to the remarks made by my colleagues from the Progressive Conservative and New Democratic Parties, and I felt compelled to take advantage of the few minutes that are allocated to us to discuss a little this amendment presented by the Progressive Conservative Party. I cannot but congratulate them given the fact that I represent in the House a riding where the major sport of my constituents happens to be hunting.

Once again, we are going to force small businesses to pay amounts varying between $10 and $200, according to what the minister just said, and I am asking myself the following question: How is it that the federal government has once again decided to tax the small businesses, while the province of Quebec already has a law whereby these small businesses are being taxed when they want to sell the necessary goods not only to Quebec hunters but also to hunters who come from the United States and other countries to enjoy this beautiful sport which is hunting?

Mr. Speaker, I think this government is again making a mistake, under Bill C-51, by asking our small businesses, those little stores, to disburse additional amounts, as the member for Joliette (Mr. La Salle) stated so well, while the sale of these firearms or ammunitions is not their primary source of income, taking into account the fact that they stock only very few of these items, but that they provide a great service to all the people who want to practise their favorite sport during their vacation time by going into remote areas of Quebec and of other provinces. I am asking myself why this government is trying to deter hunters, especially American residents, from spending their money on purchasing certain types of firearms and ammunitions, as well as all sorts of things.

[*English*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Order, please. It being ten o'clock, in accordance with Standing Order 40 a motion to adjourn the House is deemed to have been made and seconded at this time.

[Mr. Schumacher.]

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[*English*]

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 40 deemed to have been moved.

ENERGY—OIL—SUGGESTION EXTRA REVENUE BE PLACED IN FUND TO BE USED ONLY FOR EXPLORATION

Hon. Herb Gray (Windsor West): Mr. Speaker, on June 27 in the absence of the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Gillespie) I directed the following question to the government House leader, who was then Acting Prime Minister:

Is it correct that the increase in oil and gas prices recently announced by the federal government will result in windfall revenues of some $1 billion going to oil companies, largely foreign owned, without any obligation on their part to use any of this money for exploration for and development of oil and gas resources?

I will not read the rest of the question. It is in *Hansard*. The reply of the acting Prime Minister was only that he was not in a position to confirm the alleged facts pointed out by me. He said that my question was in the nature of a representation which would be considered.

In announcing a couple of weeks ago an increase in the Canadian crude oil price of $1 a barrel as of July 1 and three subsequent $1 per barrel increases at six-month intervals, the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources said that the purpose of these subtantial increases was to encourage development and production of oil resources. But how would these objectives be achieved if, of the added revenues as a result of these increases, 24.6 per cent—that is, in effect, 25 per cent—would go to the oil companies, 48.4 per cent to the oil provinces, and 27 per cent to the federal government, and if in fact the oil companies would get their 25 per cent without doing anything extra at all by way of exploration and development? How would this windfall to the oil companies create increased exploration and production activity?

● (2200)

Well, Mr. Speaker, in today's *Globe and Mail* a letter appeared signed by the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources, which constitutes an attempt to give the kind of information I was seeking in my question. First of all, his letter confirmed the provision of the additional revenues I have just mentioned. However, it disputes the claim that the 25 per cent to the oil companies would total $1 billion over the next 12 months. The letter claims, instead, that this is a gross amount and the net amount after royalties to the producing provinces would be only about half of this. Additional amounts from these revenues would go as federal taxes, the exact sum depending on the extent to which the industry re-invests the additional cash flow. But, Mr. Speaker, from the letter it seems clear that after taking taxes and royalties into account, the oil industry would still be left with as much as several hundred million dollars at the very least without doing any exploration and development in addition to what they are doing now, or would be doing anyway.

If the purpose of the increase is to bring about increased production of our petroleum resources, why should the oil companies get any additional revenue, even one dollar, that is not used for exploration and development, to bring about such increased production?

The oil companies, Mr. Speaker, have increased their profitability substantially in recent months. The figures indicate a better profit performance than our secondary manufacturing industry. If the purpose of the increase in oil prices is to encourage conservation by consumers and industry, the second reason for the increase presented by the minister when he announced it, surely there is no sound reason why the oil companies should benefit from this objective. Surely if this is the purpose, additional revenues from the price increase should be used by the government for further research into alternative energy sources, particularly renewable ones, and into better methods of conservation. They should be used to assist low income Canadians to insulate their homes, to provide meaningful financial assistance for them to do this to a greater extent than that made possible by the forthcoming federal government home insulation program, rather than letting this money go into the coffers of the oil industry.

The minister in his letter in today's *Globe and Mail* said his cash flow monitoring bill presently before parliament will give him the information necessary to evaluate oil industry behaviour. But if after this legislation is passed it is found the industry did not use the additional income from these oil price increases for exploration and development, there is no provision in the bill that I am aware of for getting this money back. It is gone forever. And even though the minister argues the information provided as a result of his bill will prepare the government to take corrective measures, and these are his exact words in the letter, there is no commitment from the government as yet to take such measures, or any indication as to what they might be.

Finally, in his letter the minister argues that the oil price increases will prevent our secondary industry from expanding, and I quote him, "into activities where competitive advantage depends on artificially depressed prices." Mr. Speaker, this is turning reality upside down. If through proper government policy oil prices reflect the actual costs of production and exploring for our own Canadian energy resources, plus a reasonable return, surely these prices will not be artificially depressed. The really artificial prices are those set by the OPEC oil cartel, prices which have no relationship to the cost of production and reasonable returns.

Canadian consumers and workers would, I am sure, prefer that the minister and the government were not seemingly so willing to bring our prices up to the level of the artificially high prices set by the OPEC cartel.

Mr. Leggatt: You are making a good NDP speech.

Mr. Gray: Mr. Speaker, I am not saying higher prices in Canada may not be necessary to bring about development and production of our own petroleum resources, but surely they should be justified on the basis of real cost plus reasonable rate of return, and surely the oil companies should get additional revenues through such increases only if, as, and when they carry out exploration and development work in addition to what they are doing now.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Order, please. I must interrupt the hon. member, whose allotted time has expired.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Maurice Dupras (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, to a large extent the hon. member has provided the answer to his question by quoting the minister's open letter which *The Globe and Mail* published today to describe fully what will happen to this additional $1 billion which the companies are expected to receive.

In fact, as the hon. member indicated, the companies will keep only half of that amount. And if the industry continues investing in 1977-78 at the same rates as in 1976, the added revenues of nearly half a billion, after deduction of the operation costs and royalties, will go into capital investments in Canada. Therefore, $160 million will be paid in federal taxes and $35 million in provincial taxes. This will leave the industry with retained earnings of approximately $60 million, and not hundreds of millions as the hon. member indicated.

It should be said also that the federal government will have to spend $105 million in increased equalization payments to the provinces, from the $160 million in added income tax received, as a direct result of the increase in oil and gas prices.

[*English*]

The government is taking all necessary steps to protect the interests of the Canadian consumer and has instituted a petroleum industry monitoring program. In order to follow more closely the reinvestment behaviour of the petroleum industry, the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Gillespie) has introduced the Petroleum Corporations Monitoring Act, Bill S-4, which provides legislative authority for the collection of cash-flow and re-investment data from members of the Canadian petroleum industry. This program has indicated an increase in reinvestment from 66.9 per cent in 1973 to 76.4 per cent in 1976 for a select sample of 35 leading members of the petroleum industry.

In the absence of any alarming divergence from this encouraging trend, the government will continue to support the view that the corporate sector is the best judge of the risks involved and the best judge of what and where to invest. The above-mentioned monitoring bill will also provide the minister with the information necessary to propose changes to the present system should future investment behaviour of the industry prove to be in contrast with our national interest.

AIR CANADA—PROPOSED COMMITTEE INVESTIGATION OF ALLEGATION LARGE NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES WANT TO LEAVE QUEBEC

Mr. Dan McKenzie (Winnipeg South Centre): Mr. Speaker, at the meeting of the Standing Committee on Transport and

Communications on June 21 I presented a motion calling for the committee to investigate the situation in Quebec where 2,600 Air Canada employees requested a transfer out of the province. My motion was accepted by the chairman and the committee. They were to request an order of the House authorizing the committee to launch an investigation.

Because of the seriousness of the matter, I raised a question the next day, June 22. I directed the question to the President of the Privy Council (Mr. MacEachen) who replied that he would consider the situation and see what could be done. Since June 22 I have heard nothing whatsoever from the government with regard to presenting this very serious problem to the committee. That is why I am raising the matter tonight.

I also pointed out at the time that the chief executive officer of Air Canada, Mr. Claude Taylor, has been unable to solve the morale problems, and employees are organizing to further their request for transfers.

I made a trip to Dorval today to visit the Air Canada overhaul and maintenance base there and to meet with the Canadian Aviation Fellowship, an organization which has provided me with information with regard to the 2,600 employees who are requesting a transfer from the province of Quebec.

The Canadian Aviation Fellowship was formed about six months ago by a group of Air Canada employees who were very concerned about radical political events occurring in Quebec which would have a profound effect upon their future. Since its beginning the CAF has expanded considerably and is an official federally chartered organization with approximately 1,000 card carrying members located mainly in Quebec. Their membership consists of people in all areas; mechanics, pilots, flight attendants, ramp workers, clerical, and management. In addition to their card carrying members, they have the full support of several thousand other aviation workers throughout the Canadian aviation industry, many of whom have not formally joined the CAF out of fear of reprisals.

● (2210)

There seems to be some support for their request to move out of the province of Quebec. The federal government and Air Canada are presently completing a $15 million hangar in Winnipeg, and Air Canada has recently been moving maintenance personnel to Toronto. I have here a copy of a letter dated December 1, 1976. It is signed by the Minister of Transport (Mr. Lang), and it was forwarded to the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams) who had written the minister on behalf of a constituent who was requesting the decentralization of Air Canada's facilities currently located in Montreal. My hon. friend was informed by the Minister of Transport as follows:

> Air Canada now has a decentralized organization with much of its staff and facilities located at points across Canada. In this connection, I would point out that an overhaul base will be established in Winnipeg.

So they are building a hangar, and the minister has stated that an overhaul base will be established in Winnipeg. I see no reason for any further delay, and I would suggest that my motion be considered immediately and this serious problem presented to the committee which would begin immediate hearings to consider all the complaints and suggestions of the employees, the unions, the Gens de l'Air and any other interested parties in connection with this serious problem, one which I confirmed today when I visited the Dorval Airport.

These are some of the concerns of the Canadian Aviation Fellowship. They want to know what is going to happen to an English-speaking, non-francophone employee whose job is suddenly designated as bilingual or "French-essential". I can understand that question because Bill-101 put forward by a separatist government is designed to drive Anglophones out of Quebec—there is no doubt about that in my mind; it was confirmed today and it is one of the concerns of these employees. There is no way in which we can operate a national airline safely and efficiently under these conditions.

The Aviation Fellowship further asks what is to become of the opportunities for advancement of English-speaking non-Francophone employees in comparison to those available for Francophone and other bilingual employees. For what jobs would employees be required to take French courses and qualify up to a certain level of competency within a given period? How will this be accomplished?

In a letter to me they point out, further, that the premier of Quebec has already talked about carving up Air Canada after Quebec achieves independence. This, they say, is a very real possibility and cannot be ignored, especially with the Parti Québécois in power. They add that according to Mr. Lévesque's timetable this may well happen within 18 months. The big question is: what is Air Canada's contingency plan to deal with Quebec independence? Never mind acting like ostriches or trying to sweep difficulties under the rug. I have mentioned safety and efficiency. There are other concerns which preoccupy the employees.

Here is an article which appeared in today's Montreal *Star*. It states:

> A committee of priests and laymen speaking for English Catholic parishes in Montreal says that debate on language is producing quarrels in French-English marriages.
>
> In addition to spreading fear among the English and sparking an exodus of both French and English from the province, the committee said in its brief on language that the government's bill is "having a divisive effect" on mixed marriages.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Order. I regret to inform the hon. member that his time has expired.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, what the hon. member just did here and in committee is tearing at the Canadian fabric, tearing at Canadian unity. I think on these occasions, we replied to him.

[*English*]

With respect to the hon. member's motion which he moved before the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications on June 21, 1977, I think it is important to clarify at this time, as I sought to do during a question of privilege on

June 22, and as I replied at the time, that this motion has by no means been agreed to in substance by the committee. Air Canada has no plans to move its Dorval maintenance and overhaul base out of Montreal. In regard to moving all the operations from the province of Quebec to Winnipeg, I would like to know from the hon. member if the policy of the Conservative party is to move all the operations from the province of Quebec to Winnipeg—

Mr. Paproski: Just answer the question.

Mr. Roy (Laval): I would like to know exactly what he means by this motion. That is why I call it "déchirure pour l'unité canadienne".

Allegations that as many as 2,600 base employees are wanting to move from Montreal are completely unfounded and the airline has no knowledge of any morale problem at the base resulting from the current political situation in Quebec. Although approximately 325 people are known to be seeking transfers from the maintenance and overhaul base, this total is not significantly higher than the normal number, which is between 100 and 200, given that the over-all work force at the base is about 4,000.

Furthermore, as president Claude Taylor told us in committee, the airline has assured all its employees that no jobs will be threatened because of Quebec's political uncertainty. Nor will an employee's status and job advancement potential be affected by the impact of bilingualism. In fact, Mr. Speaker, although bilingualism will become an increasing asset in Air Canada in Quebec and elsewhere, there will continue to be jobs for unilingual employees in all areas, including Quebec.

[*Translation*]

The motion we received is tearing at Canadian unity. I should therefore like to know the position of the Progressive Conservative Party, whether or not they agree that all Air Canada's operations be transferred to Winnipeg.

[*English*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): The hon. member for Central Nova (Mr. MacKay).

Mr. McKenzie: Let us get it into committee, then, and we will find out about it.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Order, please. The hon. member for Central Nova has the floor. The hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre has had his chance.

INFORMATION—POSSIBILITY OF LEGISLATION TO PROVIDE CITIZENS WITH RIGHT OF ACCESS TO GOVERNMENT FILES

Mr. Elmer M. MacKay (Central Nova): Mr. Speaker, it is with some anticipation that I look forward to the opportunity of debating the Prime Minister's answer to my question on February 7, 1977, regarding more freedom of information for Canadians.

The Prime Minister in his answer did not say that we have lesser rights than Americans; he only said that he would not admit it; and he did not answer my supplementary question as to whether he would consider introducing methods to improve the situation because of the necessity of Canadians having to go to the United States to receive information about their own country. He did not answer that question at all.

But this is still an issue of current interest and importance, Mr. Speaker. For example, it is very significant that a leading Canadian newspaper reported, under yesterday's date, July 11, the speech of Ralph Nader, one of the most important and well respected consumer advocates in the world, broadcast on the CBC, in which he said the following:

> In Ottawa secrecy shrouds even the most routine information—auto safety reports, meat and poultry inspections, the specific reasons for government decisions.

He also said that law students working in Washington last year got Canadian government information which was classified secret by using the American law. The law students, after hearing the Canadian government had refused to divulge the information, asked the U.S. postal service for the information and got it. Mr. Nader reminded Canadians that in the United States a government agency can be hauled into court for withholding information from the public. A Canadian information law with similar clout would reduce government corruption and waste, which Mr. Nader argued thrive in secrecy. He said that a Watergate type scandal in Canada would create a stronger push in parliament to pass a freedom of information law.

• (2220)

Never in the history of our country have we had such a secretive and incompetent government. It is a fair comment that the secrecy is partly the result of a desire to hide its incompetence. Nor have we ever had such a misguided or misinformed Prime Minister whose dreary and pedantic pronouncements in parliament have been remarkable only for their consistency in being incorrect. It is not appropriate under the terms of this adjournment debate to provide examples of his previous patently wrong pronouncements about unemployment, inflation, and the death of separatism, thus I will confine myself to examining the inconsistencies in this one about freedom of information.

The Prime Minister must know that in December, 1975, the Joint Standing Committee on Regulations and Other Statutory Instruments brought in a report approving the principle of legislation dealing with freedom of information and that the House unanimously accepted and approved this resolution on February 12, 1976.

The Prime Minister must also be aware that at the Liberal policy conference in Toronto last fall, that august body of privileged Canadians not only endorsed the concept of a meaningful freedom of information act, but gave it a standing ovation. In view of the almost unanimous cry for a meaningful freedom of information act coming from the public, the press, interest groups, and all political parties, including the Liberal party, one can only wonder why the government and the Prime

Minister refuse to enact any freedom of information legislation.

I wonder why the government, in the face of a unanimous resolution of this House and even in the face of the enthusiastic endorsation given to such a proposal by its own party, would continue to refuse to put forward a freedom of information act. The government must have serious reasons if it is prepared to face this almost unanimous demand and to fight to the end for secrecy. In view of the government's part performance, the reason is obvious. This government is the most incompetent, corrupt, and scandal-ridden government in the history of this country. It is determined to see that as little information on its activities as possible is made public because of the likelihood that such information will reveal, as it has so often in the past, that the government's performance has been incompetent and its activities suspicious.

This government is practised and experienced at hiding its activities, shielding them from public scrutiny, and keeping its activities secret, and better than all his ministers of this part of "participatory democracy" is the Prime Minister himself. No one has done more for the cause of secrecy than he.

A partial list only of organizations which agree with the need for meaningful freedom of information legislation is as follows: Canadian Association of University Teachers, Canadian Civil Liberties Association, Canadian Community Newspapers Association, Canadian Labour Congress, Canadian Manufacturers' Association, Consumers Association of Canada, and the last one I will mention is the Canadian Bar Association which passed the following resolution on freedom of information:

Whereas openness of government is essential for participatory democracy;

And whereas access to information is a prerequisite to the exercise of other fundamental rights and freedoms;

And whereas the citizens of Canada have no legal right to government information;

Now therefore be it resolved that the Canadian Bar Association urges that access to information legislation be enacted by the Parliament of Canada and all provincial legislatures in Canada creating a statutory right of persons to obtain access to information held by all governments or their agencies, subject only to a limited list of narrowly defined exceptions, with any refusal to provide such information and any unreasonable delay or costs subject to review and enforcement by the courts on the merits with the burden of proof on the government.

It is obvious that this country does not have adequate freedom of information. Mr. Speaker, I rest my case.

Mr. Mike Landers (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, Bill C-25 has now been given third reading in both Houses of Parliament. Under part IV of Bill C-25, Canadians will be given a right of access to personal information held on them by government departments and agencies. This is the first time that legislation granting such a right has been enacted in Canada or within a parliamentary system similar to Canada's. The right is not an absolute one, and there is general agreement that it cannot be absolute. The rights of the individual have to be balanced against public interest. Every effort, however, has been made by the government to limit the exemptions to the greatest extent possible. Several amendments to part IV were proposed by the government at committee stage in the House, which served to tighten the exemptions.

The exemptions which have been included in part IV are similar to those contained in the U.S. privacy act. If anything, those in part IV should prove to be somewhat narrower.

No amendments to part IV were moved by members of the opposition in committee or report stages in either the House of Commons or the other place. Although the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin) made several adverse comments about part IV, neither he nor anyone in his party actually moved any amendments to it.

In third reading debate in the other place, the Leader of the Opposition in the Senate (Senator Flynn) recognized that the bill opened up a new field of legislation and should be passed into law to see how it operates in practice.

I should point out that if the secret of the Prime Minister's (Mr. Trudeau) success is being pedantic, perhaps the official opposition should follow suit if they intend to form the government sometime within the next half century.

Mr. MacKay: It is not worth it if you have to do it on that basis.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Order, please. The motion to adjourn the House is deemed to have been adopted. Accordingly, this House stands adjourned until tomorrow at 2 p.m.

At 10.28 p.m. the House adjourned, without question put, pursuant to Standing Order.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Wednesday, July 13, 1977

The House met at 2 p.m.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

THE CANADIAN ECONOMY

PROPOSED PROGRAM FOR ECONOMIC RECONSTRUCTION—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. James Gillies (Don Valley): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 43 I rise to present a motion on a matter of urgent and pressing necessity. In the light of the continuing evidence of economic disarray in our country confirmed by today's CPI statement, and of the urgent need for leadership to halt our economic destruction, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Brome-Missisquoi (Mr. Grafftey):

That this House calls upon the government to begin immediately a program of economic reconstruction which shall include the following:

(1) A commitment to stable monetary policy.

(2) A commitment to increase the relative size of the productive element of the economy, i.e. the private sector.

(3) A cut in the federal sales tax on building supplies to stimulate demand for housing and thus create jobs in the construction industry.

(4) An emergency job creation program.

(5) Long term tax incentives for firms investing in Atlantic Canada or Quebec.

(6) Specific tax assistance to encourage small and medium-sized businesses, and

(7) A new budget.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: Under the terms of the Standing Order the proposed motion can be put to the House only by unanimous consent. Is there consent?

Some hon. Members: No!

REQUEST FOR PROGRAM FOR ECONOMIC RECONSTRUCTION—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Sinclair Stevens (York-Simcoe): Mr. Speaker, I rise under the provisions of Standing Order 43 prompted by the urgent necessity of turning around this government's so-called anti-inflation policies before the social and economic fabric of our country suffers further irreparable harm.

Believing that Canadians cannot for much longer tolerate policies which use mass unemployment to fight inflation, print money at record rates to fight mass unemployment and, finally, blame the private sector, which must live with the results of government mismanagement on this colossal scale for not investing more in permanent job creation, I ask leave to move, seconded by the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Towers):

That this House deplores the government's record of nine years of economic failure and calls for an immediate program of economic reconstruction.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: Under Standing Order 43, this motion requires the unanimous consent of the House before it can be put. Is there consent?

Some hon. Members: No!

CONDEMNATION OF POLICIES WHICH RESULT IN REDUCED STANDARD OF LIVING—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North): Mr. Speaker, I rise under the provisions of Standing Order 43 on a matter of urgent and pressing necessity to move a motion seconded by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles).

In view of the escalating cost of living as reflected in this month's increase in the CPI of 0.7 per cent which brings the increase for the first six months of 1977 to almost 5 per cent, and in view of the coming increases in oil and natural gas prices, which will lead to another significant increase in the cost of living so that the increase for 1977 is expected to be between 9 per cent and 10 per cent, and whereas wage and salary increases for this year have been limited to 6 per cent, I wish to move:

That this House condemns the government policies which will mean a reduced standard of living in 1977 for most Canadians.

Mr. Speaker: Before a motion can be presented under the terms of Standing Order 43, unanimous consent is required. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: No!

* * *

[*Translation*]

PARLIAMENTARY PRESS GALLERY

CONDOLENCES ON DEATH OF SON OF MEMBER, MR. POLIQUIN—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Armand Caouette (Villeneuve): Mr. Speaker, I rise under the provisions of Standing Order 43 to beg leave to move a motion about an urgent matter.

Considering that Mr. Jean-Marc Poliquin is a newspaper man of many years experience reporting parliamentary activi-

ties, that during these years he has made many friends among members of parliament, that his family suffered a grievous loss this last weekend, the death of his 24-year-old son, Marc-André, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Beaudoin):

That this House extends to Mr. Jean-Marc Poliquin's family its most sincere condolences on the occasion of the grievous loss it has suffered this last weekend.

Mr. Speaker: The presentation of such a motion can be done only with the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

* * *

[*English*]

CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

LACK OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE TELEVISION STATION IN NEW BRUNSWICK—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Leonard C. Jones (Moncton): Mr. Speaker, I wish to move a motion of urgent and pressing necessity under Standing Order 43.

In view of the fact that the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation does not own and operate an English language television station in the Province of New Brunswick, and in view of the fact that New Brunswick is the only province in Canada which does not have an English-language CBC-owned and operated television station within its boundaries, I would move, seconded by the hon. member for Moose Jaw (Mr. Neil):

That this House express its dismay and request the Secretary of State to cause the CBC to take immediate steps to rectify this serious omission.

Mr. Speaker: Such a motion requires unanimous consent if it is to be put to the House. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: No!

* * *

CRIMINAL CODE

SUGGESTION NO SUMMER RECESS UNTIL BILL C-51 GIVEN THIRD READING—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Ross Milne (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Communications): Mr. Speaker, I rise under the provisions of Standing Order 43 on a matter of urgent and pressing necessity. Hon. members cannot help but be aware of the terrible shooting incident which occurred the night before last almost within earshot of this House, which has so far resulted in the death of at least one police officer and the serious injury of three others. In view of the fact that this shooting was committed with a recently purchased long gun—

Some hon. Members: Shame! Let's debate it!

[Mr. Caouette (Villeneuve).]

Mr. Milne: —and might, therefore, have been avoided had a firearms acquisition certificate system been in existence as proposed in Bill C-51, I would move, seconded by the hon. member for Restigouche (Mr. Harquail):

● (1410)

That this House resolve not to rise for the summer recess until Bill C-51 has been read a third time, and also give consideration to sitting this day until the bill has been read a third time.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The purpose of Standing Order 43, of course, is to seek the setting aside of the regular business of the day in order to debate a certain subject matter. In view of the fact that the very bill which is the subject matter of this motion is in fact before the House at this time, I scarcely see how I can put the question.

* * *

SUPPLY AND SERVICES

PROPOSED INVESTIGATION OF GRANTING OF CONTRACTS TO HYDROCULTURE LUWASA—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Tom Cossitt (Leeds): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a matter of pressing necessity concerning Senator Keith Davey's directorship of Hydroculture Luwasa Limited, the fact that this company has received government business and may shortly receive more, and the additional fact that the company's treasurer, Marco Muzzo, has stated to the royal commission on certain sectors of the building industry in Ontario he is not opposed to bribery as long as it works. I move, seconded by the hon. member for Prince George-Peace River (Mr. Oberle):

That this House deplores the giving and further negotiation of government business to Hydroculture Luwasa Limited whose treasurer has admitted indulging in bribery and pay-offs, in one case amounting to $19,500, and calls for a parliamentary inquiry into whether Mr. Muzzo has attempted or is attempting to pursue similar actions with government officials; whether Senator Davey has made any direct or indirect representations to the government on behalf of his treasurer, Marco Muzzo, or Hydroculture Luwasa Limited; and finally whether or not a former director, James Coutts, principal secretary to the Prime Minister, is still a shareholder of the company.

Mr. Speaker: Presentation for debate of such a motion requires the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[*English*]

THE CANADIAN ECONOMY

POSSIBILITY LACK OF JOB CREATION FAULT OF PRIVATE SECTOR—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Sinclair Stevens (York-Simcoe): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Finance, the President of the Treasury Board, the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce and the Prime Minister, perhaps I could put my question to the Acting Prime Minister. I would make reference to the statement made by his colleague the President of the Treasury Board yesterday to the effect that "there does not yet appear to be the kind of response we are looking for" by the private sector in creating jobs. Can the Acting Prime Minister indicate whether it is now government policy that lack of job creation in the economy is the fault of the private sector?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Acting Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I believe that what the President of the Treasury Board had in mind were the measures taken in the budget which had as one of their main purposes the stimulation of activity in the private sector. Certainly, it is the main objective of the government that job stimulation take place in the private sector, as the main source of employment in Canada. That is what the minister had in mind.

POSSIBILITY OF INCREASE IN GOVERNMENT EXPENDITURES TO CREATE JOBS

Mr. Sinclair Stevens (York-Simcoe): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question for the Acting Prime Minister. Since the President of the Treasury Board indicated yesterday that it might be necessary for the so-called governmental restraint to come to an end in the interest of further government spending, would the Acting Prime Minister indicate whether such increased spending is going to be undertaken? Is it proposed by the government to make any major shifts in its fiscal stance, in the form of holding back spending on some government plans in the interest of spending money with the desired objective of creating some jobs?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Acting Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I believe the President of the Treasury Board talked about possibilities, and one of the possibilities has been mentioned by the hon. member. At the present time, the government is still assessing the effect of the budget on the economy. No major decision or shift has been made in government spending priority or in the fiscal framework as such.

INFLATION—GOVERNMENT TARGET FOR THIS YEAR

Mr. Sinclair Stevens (York-Simcoe): Mr. Speaker, my final supplementary is directed to the Acting Prime Minister who, in response to both my earlier questions, referred to the current budget which is still being processed through the House. In view of today's very discouraging figures, would the Acting Prime Minister indicate if the target of 6 per cent for the inflation level this year is still the desired target? More importantly, are they going to shoot for the 4 per cent inflation target which was contemplated in the earlier anti-inflation program papers?

Mr. Bob Kaplan (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, today's figures are not discouraging. In fact on a seasonably adjusted basis, they represent the smallest increase in several months.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Kaplan: The figures released today increase the government's confidence that it will be possible, if not to reach the 6 per cent target set for this coming October, to come very close to it.

JOB CREATION PROGRAMS—REASON FOR FAILURE TO ANNOUNCE NEW PROGRAMS

Mr. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Prime Minister, I should like to direct my question to the Acting Prime Minister. Considering for the first time that a minister of the Crown has admitted outside the House in a speech in Toronto something we have been saying for months, namely that unemployment is a major contributor to national disunity, I should like to ask the Acting Prime Minister if the President of the Treasury Board was speaking as a spokesman for the government as a whole? Does this reflect a change in government policy? If it does, and if the government is at long last serious about recognizing unemployment as a source of disunity, would the Acting Prime Minister tell us why the plans the government is allegedly working on are not now announced in the House so that we can start creating jobs for this fall and winter?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Acting Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I do not believe the President of the Treasury Board was making any new statement of policy in relating the existence of unemployment to possible strains to the unity of the country. It has always been widely regarded that regional economic disparity could be a destabilizing factor in the country, and that is something new. It was stated in the debate last week by the Prime Minister and other hon. members, and particularly by the Secretary of State for External Affairs.

With respect to the announcement of further job creation programs, that is a matter which will be taken care of in due course by the Minister of Manpower and Immigration.

* * *

MANPOWER

DATE OF ANNOUNCEMENT OF NEW JOB CREATION PROGRAMS—REQUEST FOR RELEASE OF CONFIDENTIAL STUDY ON UNEMPLOYMENT

Mr. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby): Mr. Speaker, notwithstanding what the Acting Prime Minister has said, I

am sure most members on this side of the House will recognize a shift in public policy by the government in the speech of the President of the Treasury Board in Toronto last night, when he talked about disunity and talked about the government's failure to create jobs.

I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Manpower and Immigration who inadvertently acknowledged yesterday that the government is working on plans. As reported in the press, he said that they are working on plans to offset fall and winter unemployment. If the government is working on plans, I should like to ask the minister when these plans will be announced? Will it be soon? If legislation is required to implement them and to have them in effect this fall and winter, will the minister say when we are called back here in August that we will have legislation before us which will do something about the serious unemployment question?

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Bud Cullen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, as I have indicated to this House on more than one occasion, it does not take the catalyst of an unemployment statistic to move this government to action.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

• (1420)

Mr. Cullen: That seems to be the situation with the opposition.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: Tell that to the unemployed.

Mr. Cullen: Mr. Speaker, so far as programs for this year are concerned, we had already announced that $458 million would be devoted to direct job creation. That figure represents a $100 million increase over the original amount of last October. I said that we would probably announce phase 2 some time this week, and each individual member will receive notification of the amount available for his or her particular riding. We are looking at our job experience training program, the summer component of which worked so well and about which we have received so many compliments from the business community that we are now considering putting in place a winter component of the program.

An hon. Member: Yes, Canada Works.

Mr. Cullen: Mr. Speaker, if the opposition is interested only in making catcalls I will not give them all the information they want.

Mr. Broadbent: A final supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Considering that 1.3 million are unemployed, I find it astonishing to hear the minister say his programs are working well. Since the minister expressed his intention of telling the House what is going on, will he now release his department's confidential study which forecasts increased unemployment in the coming winter months both for males and females in the age group 25 to 54?

[Mr. Broadbent.]

Mr. Cullen: Mr. Speaker, unlike the Leader of the Opposition, I respect a confidence, and when something is given to me in confidence, that is how I treat it.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Cullen: I do not think even the Leader of the Opposition, or the leader of the New Democratic Party, would suggest that the total gap should be filled by the federal government alone. I say we all have a role to play; we are playing that role well. As the President of the Treasury Board said, private enterprise has a responsible role to play. Each of us has his obligation, which each of us must live up to.

Mr. Paproski: The NDP infiltrated your department, Bud.

* * *

[*Translation*]

AGRICULTURE

AGREEMENT WITH QUEBEC ON FREIGHT SUBSIDY ON GRAIN—REQUEST FOR REPORT ON NEGOTIATIONS

Mr. Adrien Lambert (Bellechasse): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Agriculture, I should like to direct my question to his Parliamentary Secretary.

Last week, at the Quebec National Assembly, the hon. member for Beauce-Sud put a question to the Minister of Agriculture asking him what was holding up the signing of the Ottawa-Quebec agreement on the $35 million subsidy to grain transportation. The minister replied that Ottawa was responsible for the delay. Can the parliamentary secretary tell the House whether that is the truth of the matter and, if so, can he also tell us why that agreement has not been signed as expected?

Mr. Irénée Pelletier (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, I am sorry, but I do not have with me the information requested by the hon. member. Still, I can tell him that the federal Minister of Agriculture is meeting his Quebec counterpart in Victoria today and that some of those questions, of which that of the hon. member, are on the agenda and will be discussed by the two ministers.

Mr. Lambert (Bellechasse): Mr. Speaker, on a supplementary.

The answer of the Quebec Minister of Agriculture dealt precisely with the possibility of discussions in Victoria. But Quebec is where things happen and Quebec producers are concerned. They want to know, as soon as possible, why that agreement has not been signed, when funds are available and have been earmarked for Quebec transport; the parliamentary secretary should be in a position to advise the House on the matter since it has been the topic of discussions for several weeks now.

Mr. Pelletier: Mr. Speaker, this matter will be discussed today. But I must tell the hon. member that apparently the minister recently asked some of his officials not to communi-

cate with the civil servants of the Department of Agriculture of Canada. If there is a lack of communication, it might be advisable for the Minister of Agriculture of Quebec to inform his officials that they can contact us. We are not uncivilized; we can talk to them.

* * *

[*English*]

THE CANADIAN ECONOMY

INFLATION—FACTORS WHICH WOULD SLOW RATE OF INCREASE

Mr. Heward Grafftey (Brome-Missisquoi): Mr. Speaker, in a week when record unemployment is being announced—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Grafftey: —and record inflation has been announced this do-nothing government—and none of the ministers in the House to face the music—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Grafftey: —we are not going to be satisfied with answers from parliamentary secretaries.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Does the hon. member have a question?

Mr. Grafftey: My question is directed to the Acting Prime Minister, not to a parliamentary secretary.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

An hon. Member: You are a little jealous.

Mr. Grafftey: My point simply is that with record unemployment and record inflation, none of the responsible ministers are here to face the music.

An hon. Member: And record polls.

Mr. Grafftey: My question to the Acting Prime Minister is the following. Considering the consumer prices have already risen by 5.7 per cent since October 1976, will the minister now concede that there is absolutely no hope that the rate of inflation will be less than the 6 per cent target for the second year of the anti-inflation program announced by the Minister of Finance, and as prices have been increasing at an annual rate of 10 per cent in the past six months, accompanied by record unemployment, can the minister tell the House what factors he expects to slow down this rapid inflation?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Acting Prime Minister): There is a difference of opinion between the hon. member and myself as to the interpretation to be accorded to the CPI figures which have been released today. As the parliamentary secretary has indicated, the month to month increase in the seasonally adjusted CPI is the lowest this year and indicates a downward trend.

Miss MacDonald: Tell that to the old age pensioners.

Mr. Grafftey: My supplementary question to the minister is: Now that the Governor of the Bank of Canada has allowed the money supply to expand at an annual rate of 34 per cent over the past three months, and now that the President of the Treasury Board has threatened to reopen the flood gates of federal spending in the fall, can the minister tell the House whether this administration still retains its rather weak commitment to fiscal and monetary responsibilities?

Mr. MacEachen: All I suggest is that hon. members on the front bench should get together and try to correlate their various economic proposals because the whole symphony or the whole chorus on this point has been very discordant.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

* * *

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

INTERIM ARRANGEMENTS FOR SUPPLYING WEST GERMANY WITH URANIUM

Mr. Joe Clark (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Secretary of State for External Affairs and it refers to statements made yesterday by the Chancellor of West Germany that the Prime Minister said that Canada would be prepared to consider interim arrangements which would enable supplies of Canadian uranium to go forward to Euratom countries for the duration of the evaluation study on the safety of reprocessing. Would the Secretary of State for External Affairs explain to the House the terms of these interim arrangements which the Chancellor of West Germany says have been agreed to by the Government of Canada?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Secretary of State for External Affairs): I will do my best in the constraints of the question period. I should point out that it is not an agreement, except in the sense that it is a matter which we had agreed to put before the negotiators to see if it can be made into a final solution to the problem. The position is that in view of the INFCEP study, that is a complete fuel safeguard study, the proposition has been advanced that it may be possible for us to resume shipments to established customers on a consulting basis, that is that they consult with us in terms of the possible reprocessing or further use of the material on a limited basis and purely for the time during which the study is underway. We undertook to have these questions referred to the negotiators for both sides to see whether some solution within that framework might be possible to work out.

● (1430)

INTERIM ARRANGEMENTS FOR SALE OF URANIUM TO WEST GERMANY—MEASURES TO PROHIBIT TRANSFER TO OTHER COUNTRIES

Mr. Joe Clark (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, what the Secretary of State for External Affairs has said is

that Canada has now changed its policy of January and is discussing shipments. He talks about discussions. He talks about a limited basis. I remind him that on April 5 in answer to a question asked by the hon. member for Kingston and the Islands he said that, and I quote:

Unless the agreements—

Which would include an agreement between Canada and West Germany.

—bilaterally are of the nature which prevents the transfer to other member countries within the European community, we will not sign that agreement and those supplies will be held up.

I would like to know whether that is still the position of the government of Canada, and I would like to know whether the interim arrangements which Canada is now prepared to discuss will specifically prohibit the transfer of Canadian uranium to other countries within the EEC, and particularly to France, which has not signed the NPT.

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I think the answer to that is yes. Let me go on to emphasize that what was discussed with the Chancellor of Germany was purely and simply the question of the resumption of shipments. There are several other elements in the negotiating process at the moment which also have to be resolved before any resumption, even on a limited basis. One of those is the question of retransfers within the community, and in so far as we were able to determine as of yesterday it appears that there is a willingness on the part of the community members to accept Canada's conditions in this regard. Since the Leader of the Opposition specifically mentioned France, indications are that France would be prepared to accept those conditions. However, I emphasize that that is a related but separate issue from the resumption of shipments per se.

Mr. Clark: The minister speaks quite generally, particularly in relation to France. Is it the absolute position of the government of Canada that there will be a prohibition upon the transfer of materials to France until France agrees to Canadian safeguards and standards? Does that continue to be the position of the government of Canada?

Mr. Jamieson: Mr. Speaker, I thought I had answered, but unfortunately perhaps I did not do so adequately. There has been no change in the position, and therefore, as the Leader of the Opposition has stated, that is the position. I emphasize that that was not part of the discussions with the German Chancellor because we were dealing expressly with the resumption of shipments. Incidentally, there are three or four other elements of significance which have not yet been resolved, and as the Leader of the Opposition stated, our position is as we have declared it to be since the first of the year.

SALE OF URANIUM TO EUROPEAN COMMON MARKET COUNTRIES—MAINTENANCE OF CANADIAN VETO OVER USES

Miss Flora MacDonald (Kingston and the Islands): Mr. Speaker, I would like to know if in the discussion which took place, Canada expressly put forward the position that it wishes to retain its veto over the uses of Canadian uranium within any of the countries of the European Common Market to which shipments would be resumed. Did Canada ask to retain its veto?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Forgive me, Mr. Speaker, but is the hon. lady referring to a veto over transhipment?

Miss MacDonald: Over transhipment, over reprocessing and over uses to which West Germany could put Canadian uranium.

Mr. Jamieson: The proposal which was discussed at the meetings, I emphasize, was the new element of a study to be undertaken internationally and to which as a result of yesterday's talks the Federal Republic of Germany is committed. This study is likely to take somewhere between a year and a half and two years. This raises a question as to whether the so-called veto should be imposed during this interim period over limited stocks.

I emphasize that we have not accepted that position. I want to make that perfectly clear to the House. The proposal which has been put forward is that we might consider some interim arrangement which would clearly involve consultation with us, but we have not—and I am being perfectly frank and candid—yet through the negotiating process determined whether this is an acceptable proposition. But we do recognize that there are complexities which have been introduced into this issue, far beyond those which already exist, as a result of the international study because this will determine, presumably within 18 months to two years, whether the so-called plutonium economy ought to be encouraged or discouraged, or whether it is practical.

Miss MacDonald: While I understand the complexities of the situation, I also understand that there is a vast difference between the word "veto" and the word "consultation". I would like to ask the minister if in the negotiations, the purpose of which I understood was to stiffen safeguards rather than to loosen them, it was taken into consideration that in recent days France, West Germany and three other European nations signed an agreement to develop and export fast breeder nuclear reactors, in open defiance of President Carter's effort to ban such atomic devices. What is the rationale for resuming uranium shipments to West Germany at a time when countries such as West Germany and France are increasing their activities in the field of nuclear proliferation?

Mr. Jamieson: Mr. Speaker, without trying to assume your prerogatives in any way, this is an argumentative question which would take a very long time to answer. Of course, we are aware of this move in the European community and elsewhere toward the so called fast breeder reactor. We are also aware that the view of President Carter is that this kind of reactor and reprocessing is not desirable. However, at the same time there is an equally strongly held view, which has very strong technical and scientific support, which supports the

position of the Europeans. This is why the study is being undertaken. We have not said that we will resume. A proposition has been put forward to us which would contemplate very limited supplies during the period of the study, and we have said we will consider it. I emphasize that there has been no negotiation on that point as yet.

POSSIBLE DATE OF INTERIM AGREEMENT WITH WEST GERMANY ON SALE OF URANIUM

Miss Flora MacDonald (Kingston and the Islands): Mr. Speaker, when does the minister think he will be in a position to give a definitive response to the House as to when any such agreements will be arrived at?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, on the general question of the whole debate now going on universally on nuclear proliferation I think hon. members opposite know that I have had a statement in preparation, and for thoroughly understandable reasons it has not been possible to get all interested members in the House at an appropriate time to make it. I would be glad to make that statement available to hon. members or table it if, indeed, we rise before I have a chance to make that statement on motions. However, as far as the negotiations are concerned, it is contemplated that a conclusion of those negotiations ought to come within the next two or three months.

SALE OF URANIUM REPROCESSING PLANT TO BRAZIL BY WEST GERMANY—DISCUSSIONS WITH CHANCELLOR SCHMIDT

Mr. David MacDonald (Egmont): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Secretary of State for External Affairs can inform us whether there was any discussion either between himself and Chancellor Schmidt or between the Prime Minister and Chancellor Schmidt with respect to the very grave concern about the sale of a full nuclear system to Brazil, with respect to the opposition to that on the part of the United States government and, in fact, its refusal to participate in that sale, with respect to the impact any future supplies of uranium or materials to West Germany from Canada might have and with respect to the very dangerous precedent being established in Brazil, which is ruled at the present time by a military dictatorship which is known to be not entirely responsible in the area of human rights.

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I will deal with the second part of that question first. There is no contemplation that any Canadian supply of materials would in any way find its way out of either Germany or the European community to Brazil or to any other country. There is a clear safeguard in place in that regard, and there is no problem ensuring that Canadian materials are not used in reactors abroad. On the larger question, the matter of Brazil did arise. I think the hon. member knows it is central to the very fundamental differences that exist—and I repeat, I think they are legitimate differences—at the moment in scientific terms as to the wisdom or otherwise of proceeding with reprocessing. The Federal Republic of Germany has indicated it will not provide any other countries with the kind of arrangement it has with Brazil but apparently it has no intention of reneging or withdrawing from its commitment with Brazil.

● (1440)

SUPPORT FOR UNITED STATES POSITION ON DEVELOPMENT OF NUCLEAR ENERGY—POSSIBILITY OF CHANGE

Mr. James Gillies (Don Valley): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. On his return from the London summit conference the Prime Minister was asked about the relationship of Canada to the United States' position with respect to safeguards and so forth and he made it very clear that day that the Canadian position and the American position were the same and that we are moving ahead on that ground. Do I understand from the minister today that the question is now open and that Canada is no longer supporting the position put forth by President Carter?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I would have to look at *Hansard* to find out precisely what was said. I think I am reflecting the position of the Prime Minister and the government clearly, however, when I say there is no difference of opinion between ourselves and President Carter on the principles and objectives of non-proliferation. I do not believe we have ever said that we were as assured as is President Carter that reprocessing and similar activities ought to be abandoned totally. What we have said, and this was re-emphasized in the meetings with Chancellor Schmidt, is that the essential element here is a thorough study of all aspects of this matter by the recognized world authorities including many more countries than the seven who were present at the summit—

An hon. Member: Why change the policy?

Mr. Jamieson: The hon. member has asked "Why change our policy?" I have said at least five times this afternoon that there has been no change of policy.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Jamieson: In conclusion, I say once again that we have been asked to consider a possible interim arrangement and we have said we will. Up to the moment there has not been any change. I should remind hon. members opposite also that the United States at this moment is shipping enriched uranium to the same customers in Europe and of course the end result of that kind of shipment in reprocessing terms is precisely the same as getting the uranium from Canada.

INTERIM ARRANGEMENT FOR SALE OF URANIUM TO WEST GERMANY—MINISTER'S VIEW ON CASE OF ACHIEVEMENT

Mr. Joe Clark (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, may I put a supplementary question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. Chancellor Schmidt is quoted directly as saying a positive interim arrangement now seems fairly easy to

achieve. That is the arrangement which would change the Canadian position adopted in January. Is it the position of the Government of Canada that that interim arrangement which would change our January ban, now seems fairly easy to achieve?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I would not wish to go as far as Chancellor Schmidt did in that regard. I do not want to preempt the position of our negotiator. What we have said is that this seems like a basis that is worthy of discussion, if we can put certain restrictions in for a period of 18 months or two years during the period of this study. I should emphasize also that there is no likelihood that any uranium supplies from Canada or new supplies from any source at the present time are likely to be reprocessed in Europe until the mid-1980's. The practical effect of any arrangement we make short-term, therefore, is not going to be reprocessing; it is the principle which is involved and I thoroughly agree with what I detect to be the position of hon. members that the principle is very important.

SALE OF URANIUM TO EUROPEAN COUNTRIES—ALLEGATION OF CHANGE IN POLICY—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Allan Lawrence (Northumberland-Durham): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. If the policy in January was that there were to be no shipments of Canadian uranium into Europe, the EEC or any individual European country until they met with our safeguards and if the minister now tells us that they are seriously considering abridging that policy to permit the shipment of uranium until the study is completed, how can he come here today and tell us there is no change in that policy?

An hon. Member: There is no policy.

Mr. Lawrence: If serious consideration is being given to abridging that policy is that not a break with the policy? What has happened since January that has caused the minister and the Prime Minister to change their minds?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I am glad that the hon. member came to a straightforward question at the end of his discourse because I am in a position to answer. What has happened since January is a very significant commitment, first of all, on the part of the countries present at the summit and yesterday a reinforcement by Chancellor Schmidt, 24 hours before he goes to Washington, to full participation in the full cycle study which was not in existence in January and which was only proposed—

An hon. Member: That is not meeting your commitment.

Mr. Jamieson: Mr. Speaker, with the greatest respect if the hon. member would only permit me to finish the answer he might spare this House the opportunity—

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

[Mr. Clark.]

Mr. Jamieson: Mr. Speaker, it seems to me to be the essence of convoluted logic to argue that because you are prepared to talk to someone about a new proposition, you have already changed your policy. It simply makes no sense to argue that way. I think it is important, however, that the House understand that this study to which the United States attributes enormous importance—and in this respect we are totally in agreement with them and Chancellor Schmidt and the Prime Minister indicated yesterday that they are fully committed to it and wish it broadened to involve countries other than the seven—we hope the study will answer definitively what is at the present time a highly emotional argument. I do not suppose that even the hon. member for Kingston and the Islands would claim to be an authority on all of these matters.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Clark: She, at least, is consistent.

Mr. Jamieson: If we can achieve reasonable terms of reference for this study we will have something specific on which to come to the ultimate conclusion as to whether the so-called plutonium economy makes sense or whether it does not. That is the whole issue and that is the element that has been introduced since January.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lawrence: A final supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Why not wait until the end of the study?

Mr. Jamieson: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has asked why not wait until the end of the study. It is because there are existing plants in Europe in countries entirely friendly to Canada with which we seek to co-operate where there would be serious problems if there were not at least some effort made to provide them with their ongoing needs during this period. What we are seeking to do—

An hon. Member: Which you knew about in January.

Mr. Jamieson: We knew about it in January but we did not have at that time an element of the study which, of course, both from our point of view and from theirs, is causing some caution as to long-term commitments which may very well be proved ridiculous by the outcome of the study. So we are talking about an 18-month to two-year period. There is no intention under any circumstances to provide huge stockpiles which might be available for years to come.

To answer the hon. member's question, if we can co-operate on a short-term basis to ensure that existing reactors are not forced to shut down and in the case of Germany as much as 25 per cent of the population deprived of power then it seems to me sensible in the interest of the western alliance and all the other considerations for us to make the effort to come to an agreement satisfactory to both of us.

ENERGY

DATE OF ANNOUNCEMENT OF POLICY ON DEVELOPMENT OF RENEWABLE RESOURCES

Mr. Chas. L. Caccia (Davenport): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources. In view of the considerable savings in energy costs, estimated at $2 billion per year, which could be achieved by the end of the century if solar and wind energy supply were used in Canada, could the minister inform this House whether he intends to propose and eventually announce a policy aimed at increasing the development and application of renewable resources of energy?

An hon. Member: They have lots of wind.

Hon. Alastair Gillespie (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member's interest in solar energy is well known as he is the sponsor of a bill with respect to solar energy. As hon. members perhaps realize the government has been in the process of developing policy with respect to renewable energy. In my department, for example we have set up a branch which is concerned with the development of those policies but we have done more than that—we have increased our budget for research and development and demonstration of solar technology in this country very substantially. We have contacted the provinces as part of the process of trying to develop on a concerted basis—and let us recognize that the provinces have probably one of the key responsibilities with respect to solar power. They alone will determine whether the zoning and the bylaws are such that people can put solar energy in with impunity. What I am talking about is the "right to light".

● (1450)

If hon. members opposite do not think—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Fraser: We did not ask the question.

Mr. Gillespie: I regret that the interest of the opposition is so superficial on a matter of such importance. They cannot understand the importance of the right to light.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

* * *

ANTI-INFLATION BOARD

SUGGESTED CHANGE IN GUIDELINES ON WAGE INCREASES

Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Acting Prime Minister. In view of the fact that most Canadians will have a reduced standard of living in 1977 as a result of the 6 per cent limit for wage and salary increases for this year as set out by the Anti-Inflation Board guidelines while the cost of living will increase by substantially more than 6 per cent, will the government consider giving instructions to the AIB to adjust their guidelines to ensure that Canadian wage and salary earners will at least be able to maintain their present standard of living?

Mr. Bob Kaplan (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, in view of questions asked earlier by the hon. member for York-Simcoe, I would indicate that the Minister of Finance and the President of the Treasury Board today and tomorrow are travelling across the country to consult with provincial premiers and provincial governments about the decontrol period and the future of the program. Hon. members can look forward in the next few weeks to an announcement by the Minister of Finance about the future of the program which will cover the questions raised by the hon. member.

Mr. Orlikow: Mr. Speaker, the decontrol period may be months from now. Many unions are now negotiating new contracts for the next year or more. They are restricted to a maximum of 6 per cent under the guidelines enacted by this government while the cost of living in the first six months of this year has already increased by 5 per cent. Obviously they will be losers this year. Will the government give consideration to adjusting the guidelines so that people negotiating new contracts can at least keep last year's standard of living?

Mr. Kaplan: Mr. Speaker, it is taking a lot for granted to assume what the performance of the anti-inflation program will be, as the hon. member suggested, very far outside the range of the government's target.

* * *

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

REQUEST FOR INVESTIGATION OF DEALINGS BETWEEN GOVERNMENT AND DIRECTORS OF HYDROCULTURE LUWASA

Mr. Tom Cossitt (Leeds): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Justice. It arises from the business given to and presently under negotiation with Hydroculture Luwasa of which Senator Davey is a director and Marco Muzzo also a director and treasurer. Is the government aware that Marco Muzzo admitted to extensive bribery and payoffs before the Ontario Royal Commission on certain sectors of the building industry? Is the Minister of Justice therefore prepared to change his mind, and authorize a full investigation into all details that may have occurred between persons in the federal government, Marco Muzzo, Senator Davey and James Coutts with particular reference as to whether or not any inducements, undue representations or conflicts of interests are involved?

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of the information to which the hon. member makes reference. I will check into it.

Oral Questions

FOREIGN INVESTMENTS

TAKEOVER OF PONY SPORTING GOODS—POSSIBILITY OF REPRESENTATIONS BY SENATOR DAVEY

Mr. Tom Cossitt (Leeds): Mr. Speaker, I will direct my supplementary to the Acting Prime Minister in the absence of the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce whom I believe has left the chamber. This arises from cabinet approval on June 30 under the Foreign Investment Review Act—

An hon. Member: Here he is now.

Mr. Cossitt: I will then direct my question to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce. It arises from cabinet approval on June 30 under the Foreign Investment Review Act of the takeover of Pony Sporting Goods Limited of Markham, Ontario by CITC Industries Incorporated of New York, a subsidiary of Powers Commercial Corporation of the United States. Is the government aware that Senator Keith Davey was a director of Pony Sporting Goods Limited of Markham when this matter was considered by cabinet? Can he tell us now if he or any other of the officials or cabinet ministers received representations from Senator Davey for favourable consideration for appointments? If he cannot tell us, is he prepared to assure the House that he will look into this situation and report back within two days.

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): I am not at all aware of that, Mr. Speaker. However, I am extremely disappointed that the hon. member, before inquiring privately, would throw names into the arena like he is doing.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Chrétien: It is a very questionable practice. Although I am a Francophone, I have learned from studying English law that one is innocent until proven guilty.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Chrétien: I will certainly make inquiries. I know that Senator Davey never talked to me about any of this. I can report that fact to the House. I am sure that was not the consideration at all, if there is any truth to the allegation of the hon. member.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Cossitt: Aside from the fact the minister says I am throwing names around irresponsibly without looking into the matter, I would ask him this. He was the one, was he not, who announced that this takeover had taken place. I would also ask him whether he is not in a position as I was, or any other citizen is, to inquire who the directors of companies are and, if so, why did he not do that?

Mr. Chrétien: Mr. Speaker, I am not a witchhunter. Senator Davey did not speak to me. I did not know anything until the present moment. I will make inquiries. A decision was made on the facts as they were placed before cabinet. No one mentioned the name of Senator Davey to me. Even if I did know that, it would not have changed my judgment.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

* * *

LABOUR CONDITIONS

POSITION OF CANADIAN LABOUR CONGRESS ON PARTICIPATION IN MULTIPARTITE NATIONAL FORUM

Mr. John A. Fraser (Vancouver South): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Labour. In an interjection on June 13 when I was speaking in the House, the Minister of Finance said that he had had private indications from the Canadian Labour Congress that they were prepared to cooperate toward participation in a multipartite national forum which the minister put forward some months ago. Can the minister tell the House whether there have been private talks between the CLC and cabinet ministers which indicate that they are prepared to participate in the multipartite national forum or is the position of the CLC as it has been publicly stated, namely that they are not prepared to participate in that particular forum.

Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, I think the position can be more accurately stated to be this. Discussions with the CLC with reference to the multipartite forum and other various types of institutions that would ensure a working together between government, labour and business are all part of the discussions that surround an acceptable formula for decontrol. These discussions are still going on. There is no conclusion with respect to them.

Mr. Fraser: My question is whether the Minister of Finance is correct when he says he has had private communications which are contrary to what the CLC has been saying publicly. I would like the minister to answer that. As well, will he advise whether he realizes that the Canadian Manufacturers' Association as recently as yesterday said that they view this multipartite national forum as just "window dressing". If that is their understanding on the position of labour, the minister ought to inform the House whether in view of the fact that neither management nor labour will support that particular proposition, how long this government is going to hold it out as policy.

Mr. Munro (Hamilton East): Mr. Speaker, this is a very worthwhile proposal indeed, one that merits support. I think the hon. member will agree with that. This is a very worth while proposal indeed and is one which merits support. I think the hon. member would agree. It is unfortunate that he seems to be reaching to destroy what is a good proposal for the benefit of all Canadians.

● (1500)

Mr. Fraser: Now wait a minute!

Mr. Munro (Hamilton East): If you don't mind, I am answering the question. You wait a minute until I am finished, then you can ask another question. The Canadian Manufacturers' Association may not be reflecting the encouraging words we have heard from many in the business community. It is not the only spokesman for the business community. There are many in the business community who have been involved in discussions with reference to the multipartite approach. Labour wants to have a voice, as has often been stated, within a national forum where it can have some influence in the development of national economic policies. This affords them such an opportunity. The fact that they may want to negotiate with respect to the characteristics of such a council seems to me to be quite reasonable and acceptable, and a discussion of that sort is going on in the context, as I say, of talks with reference to decontrol.

Mr. Fraser: A representative of the Canadian Manufacturers' Association, Sydney Jackson, said yesterday as reported in the press today: "My view and the view of any business leaders I have talked to is that this would be window dressing and a waste of time. Labour, I understand, feels the same way." My question to the minister is this: he needs both labour and business in this multipartite committee and if neither one of them intends to take part, why does the government continue to hold this out as policy when it is clear the two essential ingredients will not take part?

Mr. Munro (Hamilton East): Answering questions from the hon. member for Vancouver South is rather like trying to blow over a stone wall. He is not receptive to what I consider to be the clear statement I have just made. His question is based on two fundamental false premises. First, Mr. Jackson does not speak for the entire business community. If the hon. member wants to believe that, he can believe a lot of ridiculous things. I, for one, do not share that belief.

Mr. Fraser: Am I supposed to believe the Minister of Finance?

Mr. Munro (Hamilton East): The other false premise is that Mr. Jackson speaks for the labour movement, or speaks to it on any regular basis. I do not believe he does—certainly not on a more regular basis than I have been doing myself for some time with respect to this item.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*Translation*]

AGRICULTURE

Third report of Standing Committee on Agriculture—Mr. Daudlin.

[*Editor's Note: For text of the above report, see today's Votes and Proceedings.*]

[*English*]

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, the following questions will be answered today: 1,899, 1,984, 2,468, 2,758 and 2,831.

[*Text*]

KITIMAT-EDMONTON PIPELINE

Question No. 1,899—**Mr. Leggatt:**

1. What are the names and file numbers of all studies pertaining to the proposed Kitimat-Edmonton pipeline which have been completed or are under way by the Department of (a) Transport (b) the Environment (c) Energy, Mines and Resources?

2. What studies pertaining to the pipeline have been proposed by the Department of (a) Transport (b) the Environment (c) Energy, Mines and Resources?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): I am informed by the Departments of Transport, the Environment and Energy, Mines and Resources as follows: 1. (a) 2254-124 "Code of Recommended Standards for the Prevention of Pollution at Marine Terminals" (TERMPOL Code) 9004-2-2 "Freight Commodities and Movements—Oil—Assessment at Kitimat, B.C.—Marine Terminal Proposal". (b) For certain environmental aspects of the proposed Kitimat-Edmonton pipeline, there is information in various stages ranging from raw data (for example, salmon spawning escapements; some weather station data) to published reports (for example, "The Kitimat River Estuary—Status of Environmental Knowledge to 1976"; a Report of the Estuary Working Group; Special Estuary Series No. 6, Department of Fisheries and the Environment, December, 1976). Studies pertaining to the marine aspects of the proposed project are as follows: (i) DFE is a member of the Termpol Coordinating Committee and has studied the Termpol Submission provided by Kitimat Pipe Line Limited in December, 1976. The first outcome of this study has been a series of questions transmitted to the Chairman, Termpol Coordinating Committee. These were compiled with other questions and sent to the company on February 25, 1977. Based on existing information as described above, as well as the Company's Termpol Submission, and replies recently received to the questions raised by the Termpol Committee, a Technical Appraisal of the proposal by the Termpol Coordinating Committee has been undertaken. The Department of Environment has contributed an environmental assessment review. (ii) Only one specific study is being prepared in support of the Technical Appraisal; a preliminary draft of "A Marine Climatology of the Approaches to Kitimat, B.C." (Hydrometeorology and Marine Application Division, Atmospheric Environment Service, March 1977). (iii) A West Coast Deep Water Oil Port Comparative Study is underway in the Pacific Region. A study of the Kitimat Pipe Line application to the National Energy Board is underway to ascertain the best course of action with respect to protection of the terrestri-

al and freshwater environment under the Fisheries Act and Migratory Birds Convention Act. (c) Nil.

2. (a) An assessment was made of the proponent's submission with respect to the proposed Kitimat terminal system and was published on May 25, 1977 as Transport Canada publication number T.P. 851. (b) Four additional studies are considered necessary. These studies relate to oceanographic and hydrographic studies, meteorological requirements (a) in support of environmental impact assessment of a port at Kitimat, B.C. and (b) to augment meteorological service along the north B.C. coast for tanker traffic, migratory bird studies and fisheries studies relating to fishing operations, resource documentation, socio-economics and water quality. With the exception of some of the hydrographic studies, these were considered to fall in the category of accelerated studies, and hence the responsibility for undertaking them was considered to be that of the company. (c) Nil.

APPLICATIONS FOR DREE ASSISTANCE TO INDUSTRY

Question No. 1,984—**Mr. Cyr:**

1. How many applications has the Department of Regional Economic Expansion received requesting assistance to industries in outlying regions for each province during the fiscal year ending March 31 (a) 1970 (b) 1971 (c) 1972 (d) 1973 (e) 1974 (f) 1975?

2. For the same years, by province, how many industries received grants and what were the amounts?

3. For the same years, by province, how many applications have been rejected?

4. For the same years, which province had the highest rate of rejections or retrieval of applications?

Mr. Ed. Lumley (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): The reply for the Department of Regional Economic Expansion is as follows: the requested information is provided for firms which, as of December 31, 1976, had applied for an incentive under the Regional Development Incentive Program to assist them in the establishment, expansion or modernization of a facility in a designated region. 1. The number of applications received, by province and by fiscal year, is shown in (1) of the list below.

2. The number of offers accepted by applicants as of December 31, 1976 is shown in (2) of the list below and reflects the fact that some offers accepted in the past were later declined by the applicant or withdrawn by the department.

3. The number of applications received by the department and rejected as that term is defined in the monthly report to parliament (i.e., an application turned down because the project in question is considered ineligible, would proceed without incentive assistance or would not make a significant contribution to economic expansion and social adjustment within a designated region) is shown in (3) of the list below.

4. The information requested is assumed to be for rejections and withdrawals. The number of applications received by the department and rejected (as previously defined) or withdrawn as that term is defined in the monthly report to parliament (i.e., an application withdrawn, at the request of the applicant, after receipt but before or during evaluation) is shown in (4) of the list below.

Activity under the Regional Development Incentives Program as of December 31, 1976

1. Numbers of applications received:

	(a) 1969-70	(b) 1970-71	(c) 1971-72	(d) 1972-73	(e) 1973-74	(f) 1974-75
(i) Newfoundland	29	80	114	71	65	43
(ii) Prince Edward Island	12	39	34	32	19	25
(iii) Nova Scotia	52	83	146	131	103	84
(iv) New Brunswick	55	122	143	155	148	114
(v) Quebec	332	744	1712	1600	842	536
(vi) Ontario	48	134	212	196	175	126
(vii) Manitoba	117	163	163	151	84	126
(viii) Saskatchewan	14	69	64	56	42	115
(ix) Alberta	28	71	65	53	53	26
(x) British Columbia	22	46	49	48	25	23
(xi) Others*	2	17	17	19	18	1
Totals	711	1,568	2,719	2,512	1,574	1,219

2. Number of applicants that accepted offers of incentive and estimated amount of incentives (in thousands of dollars)

	No.	Est. Amount	No.	Est. Amount	No.	Est. Amount	No.	Est. Amount	No.	Est. Amount	No.	Est Amount
(i) Newfoundland	3	210.9	12	1,123.1	24	5,575.0	18	1,694.9	24	1,779.5	12	1,612.2
(ii) Prince Edward Island	0	0.0	12	811.1	10	789.4	11	2,115.4	11	1,136.4	11	456.3
(iii) Nova Scotia	9	1,038.7	30	19,379.6	37	5,711.3	43	12,759.8	42	4,764.6	37	7,621,5
(iv) New Brunswick	12	5,159.1	28	6,186.9	51	8,626.1	47	6,324.4	64	13,471.0	46	10,136.5
(v) Quebec	33	5,029.6	128	25,125.0	481	52,974.6	490	40,170.0	326	36,730.0	248	34,617.5
(vi) Ontario	5	635.5	24	13,540.9	34	4,808.8	46	21,236.9	50	10,205.1	46	6,214.2
(vii) Manitoba	14	1,845.6	51	5,903.7	59	3,244.0	51	18,118.0	42	7,039.7	57	7,396.1
(viii) Saskatchewan	2	618.9	19	3,964.9	16	1,144.1	14	1,993.0	15	3,157.6	32	3,959.1
(ix) Alberta	4	1,373.4	20	16,732.1	13	2,848.7	11	3,949.9	12	839.6	16	5,775,3
(x) British Columbia	4	288.4	5	182.7	11	2,346.9	6	556.8	8	1,527.7	4	288.5
Totals	86	16,200.1	329	92,950.0	737	88,068.9	737	108,919.1	594	80,651.2	09	79,077.2

* Applications for incentives having no indication as to the location of the proposed facility.

[Mr. Goodale.]

Activity under the Regional Development Incentives Program as of December 31, 1976

3. Number of applications rejected by the department, as defined in the monthly report to parliament on Regional Development Incentives

	(a) 1969-70	(b) 1970-71	(c) 1971-72	(d) 1972-73	(e) 1973-74	(f) 1974-75
(i) Newfoundland	2	26	36	26	16	5
(ii) Prince Edward Island	0	16	13	5	5	5
(iii) Nova Scotia	3	9	22	31	30	16
(iv) New Brunswick	3	29	21	33	30	13
(v) Quebec	35	142	251	492	276	104
(vi) Ontario	4	31	56	77	36	22
(vii) Manitoba	9	45	47	58	16	15
(viii) Saskatchewan	0	15	24	31	6	26
(ix) Alberta	2	20	35	19	13	15
(x) British Columbia	4	10	19	17	6	7
(xi) Others*	0	2	3	3	8	0
Totals	62	345	527	792	442	228

4. Number of applications rejected and withdrawn by the department, as defined in the monthly report to parliament on Regional Development Incentives

(i) Newfoundland	3	41	70	52	41	26
(ii) Prince Edward Island	1	18	18	13	17	8
(iii) Nova Scotia	3	34	62	84	71	40
(iv) New Brunswick	7	44	68	87	67	56
(v) Quebec	60	339	736	1,222	600	292
(vi) Ontario	8	64	115	157	119	77
(vii) Manitoba	17	91	91	97	45	43
(viii) Saskatchewan	1	27	45	40	19	56
(ix) Alberta	3	32	52	41	31	22
(x) British Columbia	4	19	41	38	18	18
(xi) Others*	1	11	18	19	20	5
Totals	108	720	1,316	1,850	1048	643

* Applications for incentives having no indication as to the location of the proposed facility.

MANUAL FOR DECK OFFICERS ON DDH 280S

Question No. 2,468—**Mr. McKinnon:**

1. Has the Department of National Defence contracted with Sharon Professional Services to find a retired Canadian Naval Deck Officer to prepare an instruction manual for use by officers of the watch and bridge personnel on the DDH 280 Class Destroyers?

2. Is there no-one serving at the present time capable of preparing this manual?

3. How much is the Department prepared or committed to spending outside of the Department for this service?

4. Are the officers of the watch and bridge personnel on the DDH 280s managing at the present time without the manual and, if so, in what way?

Hon. Barney Danson (Minister of National Defence): 1. No.

2. Yes.

3. Not applicable in view of part 1 of this question.

4. Yes. Officers of the watch and bridge personnel on DDH 280s are qualified by way of courses at the Fleet school in Halifax and through shipboard training and familiarization. As a supplement to this training an approach to industry was made to produce a manual but, after a reassessment of the requirement the invitation for bids was withdrawn. No contract was let and none is now intended.

CANADIAN ARMED FORCES

Question No. 2,758—**Mr. Jones:**

1. What are the qualifications for enlistment in the Canadian Armed Forces?

2. Are francophones permitted to enlist with a grade 9 education and are non-francophones required to have at least grade 12 and, if so, for what reason?

3. Are non-francophone recruits who are fluent in French, given equal rights on enlistment and promotions and, if not, for what reason?

4. (a) What is the strength of the Canadian Armed Forces at the present time (b) how many are (i) francophone (ii) non-francophone?

5. (a) In each year 1970 to 1976, by province, what were the enlistments or recruits in the Forces (b) how many were (i) francophone (ii) non-francophone for each year, by province?

6. What language is the predominant language of administration and control in each service of the Forces?

7. Have armoured vehicles been brought from other parts of Canada and deployed along the Ottawa River and, if so (a) for what reason (b) on what date?

8. (a) How many major armament and ammunition depots are located in (i) Quebec (ii) other provinces (b) where is each located and what are the details and particulars on the quantity of armament, equipment and ammunition at each depot?

Hon. Barney Danson (Minister of National Defence): 1. DND enrolment standards are as follows: Canadian citizen, except in special cases, at departmental discretion i.e., where a certain skill would not be readily available or similar instances. Age 17 to 24 inclusive for unskilled applicants, up to 33 for skilled applicants. A minimum of grade eight. Requirement to meet medical standards prescribed for trades. Ability to pass appropriate tests and must be considered suitable for enrolment by recruiting officer.

2. No. The minimum of grade eight education as stated above applies to both francophones and non-francophones.

3. Yes.

Order Paper Questions

4. (a) 77,969; (b) (i) 18,205; (ii) 59,764.

5. See following list.

6. English is the predominant language of administration and control in the three elements of the Armed Forces.

7. No.

8. (a) There are no distinct armament depots in Canada. Weapons are stored in supply depots and are overhauled in repair workshops or by contract. Ammunition depots are in: (i) Quebec—nil; (ii) other provinces—five;

(b)

Province	Location	Maximum Storage Capacity	Types of Ammunition
Nova Scotia	Beford	392,500 cubic feet	Primarily naval ammunition with some land and air
New Brunswick	Renous	649,100 cubic feet	Primarily land and naval ammunition
Ontario	Angus	1,819,000 cubic feet	Primarily air and land ammunition
Saskatchewan	Dundrun	604,300 cubic feet	Primarily land, with some air and naval ammunition
British Columbia	Rocky Point	406,600 cubic feet	Primarily naval with some land and air ammunition

NOTE: It is not in the public interest to disclose specific natures and quantities of ammunition located in the various ammunition depots in Canada.

Canadian Forces Personnel
Enrolment Profile—1970-76

Province	National Group	Year of Enrolment 1970	1971	1972	1973	1974	1975	1976
Newfoundland	Anglo	201	124	182	239	274	372	440
	Franco	1	0	1	0	1	0	0
	Unknown	93	41	15	0	—	—	—
Total		295	165	198	239	275	372	440
Prince Edward Island	Anglo	29	28	54	56	17	112	135
	Franco	0	0	0	3	1	5	9
	Unknown	24	16	11	0	—	—	—
Total		53	44	65	59	18	117	144
Nova Scotia	Anglo	266	254	550	600	612	777	800
	Franco	4	6	12	13	11	23	16
	Unknown	159	85	41	5	—	—	—
Total		429	345	603	618	623	800	816
New Brunswick	Anglo	156	118	200	306	340	390	417
	Franco	37	45	90	163	98	156	166
	Unknown	129	90	37	0	—	—	—
Total		322	253	327	469	438	546	583
Quebec	Anglo	135	121	131	260	298	359	336
	Franco	1240	1253	1989	2438	2351	3132	2926
	Unknown	742	565	200	2	—	—	—
Total		2117	1939	2320	2700	2649	3491	3262
Ontario	Anglo	867	819	1531	2178	2518	3230	3357
	Franco	50	35	223	330	391	420	384
	Unknown	800	470	193	19	—	—	—
Total		1717	1324	1947	2527	2909	3650	3741
Manitoba	Anglo	173	160	236	330	330	328	296
	Franco	5	4	11	20	15	19	12
	Unknown	156	92	31	2	—	—	—
Total		334	256	278	352	345	347	308
Saskatchewan	Anglo	197	166	227	222	234	205	253
	Franco	3	2	3	9	5	8	6
	Unknown	157	85	26	0	—	—	—
Total		357	253	256	231	239	213	259
Alberta	Anglo	262	238	391	578	610	614	548
	Franco	3	4	12	6	3	12	4
	Unknown	233	117	35	3	—	—	—
Total		498	359	438	587	613	626	552
British Columbia	Anglo	288	211	234	342	527	783	854
	Franco	4	1	1	2	4	15	9
	Unknown	251	111	5	0	—	—	—
Total		543	323	240	344	531	798	863
Outside Canada	Anglo	4	0	8	7	11	24	26
	Franco	0	0	2	1	2	0	4
	Unknown	0	0	0	0	—	—	—
Total		4	0	10	8	13	24	30
Grand Totals		6,669	5,261	6,682	8,134	8,653	10,984	10,998

NOTE: The capture of National-Representation-Group information did not commence until March of 1973. Therefore, all personnel listed in the "unknown" category have been either absorbed statistically or are no longer with the service.

[Mr. Danson.]

"DAVID STEINBERG NEWS SPECIAL ON METRIC CONVERSION"

Question No. 2,831—**Mr. Neil:**

What was the total cost to the government of the production of the half hour programme David Steinberg News Special on Metric Conversion?

Mr. Hugh Poulin (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): In so far as the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce is concerned: the total cost of producing the David Steinberg News Special on Metric Conversion was $72,735.00.

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker: Shall the remaining questions be allowed to stand?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

* * *

MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Would Your Honour be good enough to call notices of motions for the production of papers Nos. 114 and 115?

[*Text*]

COPIES OF RELOCATION TASK FORCE PROGRESS REPORT ON MOVE OF HEADQUARTERS OF DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

Motion No. 114—**Mr. Marshall:**

That an Order of the House do issue for copies of the progress report presented by the Relocation Task Force to the liaison officers and union representatives having to do with the move of the Headquarters of the Department of Veterans Affairs to Prince Edward Island.

[*English*]

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, no written report was presented by the relocation task force to the liaison officers and union representatives having to do with the move of the headquarters of the Department of Veterans Affairs to Prince Edward Island. I would, therefore, ask the hon. member to withdraw his motion.

Mr. Marshall: Agreed.

Motion withdrawn and order discharged.

[*Text*]

COPIES OF RELOCATION TASK FORCE PROGRESS REPORT PRESENTED TO VETERANS AFFAIRS RELOCATION STEERING COMMITTEE MARCH 11, 1977

Motion No. 115—**Mr. Marshall:**

That an Order of the House do issue for copies of the progress report presented by the Relocation Task Force to the Veterans' Affairs Relocation Steering Committee, dated March 11, 1977, having to do with the move of the Headquarters of the Department of Veterans Affairs to Prince Edward Island.

[*English*]

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, no written report was presented by the relocation task force to the Veterans Affairs relocation steering committee having to do with the move of the headquarters of the Department of Veterans Affairs to Prince Edward Island. Therefore, I would ask the hon. member to withdraw his motion.

Mr. Marshall: Agreed.

Motion withdrawn and order discharged.

Mr. Speaker: Shall the remaining notices of motions for the production of papers be allowed to stand?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

CRIMINAL LAW AMENDMENT ACT, 1977

AMENDMENTS TO CRIMINAL CODE

The House resumed, from Tuesday, July 12, consideration of Bill C-51, to amend the Criminal Code, the Customs Tariff, the Parole Act, the Penitentiary Act and the Prisons and Reformatories Act, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs.

Mr. Speaker: Pursuant to the order made Tuesday, July 12, the House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred divisions on Bill C-51 in the order in which outstanding divisions have been deferred, which is the order in which they are listed at the back of today's order paper.

Call in the members.

• (1520)

And the division bells having been rung:

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams) on a point of order.

Mr. Woolliams: Mr. Speaker, I will be very brief. We have a number of votes and a number of motions before us. Every time a motion was called it was read to the House, and my party has been provided with a copy of the votes. Therefore, if it is the pleasure of the House, the votes could be called by number only in order to expedite this procedure.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: As the hon. member indicates, this procedure would be expedited by calling the votes by number only, rather than reading the full text of the description of the bill and the full text of the amendment. Unless an hon. member indicates

it is necessary, the Chair will follow the suggestion of the hon. member for Calgary North.

Therefore, the vote is on motion No. 1 in the name of the hon. member for Moose Jaw (Mr. Neil).

The House divided on motion No. 1 (Mr. Neil) which was negatived on the following division:

(Division No. 74)

YEAS

Messrs.

Alexander
Allard
Baker (Grenville-Carleton)
Bawden
Beatty
Beaudoin
Brisco
Cadieu
Caouette (Villeneuve)
Caouette (Témiscamingue)
Clarke (Vancouver Quadra)
Coates
Crouse
Darling
Dick
Diefenbaker
Dionne (Kamouraska)
Elzinga
Epp
Fraser
Gillies
Grafftey
Halliday
Hnatyshyn
Holmes
Hurlburt
Jarvis
Johnston
Jones
Kempling
Knowles (Norfolk-Haldimand)
Lambert (Bellechasse)
Laprise
La Salle
Lawrence
MacDonald (Egmont)
Malone
Marshall
Mazankowski
McCain
McCleave
McKenzie
McKinnon
Mitges
Muir
Neil
Oberle
O'Sullivan
Paproski
Patterson
Pigott (Mrs.)
Ritchie
Rondeau
Rynard
Schellenberger
Schumacher
Stanfield
Stevens
Stewart (Marquette)
Towers
Wenman
Whiteway
Wise
Woolliams
Yewchuk—65.

NAYS

Messrs.

Abbott
Allmand
Anderson
Appolloni (Mrs.)
Baker (Gander-Twillingate)
Basford
Bégin (Miss)
Blackburn
Blais
Blaker
Blouin
Boulanger
Breau
Brewin
Broadbent
Buchanan
Bussières
Caccia
Cafik
Campagnolo (Mrs.)
Campbell (LaSalle-Émard-Côte Saint-Paul)
Caron
Chrétien
Clermont
Collenette
Comtois
Condon
Corriveau
Cullen
Danson
Daudlin
Dawson
De Bané
Demers
Dionne (Northumberland-Miramichi)
Douglas (Bruce-Grey)
Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands)
Drury
Duclos
Dupont
Dupras
Duquet
Ethier
Faulkner
Fleming
Flynn
Foster
Francis
Gauthier (Ottawa-Vanier)
Gilbert
Gillespie
Goodale
Goyer
Gray
Guay (St. Boniface)
Guay (Lévis)
Haidasz
Harquail
Herbert
Hogan
Holt (Mrs.)
Hopkins
Isabelle
Jamieson
Joyal
Kaplan
Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre)
Lajoie
Lalonde
Lamontagne
Landers
Langlois
Lapointe
Lavoie
Leblanc (Laurier)
LeBlanc (Westmorland-Kent)
Lee
Lefebvre
Leggatt
Lessard
Loiselle (Chambly)
Loiselle (Saint-Henri)
Lumley
MacDonald (Cardigan)
MacEachen
MacFarlane
Maine
Marchand
Martin
McIsaac
Milne
Munro (Hamilton East)
Nicholson (Miss)
O'Connell
Olivier
Orlikow
Ouellet
Parent
Pearsall
Pelletier
Penner
Peters
Philbrook
Pinard
Portelance
Poulin
Raines
Reid
Roberts
Robinson
Rodriguez
Rompkey
Rooney
Roy (Laval)
Saltsman
Savard
Sharp
Smith (Saint-Jean)
Stanbury
Stewart (Cochrane)
Symes
Tessier
Trudel
Turner
Watson
Wood
Yanakis—127.

[Mr. Speaker.]

● (1530)

Mr. Speaker: I therefore declare motion No. 1 lost. The next question, in the order of deferral, is on motion No. 7 in the name of the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams). I remind hon. members that the vote on motion No. 7 disposes of the vote on motion No. 28.

The House divided on motion No. 7 (Mr. Woolliams) which was negatived on the following division:

(Division No. 75)

YEAS

Messrs.

Alexander
Allard
Baker (Grenville-Carleton)
Bawden
Beatty
Beaudoin
Brisco
Cadieu
Caouette (Villeneuve)
Caouette (Témiscamingue)
Clarke (Vancouver Quadra)
Coates
Crouse
Darling
Dick
Diefenbaker
Dionne (Kamouraska)
Elzinga
Epp
Fraser
Gillies
Grafftey
Halliday
Hnatyshyn
Holmes
Hurlburt
Jarvis
Johnston
Jones
Kempling
Knowles (Norfolk-Haldimand)
Lambert (Bellechasse)
Laprise
La Salle
Lawrence
MacDonald (Egmont)
Malone
Marshall
Mazankowski
McCain
McCleave
McKenzie
McKinnon
Mitges
Muir
Neil
Oberle
O'Sullivan
Paproski
Patterson
Peters
Pigott (Mrs.)
Ritchie
Rondeau
Rynard
Schellenberger
Schumacher
Stanfield
Stevens
Stewart (Marquette)
Towers
Wenman
Whiteway
Wise
Woolliams
Yewchuk—66.

NAYS

Messrs.

Abbott
Allmand
Anderson
Appolloni (Mrs.)
Baker (Gander-Twillingate)
Basford
Bégin (Miss)
Blackburn
Blais
Blaker
Blouin
Boulanger
Breau
Brewin
Broadbent
Buchanan
Bussières
Caccia
Cafik
Campagnolo (Mrs.)
Campbell (LaSalle-Émard-Côte Saint-Paul)
Caron
Chrétien
Clermont
Collenette
Comtois
Condon
Corriveau
Cullen
Danson
Daudlin
Dawson
De Bané
Demers
Dionne (Northumberland-Miramichi)
Douglas (Bruce-Grey)
Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands)
Drury
Duclos
Dupont
Dupras
Duquet
Ethier
Faulkner
Fleming
Flynn
Foster
Francis
Gauthier (Ottawa-Vanier)
Gilbert
Gillespie
Goodale
Goyer
Gray

Messrs.

Guay (St. Boniface)
Guay (Lévis)
Haidasz
Harquail
Herbert
Hogan
Holt (Mrs.)
Hopkins
Isabelle
Jamieson
Joyal
Kaplan
Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre)
Lajoie
Lalonde
Lamontagne
Landers
Langlois
Lapointe
Lavoie
Leblanc (Laurier)
LeBlanc (Westmorland-Kent)
Lee
Lefebvre
Leggatt
Lessard
Loiselle (Chambly)
Loiselle (Saint-Henri)
Lumley
MacDonald (Cardigan)
MacEachen
MacFarlane
Maine
Marchand
Martin
McIsaac
Milne
Munro (Hamilton East)
Nicholson (Miss)
O'Connell
Olivier
Orlikow
Ouellet
Parent
Pearsall
Pelletier
Penner
Philbrook
Pinard
Portelance
Poulin
Raines
Reid
Roberts
Robinson
Rodriguez
Rompkey
Rooney
Roy (Laval)
Saltsman
Savard
Sharp
Smith (Saint-Jean)
Stanbury
Stewart (Cochrane)
Symes
Tessier
Trudel
Turner
Watson
Wood
Yanakis—126.

● (1540)

Mr. Speaker: I therefore declare motions Nos. 7 and 28 lost.

The question is on motion No. 12, which will also dispose of motions Nos. 13 and 14.

The House divided on motion No. 12 (Mr. Woolliams) which was negatived on the following division:

(*Division No. 76*)

YEAS

Messrs.

Alexander
Allard
Baker (Grenville-Carleton)
Bawden
Beatty
Beaudoin
Brisco
Cadieu
Caouette (Villeneuve)
Caouette (Témiscamingue)
Clarke (Vancouver Quadra)
Coates
Cossitt
Crouse
Darling
Diefenbaker
Dionne (Kamouraska)
Elzinga
Epp
Fraser
Gillies
Grafftey
Halliday
Hnatyshyn
Holmes
Hurlburt
Jarvis
Johnston
Jones
Kempling
Knowles (Norfolk-Haldimand)
Lambert (Bellechasse)
Laprise
La Salle
Lawrence
MacDonald (Egmont)
Malone
Marshall
Mazankowski
McCain
McCleave
McKenzie
McKinnon
Mitges
Muir
Neil
Oberle
O'Sullivan
Paproski
Patterson
Pigott (Mrs.)
Ritchie
Rondeau
Rynard
Schellenberger
Schumacher
Stanfield
Stevens
Stewart (Marquette)
Towers
Wenman
Whiteway
Wise
Woolliams
Yewchuk—65.

NAYS

Messrs.

Abbott
Allmand
Anderson
Appolloni (Mrs.)
Baker (Gander-Twillingate)
Basford
Bégin (Miss)
Blackburn
Blais
Blaker
Blouin
Boulanger
Breau
Brewin
Broadbent
Buchanan
Bussières

Messrs.

Caccia
Cafik
Campagnolo (Mrs.)
Campbell (LaSalle-Émard-Côte Saint-Paul)
Caron
Chrétien
Clermont
Collenette
Comtois
Condon
Corriveau
Cullen
Danson
Daudlin
Dawson
De Bané
Demers
Dionne (Northumberland-Miramichi)
Douglas (Bruce-Grey)
Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands)
Drury
Duclos
Dupont
Dupras
Duquet
Ethier
Faulkner
Fleming
Flynn
Foster
Francis
Gauthier (Ottawa-Vanier)
Gilbert
Gillespie
Goodale
Goyer
Gray
Guay (St. Boniface)
Guay (Lévis)
Haidasz
Harquail
Herbert
Hogan
Holt (Mrs.)
Hopkins
Isabelle
Jamieson
Joyal
Kaplan
Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre)
Lajoie
Lalonde
Lamontagne
Landers
Langlois
Lapointe
Lavoie
Leblanc (Laurier)
LeBlanc (Westmorland-Kent)
Lee
Lefebvre
Leggatt
Lessard
Loiselle (Chambly)
Loiselle (Saint-Henri)
Lumley
MacDonald (Cardigan)
MacEachen
MacFarlane
Maine
Marchand
Martin
McIsaac
Milne
Munro (Hamilton East)
Nicholson (Miss)
O'Connell
Olivier
Orlikow
Ouellet
Parent
Pearsall
Pelletier
Penner
Peters
Philbrook
Pinard
Portelance
Poulin
Raines
Reid
Roberts
Robinson
Rodriguez
Rompkey
Rooney
Roy (Laval)
Saltsman
Savard
Sharp
Smith (Saint-Jean)
Stanbury
Stewart (Cochrane)
Symes
Tessier
Trudel
Turner
Watson
Wood
Yanakis—127.

Mr. Speaker: I therefore declare motions Nos. 12, 13 and 14 lost.

The question is on motion No. 2, which will also dispose of motions Nos. 21 and 22.

The House divided on motion No. 2 (Mr. Schumacher) which was negatived on the following division:

(*Division No. 77*)

YEAS

Messrs.

Alexander
Allard
Baker (Grenville-Carleton)
Bawden
Beatty
Beaudoin
Brisco
Cadieu
Caouette (Villeneuve)
Caouette (Témiscamingue)
Clarke (Vancouver Quadra)
Coates
Cossitt
Crouse
Darling
Diefenbaker
Dionne (Kamouraska)
Elzinga
Epp
Fraser
Gillies
Grafftey
Halliday
Hnatyshyn
Holmes
Hurlburt
Jarvis
Johnston
Jones
Kempling
Knowles (Norfolk-Haldimand)
Lambert (Bellechasse)
Laprise
La Salle
Lawrence
MacDonald (Egmont)
Malone
Marshall
Mazankowski
McCain
McCleave
McKenzie
McKinnon
Mitges
Muir

Messrs.

Neil
Oberle
O'Sullivan
Paproski
Patterson
Peters
Pigott (Mrs.)
Ritchie
Rondeau
Rynard
Schellenberger
Schumacher
Stanfield
Stevens
Stewart (Marquette)
Towers
Wenman
Whiteway
Wise
Woolliams
Yewchuk—66.

NAYS

Messrs.

Abbott
Allmand
Anderson
Appolloni (Mrs.)
Baker (Gander-Twillingate)
Basford
Bégin (Miss)
Blackburn
Blais
Blaker
Blouin
Boulanger
Breau
Brewin
Broadbent
Buchanan
Bussières
Caccia
Cafik
Campagnolo (Mrs.)
Campbell (LaSalle-Émard-Côte Saint-Paul)
Caron
Chrétien
Clermont
Collenette
Comtois
Condon
Corriveau
Cullen
Danson
Daudlin
Dawson
De Bané
Demers
Dionne (Northumberland-Miramichi)
Douglas (Bruce-Grey)
Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands)
Drury
Duclos
Dupont
Dupras
Duquet
Ethier
Faulkner
Fleming
Flynn
Foster
Francis
Gauthier (Ottawa-Vanier)
Gilbert
Gillespie
Goodale
Goyer
Gray
Guay (St. Boniface)
Guay (Lévis)
Haidasz
Harquail
Herbert
Hogan
Holt (Mrs.)
Hopkins
Isabelle
Jamieson
Joyal
Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre)
Lajoie
Lalonde
Lamontagne
Landers
Langlois
Lapointe
Lavoie
Leblanc (Laurier)
LeBlanc (Westmorland-Kent)
Lee
Lefebvre
Leggatt
Lessard
Loiselle (Chambly)
Loiselle (Saint-Henri)
Lumley
MacDonald (Cardigan)
MacEachen
MacFarlane
Maine
Marchand
Martin
McIsaac
Milne
Munro (Hamilton East)
Nicholson (Miss)
O'Connell
Olivier
Orlikow
Ouellet
Parent
Pearsall
Pelletier
Penner
Philbrook
Pinard
Portelance
Poulin
Raines
Reid
Roberts
Robinson
Rodriguez
Rompkey
Rooney
Roy (Laval)
Saltsman
Savard
Sharp
Smith (Saint-Jean)
Stanbury
Stewart (Cochrane)
Symes
Tessier
Trudel
Turner
Watson
Wood
Yanakis—125.

● (1550)

Mr. Speaker: I therefore declare motions Nos. 2, 21 and 22 lost. The question is upon motion No. 9.

The House divided on motion No. 9 (Mr. Brisco) which was negatived on the following division:

(*Division No. 78*)

YEAS

Messrs.

Alexander
Allard
Baker (Grenville-Carleton)
Bawden
Beatty
Beaudoin
Brisco
Cadieu
Caouette (Villeneuve)
Caouette (Témiscamingue)
Clarke (Vancouver Quadra)
Coates
Cossitt
Crouse
Darling
Dick
Diefenbaker
Dionne (Kamouraska)
Elzinga
Epp
Fraser
Gillies
Grafftey
Halliday
Hnatyshyn
Holmes
Hurlburt
Jarvis
Johnston
Jones
Kempling
Knowles (Norfolk-Haldimand)
Lambert (Bellechasse)
Laprise
La Salle
Lawrence
MacDonald (Egmont)
Malone
Marshall
Mazankowski
McCain
McCleave
McKenzie
McKinnon
Mitges
Muir
Neil
Oberle
O'Sullivan
Paproski
Patterson
Pigott (Mrs.)
Ritchie
Rondeau
Rynard
Schellenberger
Schumacher
Stanfield
Stevens
Stewart (Marquette)
Towers
Wenman
Whiteway
Wise
Woolliams
Yewchuk—66.

NAYS

Messrs.

Abbott
Allmand
Anderson
Appolloni (Mrs.)
Baker (Gander-Twillingate)
Basford
Bégin (Miss)
Blackburn
Blais
Blaker
Blouin
Boulanger
Breau
Brewin
Broadbent
Buchanan
Bussières
Caccia
Cafik
Campagnolo (Mrs.)
Campbell (LaSalle-Émard-Côte Saint-Paul)
Caron
Chrétien
Clermont
Collenette
Comtois
Condon
Corriveau
Cullen
Danson
Daudlin
Dawson
Demers
Dionne (Northumberland-Miramichi)
Douglas (Bruce-Grey)
Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands)
Drury
Duclos
Dupont
Dupras
Duquet
Ethier
Faulkner
Fleming
Flynn
Foster
Francis
Gauthier (Ottawa-Vanier)
Gilbert
Gillespie
Goodale
Goyer
Gray
Guay (St. Boniface)
Guay (Lévis)
Haidasz
Harquail
Herbert
Hogan
Holt (Mrs.)
Hopkins
Isabelle
Jamieson
Joyal
Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre)
Lajoie
Lalonde
Lamontagne
Landers
Langlois
Lapointe
Lavoie
Leblanc (Laurier)
LeBlanc (Westmorland-Kent)
Lee
Lefebvre
Leggatt
Lessard
Loiselle (Chambly)
Loiselle (Saint-Henri)
Lumley
MacDonald (Cardigan)
MacEachen
MacFarlane
Maine
Marchand
Martin
McIsaac
Milne
Munro (Hamilton East)
Nicholson (Miss)
O'Connell
Olivier
Orlikow
Ouellet
Parent
Pearsall
Pelletier
Penner
Peters
Philbrook
Pinard
Portelance
Poulin
Raines
Reid
Roberts
Robinson
Rodriguez
Rompkey
Rooney
Roy (Laval)
Saltsman
Savard
Sharp
Smith (Saint-Jean)
Stanbury
Stewart (Cochrane)
Symes
Tessier
Trudel
Turner
Watson
Wood
Yanakis—125.

● (1600)

Mr. Speaker: I therefore declare motion No. 9 lost.

The question is therefore upon motion No. 10 in the name of the hon. member for Palliser (Mr. Schumacher).

The House divided on motion No. 10 (Mr. Schumacher) which was negatived on the following division:

(*Division No. 79*)

YEAS

Messrs.

Alexander
Allard
Baker
(Grenville-Carleton)
Bawden
Beatty
Beaudoin
Brisco
Cadieu
Caouette
(Villeneuve)
Caouette
(Témiscamingue)
Clarke
(Vancouver Quadra)
Coates
Cossitt
Crouse
Darling
Dick
Diefenbaker
Dionne
(Kamouraska)
Elzinga
Epp
Fraser
Gillies
Grafftey
Halliday
Hnatyshyn
Holmes
Hurlburt
Jarvis
Johnston
Jones
Kempling
Knowles
(Norfolk-Haldimand)
Lambert
(Bellechasse)
Laprise
La Salle
Lawrence
MacDonald
(Egmont)
Malone
Marshall
Mazankowski
McCain
McCleave
McKenzie
McKinnon
Mitges
Muir
Neil
Oberle
O'Sullivan
Paproski
Patterson
Peters
Pigott (Mrs.)
Ritchie
Rondeau
Rynard
Schellenberger
Schumacher
Stanfield
Stevens
Stewart
(Marquette)
Towers
Wenman
Whiteway
Wise
Woolliams
Yewchuk—67.

NAYS

Messrs

Abbott
Allmand
Anderson
Appolloni (Mrs.)
Baker
(Gander-Twillingate)
Basford
Bégin (Miss)
Blackburn
Blais
Blaker
Blouin
Boulanger
Breau
Brewin
Broadbent
Buchanan
Bussières
Caccia
Cafik
Campagnolo (Mrs.)
Campbell
(LaSalle-Émard-Côte
Saint-Paul)
Caron
Chrétien
Clermont
Collenette
Comtois
Condon
Corriveau
Cullen
Danson
Daudlin
Dawson
Demers
Dionne
(Northumberland-
Miramichi)
Douglas
(Bruce-Grey)
Douglas
(Nanaimo-Cowichan-
The Islands)
Drury
Duclos
Dupras
Duquet
Ethier
Faulkner
Fleming
Flynn
Foster
Francis
Gauthier
(Ottawa-Vanier)
Gilbert
Gillespie
Goodale
Goyer
Gray
Guay
(St. Boniface)
Guay
(Lévis)
Haidasz
Harquail
Herbert
Hogan
Holt (Mrs.)
Hopkins
Isabelle
Jamieson
Joyal
Knowles
(Winnipeg
North Centre)
Lajoie
Lalonde
Lamontagne
Landers
Langlois
Lapointe
Lavoie
Leblanc
(Laurier)
LeBlanc
(Westmorland-Kent)
Lee
Lefebvre
Leggatt
Lessard
Loiselle
(Chambly)
Loiselle
(Saint-Henri)
Lumley
MacDonald
(Cardigan)
MacEachen
MacFarlane
Maine
Marchand
Martin
McIsaac
Milne
Munro
(Hamilton East)
Nicholson (Miss)
O'Connell
Olivier
Orlikow
Ouellet
Parent
Pearsall
Pelletier
Penner
Philbrook
Pinard
Portelance
Poulin
Raines
Reid
Roberts
Robinson
Rodriguez
Rompkey
Rooney
Roy
(Laval)
Saltsman
Savard
Sharp
Smith
(Saint-Jean)
Stanbury
Stewart
(Cochrane)
Symes
Tessier
Trudel
Turner
Watson
Wood
Yanakis—123.

Mr. Speaker: I therefore declare motion No. 10 lost.

The question is therefore on motion No. 15.

The House divided on motion No. 15 (Mr. Ritchie) which was negatived on the following division.

(*Division No. 80*)

YEAS

Messrs.

Alexander
Allard
Baker
(Grenville-Carleton)
Bawden
Beatty
Beaudoin
Brisco
Cadieu
Caouette
(Villeneuve)
Caouette
(Témiscamingue)
Clarke
(Vancouver Quadra)
Coates
Cossitt
Crouse
Darling
Dick
Diefenbaker
Dionne
(Kamouraska)
Elzinga
Epp
Fraser
Gillies
Grafftey
Halliday
Hnatyshyn
Holmes
Hurlburt
Jarvis
Johnston
Jones
Kempling
Knowles
(Norfolk-Haldimand)
Lambert
(Bellechasse)
Laprise
La Salle
Lawrence
MacDonald
(Egmont)
Malone
Marshall
Mazankowski
McCain
McCleave
McKenzie
McKinnon
Mitges
Muir
Neil
Oberle
O'Sullivan
Paproski
Patterson
Pigott (Mrs.)
Ritchie
Rondeau
Rynard
Schellenberger
Schumacher
Stanfield
Stevens
Stewart
(Marquette)
Towers
Wenman
Whiteway
Wise
Woolliams
Yewchuk—66.

NAYS

Messrs.

Abbott
Allmand
Anderson
Appolloni (Mrs.)
Baker
(Gander-Twillingate)
Basford
Bégin (Miss)
Blackburn
Blais
Blaker
Blouin
Boulanger
Breau
Brewin
Broadbent
Buchanan
Bussières
Caccia
Cafik
Campagnolo (Mrs.)
Campbell
(LaSalle-Émard-Côte
Saint-Paul)
Caron
Clermont
Collenette
Comtois
Condon
Corriveau
Cullen
Danson
Daudlin
Dawson
Demers
Dionne
(Northumberland-
Miramichi)
Douglas
(Bruce-Grey)
Douglas
(Nanaimo-Cowichan-
The Islands)
Drury
Duclos
Dupont
Dupras
Duquet
Ethier
Faulkner
Fleming
Flynn
Foster
Francis
Gauthier
(Ottawa-Vanier)
Gilbert
Gillespie
Goodale
Goyer
Gray
Guay
(St. Boniface)
Guay
(Lévis)
Haidasz
Harquail
Herbert
Hogan
Holt (Mrs.)
Hopkins
Isabelle
Jamieson
Joyal
Knowles
(Winnipeg
North Centre)
Lajoie
Lalonde
Lamontagne
Landers
Langlois
Lapointe
Lavoie
Leblanc
(Laurier)
LeBlanc
(Westmorland-Kent)
Lee
Lefebvre
Leggatt
Lessard
Loiselle
(Chambly)
Loiselle
(Saint-Henri)
Lumley
MacDonald
(Cardigan)
MacEachen
MacFarlane
Maine
Marchand
Martin
McIsaac
Milne
Munro
(Hamilton East)
Nicholson (Miss)
O'Connell
Olivier
Orlikow
Ouellet
Parent
Pearsall
Pelletier
Penner
Philbrook
Pinard
Portelance
Poulin
Raines
Reid
Roberts
Robinson
Rodriguez
Rompkey
Rooney
Roy
(Laval)

Messrs.

Saltsman
Savard
Sharp
Smith
(Saint-Jean)
Stanbury
Stewart
(Cochrane)
Symes
Tessier
Trudel
Turner
Watson
Wood
Yanakis—123.

● (1610)

Mr. Speaker: I therefore declare motion No. 15 lost.

The question is on motion No. 16 in the name of the hon. member for Dauphin (Mr. Ritchie).

The House divided on motion No. 16 (Mr. Ritchie) which was negatived on the following division:

(Division No. 81)

YEAS

Messrs.

Alexander
Allard
Baker
(Grenville-Carleton)
Bawden
Beatty
Beaudoin
Brisco
Cadieu
Caouette
(Villeneuve)
Caouette
(Témiscamingue)
Clarke
(Vancouver Quadra)
Coates
Cossitt
Crouse
Darling
Dick
Diefenbaker
Dionne
(Kamouraska)
Elzinga
Epp
Fraser
Gillies
Grafftey
Halliday
Hnatyshyn
Holmes
Hurlburt
Jarvis
Johnston
Jones
Kempling
Knowles
(Norfolk-Haldimand)
Lambert
(Bellechasse)
Laprise
La Salle
Lawrence
MacDonald
(Egmont)
Malone
Marshall
Mazankowski
McCain
McCleave
McKenzie
McKinnon
Mitges
Muir
Neil
Oberle
O'Sullivan
Paproski
Patterson
Peters
Pigott (Mrs.)
Ritchie
Rondeau
Rynard
Schellenberger
Schumacher
Stanfield
Stevens
Stewart
(Marquette)
Towers
Wenman
Whiteway
Wise
Woolliams
Yewchuk—67.

NAYS

Messrs.

Abbott
Allmand
Appolloni (Mrs.)
Baker
(Gander-Twillingate)
Basford
Bégin (Miss)
Blackburn
Blais
Blaker
Blouin
Boulanger
Brewin
Broadbent
Buchanan
Bussières
Caccia
Cafik
Campagnolo (Mrs.)
Campbell
(LaSalle-Émard-Côte
Saint-Paul)
Caron
Clermont
Collenette
Comtois
Condon
Corriveau
Cullen
Danson
Daudlin
Dawson
Demers
Dionne
(Northumberland-
Miramichi)
Douglas
(Bruce-Grey)
Douglas
(Nanaimo-Cowichan-
The Islands)
Drury
Duclos
Dupont
Dupras
Duquet
Ethier
Faulkner
Fleming
Flynn
Foster
Francis
Gauthier
(Ottawa-Vanier)
Gilbert
Gillespie
Goodale
Goyer
Gray
Guay
(St. Boniface)
Guay
(Lévis)
Haidasz
Harquail
Herbert
Hogan
Holt (Mrs.)
Hopkins
Isabelle
Jamieson
Joyal
Knowles
(Winnipeg
North Centre)
Lajoie
Lalonde
Lamontagne

Messrs.

Landers
Langlois
Lapointe
Lavoie
Leblanc
(Laurier)
LeBlanc
(Westmorland-Kent)
Lee
Lefebvre
Leggatt
Lessard
Loiselle
(Chambly)
Loiselle
(Saint-Henri)
Lumley
MacDonald
(Cardigan)
MacEachen
MacFarlane
Maine
Marchand
Martin
McIsaac
Milne
Munro
(Hamilton East)
Nicholson (Miss)
O'Connell
Olivier
Orlikow
Ouellet
Parent
Pearsall
Pelletier
Penner
Philbrook
Pinard
Portelance
Poulin
Raines
Reid
Roberts
Robinson
Rodriguez
Rompkey
Rooney
Roy
(Laval)
Saltsman
Savard
Sharp
Smith
(Saint-Jean)
Stanbury
Stewart
(Cochrane)
Symes
Tessier
Trudel
Turner
Watson
Wood
Yanakis—121.

Mr. Speaker: I therefore declare motion No. 16 lost.

The question is on motion No. 17 in the name of the hon. member for Moose Jaw (Mr. Neil).

The House divided on motion No. 17 (Mr. Neil) which was negatived on the following division:

(*Division No. 82*)

YEAS

Messrs.

Alexander
Allard
Baker
(Grenville-Carleton)
Bawden
Beatty
Beaudoin
Brisco
Cadieu
Caouette
(Villeneuve)
Caouette
(Témiscamingue)
Clarke
(Vancouver Quadra)
Coates
Cossitt
Crouse
Darling
Dick
Diefenbaker
Dionne
(Kamouraska)
Elzinga
Fraser
Gillies
Grafftey
Halliday
Hnatyshyn
Holmes
Hurlburt
Jarvis
Johnston
Jones
Kempling
Knowles
(Norfolk-Haldimand)
Lambert
(Bellechasse)
Laniel
Laprise
La Salle
Lawrence
MacDonald
(Egmont)
Malone
Marshall
Mazankowski
McCain
McCleave
McKenzie
McKinnon
Mitges
Muir
Neil
Oberle
O'Sullivan
Paproski
Patterson
Pigott (Mrs.)
Ritchie
Rondeau
Rynard
Schellenberger
Schumacher
Stanfield
Stevens
Stewart
(Marquette)
Towers
Wenman
Whiteway
Wise
Woolliams
Yewchuk—66.

NAYS

Messrs.

Abbott
Allmand
Appolloni (Mrs.)
Baker
(Gander-Twillingate)
Basford
Bégin (Miss)
Blackburn
Blais
Blaker
Blouin
Boulanger
Brewin
Broadbent
Buchanan
Bussières
Caccia
Cafik
Campagnolo (Mrs.)
Campbell
(LaSalle-Émard-Côte
Saint-Paul)
Caron
Clermont
Collenette
Comtois
Condon
Corriveau
Cullen
Danson
Daudlin
Dawson
Demers
Dionne
(Northumberland-
Miramichi)
Douglas
(Bruce-Grey)

Messrs.

Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands)
Drury
Duclos
Dupont
Dupras
Duquet
Ethier
Faulkner
Fleming
Flynn
Foster
Francis
Gauthier (Ottawa-Vanier)
Gilbert
Gillespie
Goodale
Goyer
Gray
Guay (St. Boniface)
Guay (Lévis)
Haidasz
Herbert
Hogan
Holt (Mrs.)
Hopkins
Isabelle
Jamieson
Joyal
Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre)
Lajoie
Lalonde
Lamontagne
Landers
Langlois
Lapointe
Leblanc (Laurier)
LeBlanc (Westmorland-Kent)
Lee
Lefebvre
Leggatt
Lessard
Loiselle (Chambly)
Loiselle (Saint-Henri)
Lumley
MacDonald (Cardigan)
MacEachen
MacFarlane
Maine
Marchand
Martin
McIsaac
Milne
Munro (Hamilton East)
Nicholson (Miss)
O'Connell
Olivier
Orlikow
Ouellet
Parent
Pearsall
Pelletier
Penner
Peters
Philbrook
Pinard
Portelance
Poulin
Raines
Reid
Roberts
Robinson
Rodriguez
Rompkey
Rooney
Roy (Laval)
Saltsman
Savard
Sharp
Smith (Saint-Jean)
Stanbury
Stewart (Cochrane)
Symes
Tessier
Trudel
Turner
Watson
Wood
Yanakis—120.

● (1620)

Mr. Speaker: I declare the motion lost. The next question, in the order of deferral, is on motion No. 18 in the name of the hon. member for Palliser (Mr. Schumacher).

The House divided on motion No. 18 (Mr. Schumacher) which was negatived on the following division:

(*Division No. 83*)

YEAS

Messrs.

Alexander
Allard
Baker (Grenville-Carleton)
Bawden
Beatty
Beaudoin
Brisco
Cadieu
Caouette (Villeneuve)
Caouette (Témiscamingue)
Clarke (Vancouver Quadra)
Coates
Cossitt
Crouse
Darling
Dick
Diefenbaker
Dionne (Kamouraska)
Elzinga
Epp
Fraser
Gillies
Grafftey
Halliday
Hnatyshyn
Holmes
Hurlburt
Jarvis
Johnston
Jones
Kempling
Knowles (Norfolk-Haldimand)
Lambert (Bellechasse)
Laprise
La Salle
Lawrence
MacDonald (Egmont)
Malone
Marshall
Mazankowski
McCain
McCleave
McKenzie
McKinnon
Mitges
Muir
Neil
Oberle
O'Sullivan
Paproski
Patterson
Peters
Pigott (Mrs.)
Ritchie
Rondeau
Rynard
Schellenberger
Schumacher
Stanfield
Stevens
Stewart (Marquette)
Towers
Wenman
Whiteway
Wise
Woolliams
Yewchuk—67.

NAYS

Messrs.

Abbott
Allmand
Appolloni (Mrs.)
Baker (Gander-Twillingate)
Basford
Bégin (Miss)
Blackburn
Blais

Messrs.

Blaker
Blouin
Boulanger
Breau
Brewin
Broadbent
Buchanan
Bussières
Caccia
Cafik
Campagnolo (Mrs.)
Campbell (LaSalle-Émard-Côte Saint-Paul)
Caron
Clermont
Collenette
Comtois
Condon
Corriveau
Cullen
Danson
Daudlin
Dawson
Demers
Dionne (Northumberland-Miramichi)
Douglas (Bruce-Grey)
Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands)
Drury
Duclos
Dupont
Dupras
Duquet
Ethier
Faulkner
Fleming
Flynn
Foster
Francis
Gauthier (Ottawa-Vanier)
Gilbert
Gillespie
Goodale
Goyer
Gray
Guay (St. Boniface)
Guay (Lévis)
Haidasz
Harquail
Herbert
Hogan
Holt (Mrs.)
Hopkins
Isabelle
Jamieson
Joyal
Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre)
Lajoie
Lalonde
Lamontagne
Landers
Langlois
Lapointe
Leblanc (Laurier)
LeBlanc (Westmorland-Kent)
Lee
Lefebvre
Leggatt
Lessard
Loiselle (Chambly)
Loiselle (Saint-Henri)
Lumley
MacDonald (Cardigan)
MacEachen
MacFarlane
Maine
Marchand
Martin
McIsaac
Milne
Munro (Hamilton East)
Nicholson (Miss)
O'Connell
Olivier
Orlikow
Ouellet
Parent
Pearsall
Pelletier
Penner
Philbrook
Pinard
Portelance
Poulin
Raines
Reid
Roberts
Robinson
Rodriguez
Rompkey
Rooney
Roy (Laval)
Saltsman
Savard
Sharp
Smith (Saint-Jean)
Stanbury
Stewart (Cochrane)
Symes
Tessier
Trudel
Turner
Watson
Wood
Yanakis—121.

● (1630)

Mr. Speaker: I therefore declare motion No. 18 lost.

The question is on motion No. 20.

The House divided on motion No. 20 (Mr. Ritchie) which was negatived on the following division:

(*Division No. 84*)

YEAS

Messrs.

Alexander
Allard
Baker (Grenville-Carleton)
Bawden
Beatty
Beaudoin
Brisco
Cadieu
Caouette (Villeneuve)
Caouette (Témiscamingue)
Clarke (Vancouver Quadra)
Coates
Cossitt
Crouse
Darling
Dick
Diefenbaker
Dionne (Kamouraska)
Elzinga
Epp
Fraser
Gillies
Grafftey
Halliday
Hnatyshyn
Holmes
Hurlburt
Jarvis
Johnston
Jones
Kempling
Knowles (Norfolk-Haldimand)
Lambert (Bellechasse)
Laprise
La Salle
Lawrence
MacDonald (Egmont)
Malone
Marshall
Mazankowski
McCain
McCleave
McKenzie
McKinnon
Mitges
Muir
Neil
Oberle
O'Sullivan
Paproski
Patterson
Peters
Pigott (Mrs.)
Ritchie
Rondeau
Rynard
Schellenberger
Schumacher
Stanfield
Stevens
Stewart (Marquette)

Messrs.

Towers	Whiteway	Woolliams
Wenman	Wise	Yewchuk—(67)

NAYS

Messrs.

Abbott	Fleming	MacEachen
Allmand	Flynn	MacFarlane
Appolloni (Mrs.)	Foster	Maine
Baker (Gander-Twillingate)	Francis	Marchand
Basford	Gauthier (Ottawa-Vanier)	Martin
Bégin (Miss)	Gilbert	McIsaac
Blackburn	Gillespie	Milne
Blais	Goodale	Munro (Hamilton East)
Blaker	Goyer	Nicholson (Miss)
Blouin	Gray	O'Connell
Boulanger	Guay (St. Boniface)	Olivier
Brewin	Guay (Lévis)	Orlikow
Broadbent	Haidasz	Ouellet
Buchanan	Harquail	Parent
Bussières	Herbert	Pearsall
Caccia	Hogan	Pelletier
Cafik	Holt (Mrs.)	Penner
Campagnolo (Mrs.)	Hopkins	Philbrook
Campbell (LaSalle-Émard-Côte Saint-Paul)	Isabelle	Pinard
Caron	Jamieson	Portelance
Clermont	Joyal	Poulin
Collenette	Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre)	Raines
Comtois	Lajoie	Reid
Condon	Lalonde	Roberts
Corriveau	Lamontagne	Robinson
Cullen	Landers	Rodriguez
Danson	Langlois	Rompkey
Daudlin	Lapointe	Rooney
Dawson	Leblanc (Laurier)	Roy (Laval)
Demers	LeBlanc (Westmorland-Kent)	Saltsman
Dionne (Northumberland-Miramichi)	Lee	Savard
Douglas (Bruce-Grey)	Lefebvre	Sharp
Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands)	Leggatt	Smith (Saint-Jean)
Drury	Lessard	Stanbury
Duclos	Loiselle (Chambly)	Stewart (Cochrane)
Dupont	Loiselle (Saint-Henri)	Symes
Dupras	Lumley	Tessier
Duquet	MacDonald (Cardigan)	Trudel
Ethier		Turner
Faulkner		Watson
		Wood
		Yanakis—(120)

Mr. Speaker: I therefore declare motion No. 20 lost.

Motion No. 21 was dealt with in the vote on motion 2. Motion No. 22 was dealt with also. Motion No. 23 has been discontinued. Motion No. 24 has been negatived on division. Motions Nos. 26 and 27 have been discontinued. Motion No. 28 was dealt with in the vote on motion No. 7. Therefore, the House will resume discussion on motion No. 25.

● (1640)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Armand Caouette (Villeneuve): Mr. Speaker, last night before the adjournment, I was wondering why this same government was again anxious to discourage tourist-hunters by requiring—

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I wonder if hon. members who wish to leave the chamber would do so promptly in order that the hon. member for Villeneuve (Mr. Caouette) may continue.

[Mr. Speaker.]

[*Translation*]

Mr. Caouette (Villeneuve): Mr. Speaker, as I was saying last night before the adjournment, I am wondering why this same government is still anxious to discourage tourist-hunters who come to my constituency where hunting is the favourite sport of many people, to spend their money to buy ammunition, rifles, and so forth. This government wants to impose—and I do not know if we may call it a tax, but I am inclined to call it so—or require small businesses to pay between $10 and $200 for selling guns and ammunition.

That is why I say the government wants to discourage small business because, instead of bringing all the necessary ammunition and food for one or two weeks vacation in our Canadian forests, we know that these tourists do not go into these small businesses or stores only to buy ammunition, but they also buy their food and all they need.

One might also wonder who will again benefit from stopping sales by the small retailer who surely will not be interested in paying again for another permit, since he is already paying for one to the provincial government, and he will not be interested in continuing to sell the small stock he owns to help hunters get ammunition, so who will benefit from that? As the minister stated it so well yesterday, asking $250 will encourage companies like Eaton's and Simpsons. For them indeed $250 will be something minimal, whereas our small industries and retailers will have to pay $10, $15 or even $25 perhaps only to sell, as I said, $50 worth of merchandise.

My party and I believe that we have to support the motion put forward by the Progressive Conservative Party to the effect that the government should withdraw that permit obligation for small businesses. In conclusion, I urge the government to consider carefully that possibility if they do not want small businesses to close their doors; they should help them by not having them take a permit to sell ammunition and a few long guns during that wonderful time the hunting season is for many people.

[*English*]

Mr. Don Mazankowski (Vegreville): Mr. Speaker, I should like to participate very briefly in the debate on this motion by the hon. member for Moose Jaw (Mr. Neil). First of all, I should point out that I am in support of the motion. The thrust of these particular clauses of Bill C-51 is simply tantamount to another form of taxation as it relates to the individual and as it relates to the business entrepreneur. It is simply another cost of doing business.

It is very strange that we have a Minister of State for Small Business (Mr. Marchand) going around the country boasting about the measures the Liberal government has engaged in, in terms of improving the climate and the environment of small business enterprises in Canada. He has talked about removing bureaucratic red tape and the number of forms and statistics which have been burdened on small business. Yet here we have another example of bureaucratic intervention, another form of taxation and another cost item which will do nothing in terms of preventing crime. How will the imposition of a fee for an

individual to acquire a firearm or a permit, or for a business enterprise to engage in the sale of firearms, in any way assist in stamping out crime? This is one of the major objections which has been cited and alluded to in the House during the course of this debate.

I should like to place on the record a sample of some of the material I have received in connection with this particular provision especially. I have a letter from Hanmer, Ontario, which reads as follows:

I object very strongly to Bill C-51 for the following reasons.

No way should I have to pay $10 for a firearm's certificate to prove I'm not a criminal or a psycho.

The law-abiding gun owner did not make the criminal or the psycho what he is. It is the government's responsibility to deal with these people and not make it look like it is my fault.

Do you think just because a criminal or a psycho doesn't have a firearm's certificate it will stop him from doing what he had in mind in the first place?

The $10 fee is simply stealing money from law-abiding citizens.

Trying to sneak unacceptable gun legislation through parliament with other possible good legislation is just plain terrible government—pure and simple.

The next letter I should like to quote is from Capreol, Ontario. It reads as follows:

I strongly object to Bill C-51 for the following reasons.

Why should I as a law-abiding citizen have to pay $10 for a firearm acquisition certificate just to prove to you that I am not a criminal or that I am not mentally disturbed.

Just because there are some criminals and psychos here in Canada I do not think that it is good government policy to try and penalize every gun-owning Canadian to pay the price for their mistakes.

Why don't you impose stiffer penalties in cases where firearms have been used unlawfully, instead of trying to take the easy way out and treating everyone as a damn criminal?

Do you think that a firearm acquisition certificate will stop a criminal or mentally disturbed person—as in previous school shootings—from committing a crime? No way. Once a person's mind is made up, I am sure that no piece of paper will change it.

The $10 fee is just, in my opinion, plain theft on the part of the government in order to cover part of the cost which the government has spent on several surveys pertaining to firearms in Canada. And how about the employment of people to take these applications for the certificates: who will pay for their wages? Sure it is a $10 fee now, but what will it be next time—$20 or $30?

Also, I would like to say that trying to push through unacceptable gun legislation with other possible good legislation, e.g. wiretapping and parole, is just plain sneaky business on the government's part.

As has been pointed out throughout this debate, the bill has many unacceptable features, but we are only dealing with one here. An assessment of fees in this connection will in no way deter the criminal from obtaining a gun if he is so disposed. What bothers me as we proceed with the passage of various forms of legislation in this House is the tremendous amount of power which is being left in the hands of the governor in council. I am bothered, also, by the tremendous complications which are accumulated as a result of legislation piled upon legislation.

We have reached a time in this country when a lot of the legislation presently on the statute books should be removed. It is time to take a thorough inventory of some of these laws. Our statutes are like accumulated stock. Over the years a business accumulates much dead stock which must be disposed of. This House has been grinding out legislation year after year, and this accumulation and proliferation of legislation and regulations has put Canadians in a statutory strait-jacket. It is time to assess our laws, streamline them and scrap those which are either redundant or outdated. It is time to free Canadians of this statutory strait-jacket and take off the hobbles of bureaucracy. It is time the government got off the backs of people.

● (1650)

I hope I have made clear my reasons for finding this bill particularly offensive. Those whom this legislation will govern will be forced to pay a price, to pay a fee which to business people engaged in providing a service will be an additional cost. I hope the minister will approve the amendment which will affect law-abiding citizens whom the legislation should not penalize.

Mr. Leonard C. Jones (Moncton): Mr. Speaker, the previous speaker was perfectly right. This whole cotton-picking provision should not come under the criminal law. Its pith and substance is not that of criminal law. It will merely enable the government to appoint more bureaucrats. Really, the government wants to tax people who get a firearms acquisition certificate and tax the small merchant who sells weapons or ammunition. This new law would punish the innocent, those who have no criminal record and are not criminals. The provision is criminal law in reverse. Those who pay the tax will not be represented; therefore we are contemplating a form of taxation without representation. Instead of telling businessmen who file the various forms and documents the government requires to pay a fee, they should be paid a fee.

Mr. Mazankowski: Right on.

Mr. Jones: I know small merchants are paid for collecting the provincial sales tax. By adopting this provision the government will put an onerous burden on the backs of small businessmen, at the expense of taxpayers. It will set up another bureaucratic empire, with administrators, personnel, and what have you. There will be a deputy in charge of firearms, an assistant deputy, an assistant to the assistant deputy, and so on.

This part of the legislation, at any rate, should not come under the criminal law. Frankly, I think it is ultra vires of this parliament. We should not even be discussing it. The government should bear the cost of the certificates it requires people to file or acquire. The government badgers small business to fill out forms and declarations. Every month Statistics Canada sends out forms. If they are not answered in a few days, you get a note from Ottawa asking why you did not send the information or form. Some people in my constituency were sent forms even after they had gone out of business. They were told to write "not applicable" in the appropriate spaces on the form. My main point is this: parliament has no authrority to pass this legislation. We should not even be discussing this provision.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Is the House ready for the question? Hon. members have heard the terms of the

motion. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some hon. Members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): All those in favour will please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

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

Some hon. Members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Pursuant to Standing Order 75(11), the recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I am not clear why the vote on the motion has been deferred. Has some order been made with respect to the matter? Are we to defer all these votes?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Standing Order 75(11) reads as follows:

When a recorded division has been demanded on any amendment proposed during the report stage of a bill, Mr. Speaker may defer the calling in of the members for the purpose of recording the "yeas" and "nays" until any or all subsequent amendments proposed to that bill have been considered. A recorded division or divisions may be so deferred from sitting to sitting.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: Mr. Speaker, until when are we deferring the vote?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Order, please. The House will now consider motion No. 29 in the name of the member for New Westminster (Mr. Leggatt).

Mr. Stuart Leggatt (New Westminster) moved:

Motion No. 29.

That bill C-51, to amend the Criminal Code, the Customs Tariff, the Parole Act, the Penitentiary Act and the Prisons and Reformatories Act, be amended in clause 7 by deleting subclause (1) and substituting the following therefor:

"7.(1) The definition "offence" in section 178.1 of the said act is repealed and the following substituted therefor:

" "offence", in relation to an authorization or application for an authorization, means an offence or conspiracy to commit an offence described in paragraph (*a*) and any such offence or conspiracy that there are reasonable grounds to believe has been or may be committed namely,

(*a*) any offence created by an act of parliament for which an offender may be sentenced to imprisonment for five years or more

and any other offence created by an act of parliament for which an offender may be prosecuted by indictment or that is an offence mentioned in section 3 or 20 of the *Small Loans Act*, that there are reasonable grounds to believe is part of a pattern of criminal activity planned and organized by a number of persons acting in concert in furtherance of the commission of crime involving one or more offences mentioned in paragraph (*a*) or a conspiracy to commit one or more such offences;"

[The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner).]

He said: Mr. Speaker, there is an error in motion No. 29. The last words in subparagraph (a) should read, "ten years or more." Perhaps, for clarity, I should read the wording of that part of the amendment as now printed on the order paper. It reads:

(a) any offence created by an act of parliament for which an offender may be sentenced to imprisonment for five years or more.

I seek the unanimous consent of the House to change "five years" to "ten years", so that the last part of the sentence shall read, "to imprisonment for ten years or more". I wonder if the House would consent to that change so that I can debate the motion as amended, not the motion as it presently reads?

Mr. Basford: Mr. Speaker, I am tempted to withhold consent because I know the hon. member would oppose his own amendment. Seriously, we consent to the change.

● (1700)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Is there agreement to allowing the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Leggatt) to change, in clause 7, the word "five" to the word "ten"?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Leggatt: I thank hon. members for their consideration in this matter. The reason for the amendment is that as this bill proceeded through committee, a number of amendments were submitted to the offence section of the wiretap bill which listed a variety of offences. The bill enumerated a great variety of specific offences in which case wiretapping is allowed. I and others expressed in committee concern about the fact that we should not have wiretapping legislation which would allow wiretapping in cases of insignificant crime or crime which is widespread throughout the population, which would give an open door and a blank cheque to the police department to wiretap everyone they wanted to wiretap regardless of the seriousness of the offence.

I think there is consensus amongst the population in favour of wiretapping, but people want it done only in cases of serious offences. The motion before the House which we are submitting states that there should be wiretapping in the case of organized crime, but there should not be wiretapping of little old ladies who have smuggled a pair of panties from Blane, Washington, to Vancouver. I see the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway (Mrs. Holt) looking incredulous. I thought she might, so I took the trouble of bringing in section 192 of the Customs Act. I use just that example, but there are a number of other examples of extremely minor offences which are common occurrences, actually just slips on the part of the population but for which wiretapping is allowed.

Under section 192 of the Customs Act, any person who smuggles anything valued at less than $200 is subject to the forfeiture of that item or a one-year jail term. Anyone who smuggles anything valued over $200 is subject to the forfeiture of that item or a four-year jail term. If, in the declaration that you file when you come across the border, you decide to

underestimate the value of your goods, that is also an offence under the Customs Act. If you buy a suit in New York and you say it cost you $90, when in fact it cost $150, that is an offence. Under section 192, any offence allows wiretapping. What I am arguing is that it is surely not the intention of the House to open the door to wiretapping so wide that these insignificant kinds of offences would allow wiretapping. That is the reason for the original proposal of the Minister of Justice (Mr. Basford) which was to attempt to define organized crime and leave the wiretapping provisions in for organized crime. I agree that conspiracy to smuggle is an important crime, even though the individual crime is not as important, but I cannot agree that in order to do that, you open the whole door. The offence section in fact opens the whole door.

My party, on second reading of the bill, voted in favour of Bill C-83 and it was the government that faced us with the conundrum of trying to vote for apples and oranges. But I will not make the same argument again in the House because I know, Mr. Speaker, that you would rule me out of order. Suffice it to say that if the government had decided to split this bill, they would have had far less trouble with its passage. I have to tell you right now that because of the failure to appreciate the civil liberties aspect inherent in the wiretapping provisions, I will vote against this bill on third reading, in spite of the strong support which this party has given to the firearms control aspect of the bill. There is no way in which we can vote for a bill which attacks so fundamentally the liberty of every Canadian, and that is the key question in terms of the wiretapping provisions of this legislation.

I want to read into the record a couple of things that have been said about wiretapping, about return to law and order and respect for the law. This is what the former chief justice of the Ontario High Court, Mr. J. C. McRuer, said:

> If there is a decline in respect for law and order, it is a disease of the body politic . . . Unjust laws we have in abundance; some a legacy of other days when standards of justice were different that they are today; others forced on us by impatient legislators who are more concerned with rules than justice.
>
> During the past 50 years undoubtedly there has been a growing discontent with certain laws and customs and never before have the people on this continent and other continents been more alert to injustice than they are today. It may well be that what is interpreted as disrespect for law, in fact may only be the manifestation of a burning desire for justice.

I emphasize what Mr. Justice McRuer said, that a burning desire for justice does not occur when we have laws in Canada allowing the police to wiretap every insignificant offender. If you read this bill, you will find that every person in the country is subject to wiretap. This is "Big Brother" legislation, make no mistake about it. Let me spell out some details of why it is "Big Brother" legislation. Look at some of the amendments the Minister of Justice saw fit to bring in. First of all, when it comes to the solicitor-client relationship, it is something that is sacred and something that has been respected under British jurisprudence for hundreds and hundreds of years.

We had a incident which occurred in Sault Ste. Marie following which the minister said that we had cured it, we had gone a limited degree in trying to control the tapping of lawyers' phones. Let me say to the House, and particularly to the Minister of Justice, who should know this, who is a lawyer, who has been trained in the law, that the solicitor-client relationship is for the privilege of the client, and when you tap the lawyer's phone you are tapping all the private conversations. Surely to goodness somewhere in this life we have the right to express something in private without its being relayed through a tape recorder. Imagine a law firm with 50 or 100 lawyers—there are many such law firms in Canada—with one bad lawyer in the barrel and an authorization to wiretap his conversation.

An hon. Member: Only one?

Mr. Leggatt: There would be probably more than one in that barrel. How many conversations could be tapped? That is the question. It is not how many are authorized. How many people have had their privacy invaded under the terms of the wiretap legislation? When we see the number of authorizations filed, and see there are a little over 1,000 wiretaps authorized at the federal level, someone might think this does not seem to be excessive; but we must remember that some of them are taps that go on for three, four or five months, and hundreds of thousands of people who have had their privacy invaded do not know it.

Slowly, the feeling that you are not free to say what you want grows among the population and your freedoms are eroded insidiously as a result of the legislation. If you put one tap on a public telephone that is constantly used, or one tap on a law office and you keep it on for six months, every person who has used that phone will find his or her conversation recorded. Imagine how many conversations that could be. Do you know how many conversations would be recorded when they say that one wiretap has been authorized? The record will show there has been only one wiretap. What about the thousands of people who have been listened to and have had their privacy violated? They are innocent victims of the wiretap system.

If the minister had been concerned about civil liberties, he would have brought in a bill which made the reporting provisions require that every person whose conversation had been overheard was listed, and every conversation that was overheard was listed, so that we would have some idea of the extent of the wiretapping invasion of privacy in Canada. We do not have this under the bill before us. When the minister decided to bring in changes to this bill, he listened to only one source of information. He listened to the police. I can understand the police wanting to increase their powers with respect to the apprehension of criminals. That is their duty. I expect the commissioner of the RCMP and other police officers to want more power. But I expect the Minister of Justice to tell them they cannot have everything they want, in a free society. This is not a police state. This is supposed to be a state in which the Minister of Justice protects the people against the state, and we do not have that.

• (1710)

Let us consider the question of national security. If the Minister of Justice wants to improve the wiretap law, why does he not allow judges to authorize taps for national security? Why do we not trust our judges and bring them into our confidence? I have never known a judge I could not trust. Why cannot we have judges authorize taps under national security provisions? If the Minister of Justice were concerned about civil liberties, he would come down with that kind of change. One of the most significant changes would allow the introduction of illegally obtained evidence. The law is for everybody. There is not supposed to be one standard for the public and one for the police. If the police break the law, we should not reward that conduct by allowing the evidence obtained through that illegal act to be introduced in court. That is not a complicated proposition.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Why get authorization, if they can use the evidence anyway?

Mr. Leggatt: Right. If we are to control the number of taps and abuses, we will not do it unless we penalize those who act illegally by not allowing the evidence they obtain to be introduced. There is no check on abuses whatsoever. With regard to notification, we had a good law. We struggled in this House in 1973 to bring forward decent wiretap legislation. But what did the minister do? Again he listened to the police. Again, I do not blame the police. They do not want to provide notification. One of the greatest things to stop wiretapping excesses would be the requirement to notify people who are the subject of wiretapping.

The minister tells us that the police tell him the present law is not working, so he has decided to allow notification to take place after three years. After three years a person will not know what was tapped, when there was a tap, or anything else. We had a law which allowed a judge to provide reasonable, determinate delay, in his discretion. That provided ample delay for law enforcement officers. Again I say that the minister has lost confidence in the bench. He does not respect our judges—and they deserve respect—when he attempts to remove that discretion and says that there will be a three year limit. How many notifications will be made after less than three years? I do not think there will be very many. Without exception, I think notification will take place after three years and a very important regulation of the wiretap law will be lost.

We listened to much evidence about wiretapping. It has been dealt with extensively, but I want to read into the record something a very wise attorney general of the United States said in our committee.

Mr. Woolliams: That was Clark.

Mr. Leggatt: Ramsey Clark. Incidentally, he had a better record of apprehending mafia and criminal figures without wiretapping than all his successors have had with wiretapping. He was one of the most successful crime fighters the United States has seen.

Mr. Symes: Besides Nixon.

[Mr. Leggatt.]

Mr. Leggatt: Someone mentioned the former president of the United States. We know what happens to wiretapping when we open up that bag of tricks. It is amazing how many of the great devotees of law and order and wiretap law wind up on the wrong side of the law by the time they are finished. Once you open up wiretap provisions, you get into a Machiavellian state in which civil authority loses control. I want to read into the record what Ramsey Clark said in our committee back in 1973. He said:

> I come not to give advice but to express my impressions of the experience of your neighbour to the south. I come because I desperately hope to see from nations in this world the new moral leadership that is founded on the proposition that governments can protect their people without acting unfairly or immorally themselves in any respect. I believe that. I do not believe the rule of law can be an effective means of social change otherwise. I do not believe it can have the respect of the people otherwise and I have not seen a society or a people who believe that wiretapping is moral. It is inherently immoral and therefore to justify it you have to say the end thoughts justify these means.
>
> I come further because of my great concern about government lawlessness, the excessive use of force, violence, treachery and secrecy, and because I believe your fortunate country has a high opportunity and, with that, a high obligation to show the world that we can act fairly with safety.

That is a great compliment to pay to this country, by a person who has a worldwide reputation on the question of civil liberties and freedom of the individual. We should have listened to Ramsey Clark, because the events which have occurred since second reading of this bill—the events which occurred at L'Agence de Presse Libre, the inquiry into the Royal American Shows, the inquiry at Fredericton, New Brunswick, the question of Praxis, and the evidence that we do not yet know about but which has obviously convinced the Solicitor General of Canada (Mr. Fox) to appoint a royal commission into the activities of the RCMP—are all factors which should convince members of this House that a blank cheque on wiretapping is not necessary for the police forces of Canada, if the evidence is fresh.

I hope the Minister of Justice and hon. members opposite will not close their minds to this question, because it is one of the most serious moral questions this country has faced. We can have law and order, and we can have the forces of law and order obey the law. They do not need to use treachery, breaking and entering and wiretapping excessively, to invade the privacy of thousands and thousands of citizens, in order to maintain law and order. Respect for the law is not a one-way street. We must have respect for those who enforce the law. We must have respect for those who make judgments and for the Minister of Justice and the judgments he makes.

However, this insidious "Big Brother" legislation and this insidious "Big Brother" attitude on the part of this government, as represented by the Minister of Justice, should convince hon. members that this bill—because we cannot sever the wiretap provisions, although we may try—is not worthy of support. I want to tell the minister that if he would agree to sever the wiretap provisions, he could have the support of this party for the remainder of the bill. However, if we are unsuccessful in referring the wiretap provisions of this legislation back to the committee, he will not have the support of this

party. He will not deserve the support of this party or of the Canadian people.

Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Calgary North): Mr. Speaker, having listened to the eloquent speech of the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Leggatt), I find that my duty is much easier to perform. If ever I was in full agreement with anything said by a member of the New Democratic Party, I am in full accord today.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Woolliams: We stood shoulder to shoulder in the committee in this regard. Why has the Minister of Justice (Mr. Basford) decided to give the police authorities of this nation elephant ears so that those ears can stretch into the homes of every Canadian and invade privacy?

● (1720)

The next question is, what changes are being made in this bill? The period for wiretapping was extended by 100 per cent, from 30 days to 60 days, and a further extension can be applied for. As the law stands, in order to get authorization for tapping a telephone an application must be made to a judge. Authorization can be given for 30 days, and the person involved has to be given notice within 90 days after that. This bill has doubled the time of the right to wiretap by 100 per cent and it has done away with the period of notice of three years. But as the hon. member for New Westminster pointed out, applications for authority can be made repeatedly. The minister will say that it could be less than three years, but we know that once the three-year rule is adopted it will be generally used. There will be a form to be used as an affidavit because nobody cross-examines that kind of evidence.

I read an interesting statement by the Minister of Justice in the Ottawa *Citizen*, in which he was reported as saying that people guilty of trafficking in drugs were getting off because of the way the law stands now. On second reading I set out some cases, and I am not going to restate them. There may be one such case, as the minister said, where because of a technical error in the affidavit the evidence was declared inadmissible. But that is not the law of Canada and, again, the Minister of Justice has misstated the law. He should refer to "Weekly Criminal Bulletin" No. 34, of June 17, 1977, where on page 362 it is stated:

On voir dire—

That is a trial within a trial which was held to determine whether wiretap evidence was admissible.

—to determine admissibility of wiretaps, held: defence cannot cross-examine to show conditions precedent in s. 178.13 to granting of authorization not met as such irrelevant to lawfulness of interception once authorization granted.

The minister left the impression that because there was a technical mistake in the affidavit, the evidence would be thrown out. What does the Ray case say? What does the Supreme Court of Canada say? It says that even if there is an unauthorized wiretap—whether it is technical or otherwise, and even if you do not get an order—if it is relevant to the issue, it is admissible. That is the law. That is why I put down three distinct amendments on the order paper. One is to reinstate the 90-day period, and another is that any evidence gained from an unauthorized wiretap is inadmissible, or any evidence gathered as a result of an unauthorized wiretap is inadmissible. The minister wants to give the snooper more power. As the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands (Mr. Douglas) said, why bother about getting authorization because you can get it into evidence anyway?

The defence against my position is: if you have nothing to hide, why worry? Let us take the case of a medical clinic with a staff of 20 doctors, 25 nurses, X-ray and technical staff, where the police suspect that someone there is smoking marijuana and wiretap the clinic. They find that someone is getting marijuana from George, say, but it is not just the conversation establishing that which goes in as evidence: hundreds of conversations of people who have called their doctors on private matters are played in court. That is why they sometimes do not use the evidence, because it would take too long to play. But in this computer age, all this stuff is stored and is never done away with. Sarah gets pregnant at 16, is happily married at 22 and does not want her husband to know, but the information is on the computer because the clinic was wiretapped in relation to another matter.

Now let us take the case of a law firm with maybe 100 lawyers, 40 secretaries and 40 other people on staff. One person is suspected of breaking the law, so the office is wiretapped. Not only that, but the courthouse is wiretapped as well. The evidence obtained is admissible if it is relevant to the issue. Every lawyer's conversation in the court house is listened to and every lawyer's conversation in that law firm is listened to. As my hon. friend said, the privilege and confidentiality of such conversations is not to protect lawyers; a lawyer's job is to protect people against the state, and when their telephone conversation is tapped so is that of the average law-abiding citizen.

I should like to give an example of how bad this is, Mr. Speaker. My friend said he trusted the courts. I trust the judiciary, but I would remind hon. members that they are human beings. When this government appointed 19 lawyers to the bench, and 18 of them were known Grits, the right hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker) was asked what he thought about it. He said, "It is clear we have a just society. Now I understand. It is just for Grits."

The last murder trial in which I was defence counsel was a very serious case where someone had been stabbed some 30 times and died as a result. The defence was insanity, so I got an order to get a psychiatrist. The fellow was incarcerated. They were not going to let him out on bail until they decided just what the situation was. While the psychiatrist was interviewing the accused, that room was not only bugged but, as I proved at the trial, there was a spy representing the Crown in the room.

● (1730)

Once you open the door to that kind of electronic surveillance, you put elephant ears into every home in Canada. As I said in committee, the Minister of Justice might as well get it over with. Get hold of Bell Telephone and all the other telephone companies in this country, run all telephones through a computer, then turn on the computer so the police can sit back, enjoy life and listen to the conversations of every Canadian. In three years, somebody might be notified. If they are not notified, the evidence is still admissible if it is relevant to the issue.

There is another development which was reported in the *Globe and Mail*. You can listen in on telephone conversations internationally by microwave. The United States is concerned that the U.S.S.R. is tapping their long-distance calls. Maybe we have reached the point talked about by Mr. Cooper and Mr. Cartwright when they appeared before the committee. They are lawyers of the Law Society of Upper Canada. They said we may have reached the time when, if you want to talk to anybody, the lawyer talking with a client, or a doctor with a patient, you must find some lonely place in the bush and then check the trees to see whether they are bugged.

I am opposed to this legislation which gives more authority to the state against law-abiding citizens. That is why I moved the motion. A lawyer's office should not be bugged, not because he is a lawyer but because it is a place where law-abiding citizens discuss their problems in reference to the state. That must be privileged and confidential in accordance with the common law. I spoke about the clinic. I say any evidence derived from wiretapping should be declared inadmissible if it is an unauthorized wiretap.

The hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands (Mr. Douglas), a former leader of the NDP and former premier of a province, was right when he said, "Why bother getting the authority?" The evidence can be admissible even if it is from an unauthorized wiretap. Even worse, not only the evidence gathered as a result of the wiretap goes in, but other facts found out in reference to that. The police do not bother with a code. Let's not be children. They go on wiretap and they listen. When they finally find some information, they send one of the boys down to try to catch that person. That evidence can be admissible. That is why we oppose this kind of legislation.

The Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) said that the state had no place in the bedrooms of the average Canadian. Before becoming a member of parliament, when he was a member of the NDP—

Some hon. Members: No, no!

Mr. Woolliams: They deny him. They are just like the disciples. In any event, he finally became respectable when he became Liberal. He stood for civil rights, unions and other such things. Maybe the state has no place in the bedrooms of this nation, but it is in there. The law has no business in the homes of law-abiding citizens, rooting around, listening and looking for crime that may be minor in nature. Next we will have—and this matter has already been raised in the House by the hon. member for Central Nova (Mr. MacKay)—"no knock" legislation, permitting the police to break into homes for whatever reason. If we accept this legislation, we will have "no knock" legislation. The government says no harm can come from this. I wish to read from an article in the Criminal Law Review, by T. B. Radley. It deals with how wiretaps can be changed. I quote:

> As to the limit of fineness of elimination which is possible with good machines and skilful operators, this is smaller than might be expected. It is often possible, granted skill, to eliminate even a single monosyllabic word. The easiest way to do this is to turn off the loudspeaker current while the word is being spoken. This leaves a little gap of silence on a dubbing, but even this gap can be closed if necessary.
>
> Turning for a moment to a hypothetical recorded confession, it is apparent that a remark originally, " I am not guilty," could be altered fairly easily to "I am guilty."

I once acted in a murder trial in which the police went to arrest a certain woman. There was a question as to whether the husband, or the wife, had committed the crime. She was walking around the room saying, "Why did I do it?". As I said to the jury, it could have been "Why? Did I do it?" That is exactly the way things can be changed. You can leave out the word "not" so that it is affirmative. Sometimes members of this place try to be humorous. Someone reading *Hansard* on a platform in the hustings can make it sound entirely different when it is taken out of context. The minister said they have compromised, leaving it to the discretion of the judiciary.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Order, please. I regret to interrupt the hon. member, but his allotted time has expired. He may continue only with unanimous consent. Does the hon. member have consent to continue?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Woolliams: The hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville (Mr. MacGuigan), a very distinguished scholar and former dean, was opposed to this bill, but the minister and his friends got close to him. They came up with a compromise. They said they would leave the decision to the discretion of the judge. Where there is no authorization and something is improper, they said they would leave it to the discretion of the judge and there would be no problem. The Ray case in the Supreme Court of Canada stated that if something is relevant, it is admissible. All the other judges are controlled by the highest court in the land. The Supreme Court of Canada states that if it is relevant, it does not matter how it is obtained. So we leave it to the discretion of the judge, and the trial judge says, "Well, my hands are tied. If it happens to be relevant to the issue, it is admissible." That is no compromise at all. That is why I say any evidence derived from an unauthorized wiretap should be inadmissible, and any evidence derived from listening to a doctor, a lawyer or any other professional person, or people in that type of service dealing with human beings, should be privileged and confidential. Otherwise you might as well turn on the computer and listen to all the telephone calls that go through a police station.

• (1740)

What the minister has done is give the state and the police elephants ears so that they can be in every home and every room belonging to every law-abiding Canadian. That is what he is doing today. That is why members over there want to rush this bill through. In addition, this measure is linked with gun control, prison reform and dangerous offenders. We know why this was all put together. It was because the minister knows he could not have got the gun section through, or this part of the bill through if he could not put it in one package.

The party to which I belong moved that this bill be split, and the New Democratic Party supported us, so that we could have voted separately on gun control, wiretapping, dangerous offenders, reform and parole. That would have been reasonable legislation.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Woolliams: We, as a party, intend to vote against this bill on third reading. I hope every Canadian, particularly those in his constituency, will remind the Minister of Justice of what he has done to the Criminal Code and to the average Canadian in reference to the invasion of privacy.

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Justice): Perhaps I might just say a word at this point. I appreciate the fact that two hon. members have spoken across the range of the wiretap section. They have spoken briefly and I know there is a desire to move very quickly, so I shall be brief. I might say, first of all, that I do not think much is accomplished by one group or by another group, whether on this side of the House or on the other, claiming that they are more concerned with civil liberties than some other group in the House. I think all groups and all members of the House are concerned with the rights and civil liberties of Canadians, since this is obviously a function of parliament. But we need to address ourselves to the problems which face the country, and it is up to us to deal with them in a realistic and proper way while at the same time protecting Canadians.

This having been said, I want to go briefly into the history of the wiretapping section which was put into the Criminal Code in 1974 after long discussion, debate and examination of the question by a parliamentary committee. That committee came to a number of conclusions. Until then, as hon. members know, there was no law relating to electronic surveillance or wiretapping. There was no law prohibiting it. It was clear there were people engaged in private wiretapping and that the police were also engaged in wiretapping without any judicial supervision whatsoever.

The committee, in 1974, came to three conclusions. First, that there should be no private wiretapping—that no private citizen should be able to eavesdrop on the telephone or communications of another citizen. That is the law now, and will remain the law and should remain the law. There is no dispute about that. Second, the committee came to the conclusion that electronic surveillance was an indispensable tool in the hands of the police against a certain set of crimes, and that under proper judicial supervision electronic surveillance should be available to the police for this purpose.

Furthermore, there should be a particular section in the act relating to organized crime which was, and is, a menace in this country. The particular wording in the Criminal Code related to organized crime was written by Ron Atkey, a former member of parliament who sat for the Conservative party, a man whose record in civil liberties is well recognized but who, in parliament, acknowledged that in certain circumstances wiretapping was necessary. He, in fact, wrote the wording relating to organized crime.

Two things have happened since 1974 when that law was written. One is that the organized crime section has not worked because no judge knows the legal meaning of "organized crime". The other is that every attorney general in this country has annually reported that because of the provisions of the wiretap legislation they are handicapped in the investigation of certain major crimes and handicapped in their investigation of organized crime. I submit, as I have submitted throughout, that there is no dispute in this country or, at any rate, there should not be, as to who feels the greater concern for the civil liberties of Canadians. But I also assert that it is the responsibility of the House to take account of the reports we have received on the activities of organized crime and endeavour to write the law in such a way as to give the police, under proper judicial supervision, the instruments to allow them to investigate, charge, prosecute and convict organized criminals more effectively.

What went on in the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs was a long and thorough investigation of that section. Knowledgeable people from both sides of the House served on that committee. I had initially suggested to the committee that an authorization for wiretap should be obtainable by the police from a judge for any offence carrying a sentence of five years or more. After much discussion, that proposition was rejected by the committee and the committee went back to the form of the existing Criminal Code, working on the basis of a list of serious crimes with a separate section on organized crime. So if the police officers, through Crown counsel, went to a judge they could get an authorization on the basis of the suspected commission of named offences or of organized criminal activities. The committee examined that list, the list presently in the Criminal Code.

Mr. Woolliams: What committee are we talking about?

Mr. Basford: The Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs. That list was approved by a vote in the committee. The hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Leggatt) has proposed an amendment to restrict the list of offences and restrict the meaning of "organized crime". It may well be unintentional on his part, but if his amendment were to carry it would amount to an open season for organized crime in this country.

An hon. Member: Nonsense.

Mr. Basford: Just listen for a moment. The specific offences left out of the list—and I think they are serious offences—are such as the possession of explosives which could be and have been used by terrorists and saboteurs, fraud upon the government, breach of trust by public officials, and municipal corruption. All these are activities which I regard as serious and which I believe the country regards as serious. Then there is bribery, obstructing justice, an offence which could relate, for example to jury tampering and unlawful interception. This has been taken out and I do not think it should be excluded. Surely it should be a serious offence to illegally wiretap another person's communications, and it seems to me that this is something which is most "catchable" or "investigatable" through electronic surveillance.

● (1750)

With regard to fraudulent manipulation of stock exchanges, we have seen, not necessarily organized crime but very big criminals move into this country for purposes of committing offences under this section. This is an activity which is not carried out on the street in the usual criminal haunts, but in office towers—

Mr. Leggatt: A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Order. The hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Leggatt) is rising on a point of order.

Mr. Leggatt: Mr. Speaker, I know that the minister is anxious to proceed with his legislation, and I may be able to save some time. He is now referring to a section of the motion which deals with the definition of "organized crime" and the offences which are tappable. From reading my section, I now see what the minister is getting at. I can assure the House that I did not intend to limit the tapping of organized crime as defined in the motion only to those offences which carry a sentence of ten years or more. I intended to leave it open to any other offence created by an act of parliament for which an offender may be prosecuted by indictment; that is, an offence mentioned in section 3 or section 20 of the Small Loans Act. So it is inadvertence on my part, and for that I apologize to the House.

As I say, if the Minister of Justice wants to save time, it is not necessary for him to dwell on that section. My intention is very clear; I want this section to have the capacity to tap organized crime for all indictable offences, including, of course, the sections under the Small Loans Act.

Mr. Basford: Mr. Speaker, I asked the hon. member to listen to me for a moment, and I am glad that he did and that he got my point. Because by the use of the words "in furtherance" in his amendment, it clearly has the result that the only way you can wiretap organized crime is if an offence on the list was being committed—which leaves out certain serious offences and would be, as I say, an open season for organized crime. I accept the word of the hon. member that that is a case of inadvertence, but obviously it leaves me having to resist the amendment.

Even forgetting the organized crime section for a moment, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that some of the offences that I have mentioned are serious. They are not necessarily committed by what might be called organized crime; they are committed by major criminals and should be in the list of offences for which the police, under proper judicial supervision, can obtain an authorization to wiretap.

I mention only the last one, pornography, which the committee put in deliberately. There is a good deal of concern in this House and in the country about the kind of hard core pornography that is coming into Canada. I am not referring to the *Playboy* magazine type, but to hard core pornography, depicting young children in the commission of sexual acts either with themselves or with adults, bestiality and other magazines of that kind. It seems to me that the committee looked at these offences carefully, examined each one and made a recommendation to the House which should, with respect, be accepted.

One last quick point, Mr. Speaker. The hon. member referred to smuggling. He ridiculed the section on the basis of some tourist coming in with some panties which she refused to declare. I can assure the House, as I did the committee, that the customs officials have neither the intention nor the resources to wiretap in those cases. Whether or not it be someone failing to declare a pair of panties, the section also includes smuggling carloads or truckloads of, for example, pornographic material. It includes smuggling of stolen goods in huge quantities by very sophisticated, major criminals. Therefore, it seems to me that while one might ridicule smuggling on the one hand, there are certainly smuggling activites which are serious and dangerous and are a large part of criminal activity in this country.

Mr. F. Oberle (Prince George-Peace River): Mr. Speaker, my summer is moving along just as quickly as that of the Minister of Justice (Mr. Basford). I should like to stroll the streets of Prince George to be with my constituents just as much as the minister would like to walk down Robson's Cross in Vancouver and do the same there. His need, of course, is greater than mine because I am not the sponsor of this bill which is before us and which is cutting into the work we should be doing in our constituencies this year.

I sat on this committee for some time as a layman, and as you can well imagine, Mr. Speaker, the deliberations were often tedious and boring for a layman who does not understand all this legal jargon which our learned and honourable colleagues indulge in at times in this House and certainly in committee. But as a private citizen and a layman, I was appalled, concerned, at times frightened, by the testimony that was placed before the committee.

Not all the evidence was brought before the committee, of course, because when the committee was finally prorogued on the gun sections of the bill I understand there were some 24 application from groups of individuals throughout the county to appear before the committee to give testimony. I never

understood why there was this indecent haste about this bill. There was indecent haste last year and there is, again, indecent haste about this omnibus bill.

I hear the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway (Mrs. Holt) interjecting. I would invite her to stand up and participate in this debate, and don't you tell me that I have blood on my hands as well.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Order, please. The hon. member for Prince George-Peace River (Mr. Oberle) should address the Chair.

Mr. Oberle: Would you call it six o'clock, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Woolliams: May I just have one word with the Chair?

Mr. MacFarlane: No, sit down.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Order, please. The hon. member for Prince George-Peace River has the floor.

Mr. Woolliams: I am sorry; I thought he was calling it six o'clock.

Mr. Oberle: I yield the floor to my hon. friend from Calgary.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Is the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams) rising on a point of order?

Mr. Woolliams: Mr. Speaker, the point I want to make is this. The hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Leggatt) did make an error in his amendment which he would like to correct, I hope by unanimous consent. I hope that when this bill is called again tomorrow there is an order that he be able to make this change to his amendment. I think it would be fair to him. He is a distinguished member of the House and he is a lawyer. We are all very busy and have a lot to do in our offices, but he found he made one little mistake in a phrase. I ask that the House consent that he be allowed to change his amendment to what he really intended to say.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Has the hon. member for New Westminster the consent of the House to correct his amendment?

Mr. Basford: With respect, Mr. Speaker, it was I who pointed out the error—

Mr. Paproski: You want to take the credit.

Mr. Basford: No; I would like to know exactly what the correction is.

Mr. Leggatt: Mr. Speaker, on that very point, if I can be recognized I should like to give the exact deletion required to make the motion square with the argument which has been presented in support of it. In the third to last line of the motion the words "mentioned in paragraph (a)" should be deleted from the motion.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Is that agreed?

Mr. Basford: Mr. Speaker, unless we are voting on it right now, and I do not think we are, I should like to give my reaction tomorrow, if I may.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): It being six o'clock p.m., this House stands adjourned until two o'clock p.m. tomorrow, pursuant to Standing Order 2(1).

At 6.01 p.m. the House adjourned, without question put, pursuant to Standing Order.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Thursday, July 14, 1977

The House met at 2 p.m.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

CENTRAL MORTGAGE AND HOUSING CORPORATION

REQUEST FOR TABLING OF INSPECTION AND MANAGEMENT MANUALS FOR HOUSING PROJECTS—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Dean Whiteway (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, I rise under the provisions of Standing Order 43 on a matter of urgent and pressing necessity. In view of the newly enlightened spirit of this government and its reformed will to make more information available to members of parliament, and in view of the refusal by the President of Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation to produce guidelines affecting the approval, management and inspection of housing projects, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Parry Sound-Muskoka (Mr. Darling):

That this House direct the Minister of State for Urban Affairs to table forthwith inspection guidelines, project officer manuals and lending approval criteria as requested by members in committee during the hearings on main estimates.

Mr. Speaker: Presentation of such a motion for debate pursuant to the Standing Order can be done only with the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

* * *

BELL CANADA

SUGGESTED PROTECTION FOR SUBSCRIBERS AGAINST FURTHER RATE INCREASES—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Cyril Symes (Sault Ste. Marie): Mr. Speaker, I rise under the provisions of Standing Order 43 to move a motion of urgent and pressing necessity. Since senior Bell Canada executives have stated that that company intends to approach the CRTC before this year's end for another rate increase, and whereas a June 1, 1977 rate decision increased company revenue by $162 million and a January 1976 rate decision increased Bell's coffers by $110.3 million, and in light of the fact that Bell executives cite delays due to public hearings in receiving approval of the $162 million increase as a justification for the new application, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Cape Breton-East Richmond (Mr. Hogan):

That this House instruct the CRTC to protect telephone subscribers from further uncalled for rate increases by reassessing Bell's profitability by examining the earnings of Bell's subsidiaries, and further that the CRTC not speed up public hearings to suit the corporate interests of Bell over those of its subscribers.

Mr. Speaker: Presentation of such a motion for debate requires the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

* * *

● (1410)

[*Translation*]

AGRICULTURE

REQUEST FOR STATEMENT BY MINISTER ON RESULTS OF VICTORIA CONFERENCE—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Léonel Beaudoin (Richmond): Pursuant to Standing Order 43, Mr. Speaker, I seek the unanimous consent of the House to move a motion on a matter of urgent and pressing necessity.

Considering that the Minister of Agriculture has taken part, together with his provincial colleagues, in a very important conference of a few days duration in Vancouver, that all hon. members in the House, as well as indeed all Canadian farmers, are anxious to see significant changes made to the agricultural policies of Canada, and that the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Whelan) could no doubt advise the House of the main issues which were dealt with during this conference, as well as the resolutions which were agreed upon, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Shefford (Mr. Rondeau):

The the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Whelan) make a statement in the House, followed by a question period, concerning the direction he intends to take following the agreements entered upon during the last federal-provincial conference of agricultural ministers.

Mr. Speaker: Order. Under Standing Order 43, this motion requires the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

[*English*]

FARM CREDIT CORPORATION

PROPOSED REFERENCE TO COMMITTEE OF MANAGEMENT AUDIT BY SIBBALD GROUP—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Perrin Beatty (Wellington-Grey-Dufferin-Waterloo): Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that a recent management audit of the Farm Credit Corporation conducted by the Sibbald group disclosed serious management problems within the Farm Credit Corporation, declining employee morale and moonlighting on government time by some employees, and in view of the unwillingness or the inability of government to give adequate explanations as to how they intend to deal with these problems, despite the clear need for the government to show ministerial responsibility in dealing with this $306 million federal corporation, I ask the unanimous consent of the House, under Standing Order 43, to move, seconded by the hon. member for Battle River (Mr. Malone):

That the management audit of the Farm Credit Corporation prepared by the Sibbald group be referred to the Standing Committee on Agriculture for examination, and that the Minister of Agriculture appear before that committee to explain what action the government has taken or proposes to take to deal with the serious problems in the Farm Credit Corporation.

Mr. Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 43, presentation of such a motion for debate can be done only with the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

* * *

CRIMINAL CODE

SUGGESTED REINTRODUCTION OF CAPITAL PUNISHMENT—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Stan Schumacher (Palliser): Mr. Speaker, I rise under the provisions of Standing Order 43 to move a motion on a matter of urgent and pressing necessity. In view of the fact that this is the first anniversary of the complete abolition of the death penalty in Canada, and in view of the fact that today a young police officer, killed in the performance of his duties, is being laid to rest, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Dauphin (Mr. Ritchie):

That this House ask the government to immediately bring forward a measure reintroducing capital punishment.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. With all due respect to the sincerity of the motion before us, which has described the anniversary of the bill and the tragic events, I do not see any element of urgency to the subject matter raised.

[Mr. Speaker.]

CANADA PENSION PLAN

PROPOSED PENSIONS FOR ALL HOMEMAKER SPOUSES—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, even in this twelfth year of the Canada Pension Plan, the urgency of the matter I wish to raise under Standing Order 43 will not go away. Indeed, it becomes more pressing as time goes on. Therefore, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands (Mr. Douglas):

That this House urges the government to bring in legislation to provide pensions for all homemaker spouses, in their own right, equivalent to those earned by contributors to the Canada Pension Plan, thus recognizing for pension purposes the contribution to our society made by those who work in the home, and this House urges that such legislation be included in the Queen's speech to be made at the opening of the next session of this parliament.

Miss MacDonald: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 43, presentation of such a motion for debate requires the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[*English*]

BILINGUALISM

RESTRICTION OF RIGHT TO ENGLISH LANGUAGE EDUCATION UNDER QUEBEC'S BILL 101—GOVERNMENT ACTION

Mr. Joe Clark (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Prime Minister. In view of the fact that the government of Quebec has now presented Bill 101 and that that bill has no changes in the provisions restricting the right to English language education of Canadian children moving from other provinces, I wonder if the Prime Minister will tell the House whether he or the constitutional advisers to the government have this matter under consideration? What options are they considering now in light of the fact that this bill is almost certain to be passed by the Parti Québécois majority in the Quebec legislature?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, we were certainly surprised and saddened to see that the bill was brought back under a new number without any change in this very fundamental provision, to which the federal government has indicated its opposition. It is still a formal bill and it will be heard by the relevant committee of the Quebec legislature. We are still hopeful that the Parti Québécois government will see its way clear to change this very serious infraction of the right of Canadians to move across the country. In its present form, it looks as if the Parti Québécois is acting as

though the province were already separated. This is a point of view we most seriously deny and attack.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Trudeau: The federal government's position on this has been made very clear, to wit that English-speaking Canadians from other parts of Canada should be able to move into Quebec and have their children go to the official language school of their choice when such schools exist and are justified by numbers of English-speaking Canadians.

An hon. Member: And vice versa.

Mr. Trudeau: Yes, we have also indicated in our policy that, vice versa, French-speaking Canadians moving from Quebec to other centres where there are sufficient numbers of French-speaking Canadians should find schools in that language so that they can exercise the same freedom to move and have their children educated in the language of their choice.

The Leader of the Opposition asks if there has been a reference to the Department of Justice. Certainly, the minister and I have discussed this matter, but there would not be a formal reference of a bill to his law officers until that bill became law and until the constitutionality or otherwise of the bill was made an object of study by the Department of Justice.

Mr. Clark: Just so we are clear, Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister has repeated the principle that he says guides the attitude of his government. He indicated that the only action the government has taken to this point is that there has been a discussion between himself and the Minister of Justice. There has been no reference to the law officers of the Crown to get a legal opinion of the constitutionality of a bill that holds every likelihood of being passed into law by the government of Quebec. Does the Prime Minister agree that citizens who are facing passage of a law which calls into question long standing rights that they have exercised are entitled to some reassurance from the government of Canada that this government will concern itself with their problems. What kind of reassurance is the Prime Minister prepared to give those Canadians today?

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, I dealt with this matter a few weeks ago when the Secretary of State tabled his paper on language policy. I indicated it was our hope that the provinces within the area of education, an area in their constitutional jurisdiction, would want to protect the linguistic rights of the official minorities in their provinces. I went further and said we would be prepared to envisage a constitutional amendment which would give the federal government the authority in the area of education to step in and protect those rights.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Trudeau: With the present state of the constitution, the Leader of the Opposition knows that the area of education is within the jurisdiction of the provinces. We are still hopeful that Bill 101 will be amended. If it is not and it passes into law, we will pursue the two courses that I just indicated, get the provinces together to try to obtain from them some guarantee for their linguistic minorities and, if not, press for a constitutional amendment that will give us the authority to intervene on behalf of minorities.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

POSSIBILITY OF REFERRING QUEBEC'S BILL 101 TO SUPREME COURT

Mr. Joe Clark (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister has indicated two courses of action that could be taken, both of which would be some time in having any consequence. I note that the Prime Minister did not make any reference to the possibility of the matter of the constitutionality of the bill, once it becomes the law, going before the courts. Does the Prime Minister exclude the possibility that the federal government would on its own initiative refer such a law to the Supreme Court in view of the serious questions that arise as to its effect on constitutional rights? In any case, will the Prime Minister commit the government of Canada to intervene in a court action brought by private citizens to protect constitutional rights which may be infringed by any such law?

● (1420)

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the answer to the first question is, no, we do not exclude such a course. In answer to the second question, it would be most likely the way in which the federal government would act by intervening in a case which would be brought by private citizens, which is the general and normal way whereby the federal government intervenes to plead the constitutionality or otherwise of the law.

Mr. Diefenbaker: What about disallowance?

Mr. Trudeau: That was not the question of your leader. You could wait a moment.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Paproski: You better be careful or the right hon. gentleman will bop you on the nose, making you worse than you are.

An hon. Member: Watch that face.

Mr. Trudeau: Just because the right hon. gentleman had the privilege of sleeping with me one night on the aeroplane does not mean—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Some hon. Members: Shame.

An hon. Member: The government has no place in the bedrooms of the nation.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Trudeau: Of course, we would keep open the possibility of intervening in a court case as, incidentally, we have done in Manitoba in a case which is not completely dissimilar, at least in so far as language rights are concerned. Here again, it would depend on our views on the constitutionality or otherwise of that particular piece of legislation. I should tell the Leader of the Opposition that in matters of education, I, personally, am not speaking yet as one who has been advised by the Minister of Justice or that department but I, personally, have always taken the view that educational rights were for the province to legislate upon and that there were only certain confessional aspects of those rights which permitted the federal government to intervene and plead ultra vires in that particular decision. But this is a legal discussion which I would gladly hold until the bill has become law and until the law officers of the Crown have reported on it.

Mr. Clark: To make it absolutely clear could the Prime Minister say whether the situation now is that there is no formal study by the law officers of the Crown of Canada of the constitutionality of Bill 101? That is not now being undertaken by the federal law officers?

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, as I said, I discussed this matter with the Minister of Justice. I cannot say that he has not discussed this matter with his officials and that they have not begun to look at the bill before it becomes law. I said there has been no decision on my part or by the cabinet to ask for a formal opinion about the bill until it becomes law. We still hope the bill will be changed and that the law will be better than it is now.

RIGHT TO EDUCATION IN OFFICIAL LANGUAGE OF CHOICE—GOVERNMENT'S INTERPRETATION OF "RIGHT"

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Halifax): I am sure we all share the hope of the Prime Minister that the law now before the Quebec National Assembly will be more to our taste and more in accordance with our views than at present. I now seek some elucidation from the Prime Minister. Is he not using the word "right" in two senses? His government has stated most categorically that, subject to circumstances which may make a deferment of application necessity, Canadians have a right to have their children educated in the official language of their choice. Now, he has just said that the right within the field is in the provincial jurisdiction. Is the government of Canada in fact declaring that Canadians do have this right, or is it more accurate to state that they express the hope that this right will be appealed some day?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): I think the hon. member for Halifax knows the answer to that question, but I would certainly repeat it for him. In areas of provincial jurisdiction we can express hopes that rights will be respected, but we cannot legislate in those areas. Naturally, the paper tabled by the Secretary of State a couple of weeks ago covered the whole area of languages in Canada. Some matters can be legislated exclusively by the provinces. Because of that, however, we did not feel that we should be precluded from expressing the view that we have of Canadian citizens and how this country should be operated as one country. It is in that sense that we talked of rights; not in the legal sense, but as they should be.

Mr. Stanfield: Mr. Speaker, whatever differences we may have in some areas I do not think there are any differences between myself and the right hon. gentleman on the subject of languages. Having said that, I would like to ask the Prime Minister whether it is appropriate for the federal government to declare rights or to appear to declare rights in areas of provincial jurisdiction, and whether it is really in the interests of national unity for the federal government to appear to declare a right for Canadian citizens and have that challenged by a province within a matter of weeks. I ask that question most earnestly.

Mr. Trudeau: I suppose this is a question of approach and of tactics. The hon. gentleman indicates that we are probably agreed on substance in so far as our belief in language policy. However, in so far as this particular question is concerned, we, in our paper tabled by the Secretary of State, did not hesitate to use the word "right" because we intended to signal to the provinces that we think this particular right should exist in the constitution.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Trudeau: The hon. gentleman will recall that in 1971 at Victoria we indeed stated rights that did not exist, relative to entrenching the official languages in the constitution. They were not rights in the sense that they did not then exist in the constitutional sense, but we wanted them to become constitutional rights. We are saying the same thing in this particular area about the right of minorities in Canada to be able to move where they want in Canada and to be able to continue having their children educated in the official language of their choice.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Stanfield: Without questioning the earnestness and the good faith of the right hon. gentleman in this area, I ask him whether, when the right hon. gentleman is referring to the intention to do everything possible to protect those rights, the declaration of rights will not create tensions in the country, which we can well do without at the present time.

Mr. Trudeau: I understand that it is the general inclination of the hon. gentleman never to provoke confrontation of any kind or anything which might be described as a tension, but it seems to me that in this particular case if there is any tension, it results from the actions of a government in Quebec which was not elected on a mandate to separate but which is now acting as though the country is—

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

ENERGY

NATURAL GAS—PROPOSED INCREASE IN EXPORTS TO UNITED STATES—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources. Last week the National Energy Board indicated to the petroleum industry its willingness to consider applications to increase gas exports to the United States during the next five to seven years. As a result two companies, TransCanada Pipeline and Pan-Alberta Gas, are now stepping up their purchase contracts to a combined total of 1.5 billion cubic feet per day, and they claim that they do not anticipate any difficulties or delays in getting National Energy Board approval to export part of this gas.

● (1430)

In view of the fact that the last report of the National Energy Board foresees a shortage of gas in Canada at the earliest by 1982 and at the latest by 1985, does the government approve of stepping up gas exports to the United States in view of the pessimistic and gloomy forecast which the National Energy Board has made with respect to Canada's anticipated gas shortages within the next five to eight years?

Hon. Alastair Gillespie (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, the government has not been asked to approve and we have not been given any reasons why we should approve.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I am raising the question with the minister because I thought he would be aware of the action of the National Energy Board and would be willing to give the government's views to the National Energy Board if not to the House. In the proposal being made it is now suggested that the increased exports to the United States should be on a swap arrangement by which Alberta gas would be sold in exchange for Alaskan gas to be delivered when the pipeline is built.

Does the minister not think that this means Canada will be selling cheap gas to our American neighbours and in due course purchasing Alaskan gas at two or three times the price we have received for the Alberta gas? I should like to ask the minister if he considers this to be in the best interests of Canadian consumers and whether he proposes to make any representations to the National Energy Board who, after all, are appointed to protect the interests of Canadian consumers?

Mr. Gillespie: Mr. Speaker, I understand very well the question the hon. member is raising about selling now and buying back later on a more expensive basis. The National Energy Board raised this sort of question in its recent report with respect to the Arctic gas pipeline questions. Those are the sorts of questions which members in the coming weeks during the debate in the House of Commons, will have an opportunity to examine. Undoubtedly, there will be considerations which will bear upon the final decision of the government.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): A final supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. The National Energy Board report speaks of the gas surplus "bubble" and points out quite properly that many of the gas companies want to sell their gas. If they cannot sell it in Canada they want to sell it in the United States in order to get sufficient financing for further exploration. That is understandable. I want to ask the minister if he or the government as a whole have given any consideration to the advisability of using Petro-Canada to buy gas in the ground, as is done in many countries and as has been done in Saskatchewan for many years where they bought gas in the ground in Saskatchewan and in Alberta as well. Such a procedure would enable the companies to get the necessary cash flow to continue exploration programs while at the same time retaining the cheap gas for the future needs of Canadians rather than swapping it now and having to pay very high prices to get Alaskan gas years later?

Mr. Gillespie: In general terms, Mr. Speaker, I have had discussions with senior officers of Petro-Canada about the gas situation in Alberta and what part of Petro-Canada might play with respect to the development of those resources. As the hon. member knows, those resources are subject to the controls and regulations of the Alberta government. I think one of the ways of alleviating the situation with the gas producers who have found gas, as the hon. member pointed out, largely as a result of the incentives which the Alberta government and this government have provided through higher prices—something which he has resisted—might be the pro-rationing by the Alberta government.

* * *

[*Translation*]

INDUSTRY

POSSIBILITY OF RESTRICTING SHOE IMPORTS TO PREVENT UNEMPLOYMENT IN QUEBEC

Mr. Léonel Beaudoin (Richmond): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce. Could he indicate whether he has replied to a letter from the Quebec Industry and Commerce Minister Rodrigue Tremblay in connection with the urgent need of restricting footwear imports in Canada to preserve some 10,000 jobs involved in Quebec alone?

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, I have received several representations to that effect including those from my Quebec counterpart. This week, the Anti-dumping Tribunal should report to the Minister of Finance and at the beginning of next week we hope to table the report concerning the steps to be taken to assist this industry experiencing some difficulties at the present time.

Mr. Beaudoin: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a supplementary question. Since the House is to adjourn tomorrow—a motion to this effect appears on the order paper—will the minister be in a position to give us tomorrow some news to reassure the workers in that industry?

Mr. Chrétien: Mr. Speaker, I would very much like to be able to do it tomorrow, but I do not believe I shall have received the report by then. However, I shall act as quickly as possible, as I already indicated to the hon. member.

* * *

[*English*]

GRAIN

WHEAT—POSSIBILITY OF INCREASING QUOTA FOR 1976 CROP YEAR

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Prince Albert): Mr. Speaker, I ask this question with becoming appreciation of the fact that the Prime Minister said we slept together, which apparently indicates that having taken me for a ride I was to be denied any further interruptions. I want to assure him that he is entirely wrong. We did not even follow the Scottish custom of bundling together. I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, no bolster was needed between us.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Diefenbaker: In that spirit may I ask the amiable Minister of Transport a question. A number of prairie farmers have been in touch with me because they have found themselves unable, because of restrictive quotas, to dispose of their 1976 crop. As there remain only 16 days in which they can sell their wheat before last year's production will come under the 1977 quota, will the minister approach the Wheat Board about increasing the quota so that farmers who have a great deal of wheat on hand today may dispose of a portion, if not all of it, in the current crop year?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I have discussed this matter several times recently with the Canadian Wheat Board. They are opening the appropriate quotas to bring in all the kinds of grain required. Last year the prairie provinces produced an all-time record volume of grain. The result is that with the current program of selling, even though it is the highest in history except for the two superb years, 1971 and 1972, there is a small increase in the supply of wheat on hand at the end of this crop year. It is very encouraging for farmers to note the forward selling program by the Canadian Wheat Board, a very successful Canadian marketing agency, assures that very brisk movement of grain will continue. There will be space in the elevators so that farmers can deliver straight from their combines. This was not possible under previous systems.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, I would point out to the minister that we have an accumulation of wheat. It is piling up at a tremendous rate. After going to Europe and personally finding out the situation there, in the last few days Premier Lougheed has contended that we are losing our markets because of the failure of this government to act.

An hon. Member: He was wrong.

[Mr. Beaudoin.]

Mr. Diefenbaker: In view of the fact that the Minister without Portfolio (Mr. Horner) is being regarded as the representative of the western farmer, would the minister consult with him and get his support for what he has already spoken his support for?

Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, I think it is important in this House to meet the suggestions of Premier Lougheed which are completely unfounded criticisms of the Canadian Wheat Board and its operation. As a matter of very serious fact his interference and intervention in marketing has done more real harm and his criticism of the Canadian Wheat Board is absolute nonsense at a time when our sales have increased our share of world markets and sales ahead have increased it even more.

* * *

● (1440)

ROYAL CANADIAN MOUNTED POLICE

REQUEST FOR REPORT ON INVESTIGATION IN NOVA SCOTIA

Mr. Elmer M. MacKay (Central Nova): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Solicitor General. An extensive RCMP investigation has been proceeding in Halifax and other parts of Nova Scotia for some time. I ask the Solicitor General, further to our earlier brief conversations, what progress is being made pursuant to the raids by the force in various premises in Halifax and other parts of Nova Scotia, including the premises of a Halifax firm, Automatic Amusement Co. Ltd. I realize the minister has been busy in cabinet this morning; perhaps he could give the House some information, since my information is that this investigation may extend to the highest echelons of the Nova Scotia government.

Hon. Francis Fox (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for giving notice this morning of his intention to raise his question in the House this afternoon. It has been the practice of previous Solicitors General and my practice not to say if any specific individual in the country is being investigated unless that investigation has become common knowledge, and I see no reason to depart from that rule which is designed to protect peoples' civil rights. At any given time the force is carrying out a number of investigations into the activities of individuals in provinces where the force has policing responsibility, but I would be adversely affecting peoples' civil rights if I were to say, "Yes, Mr. so and so is being investigated, or he is not." I hope the hon. gentleman will therefore accept my answer on those grounds.

Mr. MacKay: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I thank the minister for his answer. Perhaps the minister will assure the House that he will check to make sure that in this case the RCMP are, as I assume, receiving maximum co-operation from the Nova Scotia attorney general's department, that wiretaps used in this investigation has been obtained under proper legal procedures and that this investigation, significant as it is, is being carried out entirely in accordance with the law. Can the minister give me that assurance?

Mr. Fox: Mr. Speaker, I have not received any indication to suggest there has been anything but full co-operation between the RCMP and the office of the attorney general of the province of Nova Scotia. Of course, any electronic listening carried out in Nova Scotia would have taken place in accordance with the general practices and procedures of the force, in conformity with the requirements of the law, particularly the Protection of Privacy Act. The force would only have done this after obtaining the authority of the appropriate court.

* * *

SOCIAL SERVICES

REQUEST FOR REPORT ON MEETING QUEBEC'S OBJECTIONS TO PROPOSED LEGISLATION

Mr. Lincoln M. Alexander (Hamilton West): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of National Health and Welfare. Will we have uniformity and equality of service under the new social services act? The minister may recall that I asked him to look at the position of Quebec, the province which adamantly opposes the bill. The minister said he would look into the matter. Has he had further conversations with his provincial counterpart and can he say what progress has been made to meeting the objections of the province of Quebec to this bill?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Marc Lalonde (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, the province of Quebec seemed to object to the financing method provided in the legislation on social services. The Quebec Minister of Social Affairs told me that he would send me some suggestions or propositions in this respect. However, I did not get them yet.

* * *

BILINGUALISM

PRESENTATION OF ANNUAL REPORTS OF CROWN CORPORATIONS ON IMPLEMENTATION OF LANGUAGE POLICY

Mr. Serge Joyal (Maisonneuve-Rosemont): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the President of the Treasury Board, my question is for the right hon. Prime Minister.

Considering that on July 13, 1976, the President of the Treasury Board announced that from then on he would require Crown corporations to submit annual reports on the development of their linguistic policy and program, and considering also that he said that the government must be able to assess the progress made by those corporations and that the establishment of a control mechanism would be necessary, can the right hon. Prime Minister inform the House whether today, a year later, the Crown corporation will table the reports required by the Treasury Board last year, and if not, what steps does the government intend to take to make sure that Crown corporations are taking all the necessary measures to guarantee that the equality defined in the Official Languages Act will be rigourously respected?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, to my mind, the hon. member is perfectly right in being concerned about the reply to that question. If he refers to *Hansard,* some two weeks ago, he will find that I said, in reply to the hon. member for Fundy-Royal, who put a similar question to me about the status of women in Crown corporations, that I too was concerned about what was being done about the instructions of the government in the field of official languages, and that I indicated that I would ask my officials to get in touch with the responsible minister to make sure that the corporations concerned did in fact hand in the report requested by the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce, the then President of the Treasury Board. I must recognize, with some shame, that those reports have not been received, in any event, not in any large numbers, but I did ask my officials, after having given that reply to the hon. member for Fundy-Royal, to follow-up my answer and take action concerning the subject of the question just put to me by the hon. member for Maisonneuve-Rosemont.

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Because of some delay in translation I did not give the hon. member for Hamilton West the opportunity to ask a supplementary question. I now recognize the hon. member.

* * *

SOCIAL SERVICES

CONSULTATION WITH PROVINCES ON PROPOSED LEGISLATION

Mr. Lincoln M. Alexander (Hamilton West): Mr. Speaker, I was a little slow; usually I am very fast.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Alexander: May I direct a supplementary question to the Minister of National Health and Welfare. My preliminary investigations, as a result of correspondence with provinces involved with this bill, show me that they are concerned because they do not know what the regulations will say and they fear inflexibility. Will the minister assure this House that he will consult with the provinces, in order that they may have input into the substantive part of the regulations to do with the social services act?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Marc Lalonde (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, the bill itself has been the subject of long consultations. Indeed, the provinces and the federal government studied six different projects before agreeing on the one that was tabled in the House in June. That bill was tabled precisely to allow my officials to discuss more freely with the provinces the suggested regulations that will be promulgated under that bill, once it has been passed by Parliament. Consul-

tations will be held during the summer with the provinces concerning those regulations.

* * *

[*English*]

GRAIN

TWO-PRICE WHEAT POLICY—POSSIBILITY OF REVIEW AND RISE IN MINIMUM PRICE

Mr. Don Mazankowski (Vegreville): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Transport in his capacity as minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board. I would think, after what he said about Premier Lougheed in response to the question of the right hon. member for Prince Albert, that he would say what specific sales opportunities were lost by reason of the premiers' visit to Europe; otherwise, one must assume his statement was nothing more than rhetorical fluff. My question arises from the government's two-price wheat policy. Since the Canadian farm input index has risen between 30 per cent and 35 per cent since the policy was introduced, and since legislation provides for the minister to make an annual review and to recommend increases in the minimum price to reflect increases in the cost of production, I ask if such a review has taken place, and does the minister contemplate raising the minimum price under the two-price wheat policy?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, we have had detailed discussions with the Canadian Federation of Agriculture and others about the price level of two-price wheat and are now considering what action to take in the light of their comments and suggestions. The consultation with producers of course follows the spirit of the legislation to which the hon. member referred. As to the hon. member's opening remarks, it is a matter of very delicate judgment as to whether relationships built up over the years between the Canadian Wheat Board and its customers have been impaired. I am fairly satisfied that the Canadian Wheat Board, by its strenuous and effective efforts, will put right the harm done, but I resist very much any public suggestions by the premier that he will begin to interfere with the manner in which the Canadian Wheat Board is marketing our wheat. I should think hon. members opposite would resist that kind of interference.

Mr. Mazankowski: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. The minister has again refused to give specific examples; therefore we can only conclude his statements are rhetorical. Could the minister tell the House whether, in the light of the review process, which is being undertaken in connection with the two-price wheat policy any consideration will be given to making this adjustment retroactive and, if so, for what period?

● (1450)

Mr. Lang: That is obviously part of the consideration also.

[Mr. Lalonde.]

NORTHERN AFFAIRS

ENFORCEMENT OF MINE SAFETY REGULATIONS IN NORTHWEST TERRITORIES—REQUEST FOR REPORT ON CONSULTATION WITH MINISTER OF LABOUR

Mr. Wally Firth (Northwest Territories): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In the absence of the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development I should like to direct my question to the Minister of Labour. It has to do with the appointment of Territorial mining inspectors. Two weeks ago, I asked the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development to check into the matter of mine safety in the Northwest Territories. I have learned, as I stated then, from the office of the Minister of Labour, that this matter does not come within the jurisdiction of that department. The Commissioner of the Northwest Territories has made repeated requests for authority to enforce the Territorial Mining ordinance and the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development told me last week he would consult with the Minister of Labour about this matter. I should like to know whether such consultation has taken place and how the government intends to act in this regard. When can we expect a reply?

Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of Labour): Soon, I hope. I believe that as a result of the questions the hon. member has asked officials of the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development and of my own department have been in discussion. But I understand this particular matter does not fall within my jurisdiction. I shall endeavour to get a report as soon as possible and get in touch with the hon. member.

* * *

FISHERIES

DATE OF ANNOUNCEMENT OF POLICY ON RESEARCH ON CONTINENTAL SHELF SPECIES, FLEET DEVELOPMENT AND CO-OPERATIVE ARRANGEMENTS

Mr. Lloyd R. Crouse (South Shore): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Fisheries but in his absence I would direct it to the Prime Minister who showed an interest in our fisheries problems in 1974 when he was in Nova Scotia during an election campaign.

In view of the uncertainty which exists within the Canadian fishing industry among fishermen and processors ever since the unilateral announcement on January 1, 1977 of a 200-mile limit with regard to fish stocks and their location both laterally and vertically, would the Prime Minister tell us when we may expect an announcement that more research is contemplated with respect to continental shelf species—a project which could utilize some of our unemployed scientists—plus an announcement of government policy on fleet development strategy, which could activate our unemployed shipbuilders and shipyards as well as an announcement of government policy on foreign co-operative fishing arrangements? The present situation appears to be troubling processor and fishermen in Atlantic Canada.

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): I take the question to be a series of interesting representations by the hon. member. I will transmit them to the Minister of Fisheries.

* * *

AIR CANADA

ALLEGATION PLANES UNSAFE AND EMPLOYEES REQUESTING TRANSFERS FROM QUEBEC—REQUEST FOR REPORT

Mr. Dan McKenzie (Winnipeg South Centre): On June 22, Mr. Speaker, I directed a question to the government House leader with regard to a motion I presented to the Standing Committee on Transportation and Communications. I should like to direct my question today to the Minister of Transport. I asked that the committee launch an immediate investigation into statements made by the Canadian Aviation Fellowship that 2600 Air Canada employees are requesting transfers out of the Province of Quebec. To date the government has taken no action with respect to my motion. Today, the Canadian Aviation Fellowship released a document of which the minister has a copy. It states that Air Canada planes are in a questionable state of airworthiness and that there have been complaints from pilots. Would the minister launch an immediate investigation or have the transport committee investigate the charges made by the CAF?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): As I indicated to the hon. member on an earlier occasion, this whole issue of the relationship between employees and the corporations has been adequately brought to the attention of Air Canada management. I have confidence in the way it is being handled. I would hope the hon. member is not attempting to associate himself with some rather exaggerated statements without some further attempt, even on his own, to check with management, a course which I am sure would reassure him with regard to the safety of the aircraft.

Mr. McKenzie: The reason the CAF is preparing these documents, and the reason I am raising the matter, is that we have received no satisfactory answer at all from the chief officer, Mr. Claude Taylor; he has taken no action whatsoever. Since our committee meeting he has taken no steps to meet with these people, hence the steps which they are taking. So the minister will have to initiate some action himself and I would ask him to do so immediately.

Mr. Lang: The management of Air Canada has been very conscious of any problems which exist and is fully sensitive to their nature in the attempts made to deal with them. Obviously, there is some gross overstatement of the situation which they cannot meet. However, management is handling a situation which is not without its difficulties and sensitivities and recognizes there are people who feel themselves in a difficult situation. The hon. member is not helping the situation at all by his intervention and I may say I believe I know why he is raising the matter.

REGIONAL ECONOMIC EXPANSION

AGREEMENT WITH BRITISH COLUMBIA—PROVISION FOR KOOTENAYS

Mr. Bob Brisco (Kootenay West): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion. I draw to his attention the terms of the General Development Agreement with the Province of British Columbia signed on March 28, 1974 in which it is clearly stated that the main sectors identified in the agreement as warranting special attention are the northwest of British Columbia, the northeast and the Kootenays. In the light of the fact that the northwest and the northeast have now been singled out for special attention, what special status has been provided for the Kootenays? Are they to be ignored or will they be covered under a supplementary agreement?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Marcel Lessard (Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): Mr. Speaker, recently we did sign very important agreements with the government of British Columbia and, in most cases, these agreements cover the whole province, with the exception of the greater Vancouver and Victoria areas. Therefore, the area the hon. member has mentioned will of course benefit from all programs covered by these agreements and I am sure that the hon. member will be the first to recognize that all the decisions that have been taken during the last few weeks go in the direction of the representations made by all members of this House.

[*English*]

WATER SHORTAGE AT CASTLEGAR—POSSIBILITY OF ASSISTANCE

Mr. Bob Brisco (Kootenay West): In the light of the urgent situation of the city of Castlegar in terms of its critical and chronic water shortage, can the minister tell us whether this community will qualify for assistance under DREE in respect to this problem within the new agreement signed with British Columbia?

Hon. Marcel Lessard (Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): It is difficult to be specific at this point. Obviously, the city of Castlegar is one case among many other cases and I suppose that according to the subagreement which has been signed it might be possible for this municipality to get some assistance. But this will have to be weighed against other needs and the industrial potential of the city.

* * *

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS

MONCTON—MAKING SKELETON STAFF WORK OVERTIME RATHER THAN RECALL WORKERS LAID OFF

Mr. Leonard C. Jones (Moncton): Mr. Speaker, my question is addressed to the Minister of Transport. Is the minister aware that despite a prolonged shutdown of the CNR shops in

Moncton this summer, some of the personnel who were kept on as so-called skeleton staff are being asked to work overtime rather than calling back men who were laid off? Is this what the CNR calls "adjustment of railway expenses"?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): I was not aware of this situation but I shall be glad to take the hon. member's representations to the CNR.

Mr. Jones: A supplementary with respect to the railway in Moncton. Will the minister be able shortly to answer my starred question No. 2,855?

* * *

CANADIAN COAST GUARD COLLEGE

DECK AND ENGINEERING GRADUATES—REQUEST FOR EXPLANATION OF DIFFERENTIATION IN CERTIFICATES

Mr. Robert Muir (Cape Breton-The Sydneys): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I hesitate to take the time of the House to raise this grievance but it is one which has gone on for many months without corrective action being taken. Is the minister aware that deck graduates from the Canadian Coast Guard College are restricted to the fleet systems section of the Ministry of Transport due to the nature of the certification they receive while engineering graduates from the same college are given marine safety certificates and become eligible to serve ashore or afloat in any marine position in the Commonwealth? Would the minister not agree that this is a form of discrimination and would he investigate the matter with the object of rectifying this anomaly?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I will be glad to obtain an elaborate explanation for the hon. gentleman.

* * *

● (1500)

CONSUMER AFFAIRS

HIGHER FOOD COSTS IN THE NORTH—GOVERNMENT ACTION

Mr. John Rodriguez (Nickel Belt): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. In view of the fact that the most recent consumer price index shows an increase in food prices of more than 20 per cent for some items and an increase of over 15 per cent for fuel and utilities, and in view of the fact that this situation, while bad enough in southern Canada, is even worse in northern Canada where a monitoring committee established by the New Democratic Party has shown that a basket of essential food items cost 40 per cent more north of 60 than in Ottawa and energy costs are 20 per cent higher, can the minister tell this House what steps his government is prepared to take to ensure that people living north of 60 are not penalized by paying as much as 40 per cent more for the necessities of life than people living in the southern part of the country?

[Mr. Jones.]

Hon. A. C. Abbott (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I cannot comment on the specific statistical breakdown which the hon. member has supplied, except to say that it is recognized by myself and other members of the government that people in the north are subjected to higher prices for many goods in those areas. I cannot offer at the moment any precise solution to this problem. I hope to visit the northern parts of the provinces as well as other areas, and I expect to hear directly about this; at the same time I cannot accept at face value the statistical percentage breakdowns of the hon. member.

* * *

ANTI-INFLATION PROGRAM

SUGGESTED LIFTING OF WAGE CONTROLS FOR NORTHERN WORKERS

Mr. John Rodriguez (Nickel Belt): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a supplementary question to the Prime Minister. In view of the answer just given by the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs that the members of the government are aware of the disparity in prices between northern and southern Canada, is the Prime Minister prepared to consider the lifting of the Anti-Inflation Board controls on the wages of workers who live and have to earn their living in the northern parts of this country, since they have to pay 40 per cent more for food and the necessities of life? Is the Prime Minister prepared to drop the AIB program in the Northwest Territories immediately?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I am sure the hon. member is not implying that the people of the north are not interested, as he is, in combatting inflation.

* * *

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

WEEKLY STATEMENT

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, before we proceed I wonder whether I might ask the government House leader what is proposed by way of business later today and tomorrow, and for however long we may be here?

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Speaker, we will continue the debate on the bill in the name of the Minister of Justice, Bill C-51. Following that we will deal with Bill C-27, Bill C-17 and Bill C-23.

Mr. Epp: What are we going to do tomorrow?

Mr. MacEachen: The first three bills are in immediate play. As hon. members will have noticed, there is a notice of motion in my name on the order paper which proposes the adjournment of the House tomorrow, but that will only be called if in the meantime we have reached some understandings, which

have not yet been reached. We are continuing our consultations.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, the following questions will be answered today: 1,648, 2,349, 2,748 and 2,800.

[*Text*]

AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

Question No. 1,648—**Mr. Herbert:**

As a percentage of total government spending, how much has been allocated in each of the past ten years for agricultural research and development?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretay to President of the Privy Council): In so far as Agriculture Canada is concerned: 1967-68, $39,695,260; 1968-69, $45,308,993; 1969-70, $45,870,584; 1970-71, $47,753,268; 1971-72, $50,726,390; 1972-73, $54,310,436; 1973-74, $62,959,460; 1974-75, $74,334,487; 1975-76, $95,633,279; 1976-77, $95,747,501.

In so far as National Research Council is concerned: expenditures in Agricultural and Food Research and Development should be reflected in so far as they are available over the past ten years in Statistics Canada reports of scientific expenditures. Specific figures for grants to universities were available and provided for the years 1968-1977 in response to parliamentary questions Nos. 1,878 of October 13, 1971; 882 of February 9, 1973; 2,056 of March 8, 1977.

Order Paper Questions

CANCER OF THE BLADDER

Question No. 2,349—**Mr. Rynard:**

1. For each year 1965 to 1976, by province, what was the death rate for cancer of the bladder?

2. For the same years, what was the percentage of cancer of the bladder in (a) males (b) females and what percentage were cigarette smokers?

3. For the same years, what was the percentage of cancer of the bladder in diabetics and what percentage were cigarette smokers?

4. Were 10 cases of bladder cancer in heavy saccharin users reported to the Health Protection Branch of the Department of National Health and Welfare and, if so, how many (a) used saccharin for (i) 5 years (ii) 10 years (iii) 15 years (iv) 20 years (v) 25 years or more (b) were (i) on diabetic drugs (ii) on insulin (iii) on a special diet (iv) on alcohol abstainers (v) heavy users of alcohol (vi) moderate users of alcohol?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): I am informed by Statistics Canada and the Department of National Health and Welfare as follows: 1. The death rate for cancer of the bladder for the years 1965 to 1974 is provided on the following lists.

2. The percentage of cancer of the bladder in males and females for the years 1965 to 1974* is provided on the following lists. It is not possible to distinguish between cancer deaths of cigarette smokers and non-smokers.

3. Data unavailable.

4. The Health Protection Branch has received documentation on a number of cases of bladder cancer in persons consuming artificial sweeteners. Of these, six were known to have used saccharin, although in three cases, cyclamates also were consumed. Precise information on the duration and degree of exposure to saccharin for these individuals is not available. They were reported, however, to be heavy users of the substance. No information is available on concurrent exposure to drugs, alcohol or tobacco nor are their dietary histories known.

* Data is not available for 1975 and 1976.

Mortality Rates for Bladder Cancer by Province and Sex, Canada, 1965-1974
(per 100,000 population)

	Canada	Newfoundland	Prince Edward Island	Nova Scotia	New Brunswick	Quebec	Ontario	Manitoba	Saskatchewan	Alberta	British Columbia	Yukon	North West Territories
1965 T	3.9	1.8	7.4	3.0	3.5	3.4	4.5	3.5	4.5	2.9	4.5	6.7	—
M	5.3	2.4	12.7	4.1	3.8	4.7	6.0	6.0	6.7	4.6	5.9	—	
F	2.4	1.2	1.9	1.9	3.2	2.1	3.0	1.1	2.2	1.1	3.1	14.9	—
1966 T	4.1	2.0	5.5	4.2	2.8	3.4	4.9	4.0	3.2	3.8	5.4	—	—
M	6.2	3.2	9.1	5.5	3.9	5.2	7.0	6.6	5.3	5.8	8.7	—	—
F	2.1	0.8	1.9	2.9	1.6	1.6	2.8	1.5	1.1	1.8	2.1	—	—
1967 T	3.8	3.8	5.5	4.5	4.2	3.2	4.4	3.6	2.9	3.0	4.0	—	—
M	5.4	6.3	10.9	6.6	8.3	4.5	5.8	5.6	5.1	4.3	5.4	—	—
F	2.2	1.2	—	2.4	—	1.9	2.9	1.7	0.6	1.6	2.6	—	—
1968 T	3.8	2.2	3.6	4.5	3.8	3.2	4.4	4.4	3.9	2.6	3.8	—	—
M	5.5	2.7	5.4	6.0	6.7	4.6	6.3	7.0	6.5	3.9	5.3	—	—
F	2.0	1.6	1.8	2.9	1.0	1.8	2.5	1.9	1.1	1.3	2.3	—	—
1969 T	4.0	2.9	5.5	4.3	5.1	3.6	4.3	4.3	3.1	3.3	4.8	6.7	—
M	6.0	5.3	9.0	5.5	7.0	5.2	6.5	7.1	5.5	5.0	7.5	—	—
F	2.0	0.4	1.8	3.2	3.2	2.0	2.1	1.4	0.6	1.6	2.2	14.5	—
1970 T	4.0	1.7	4.5	3.8	3.8	4.1	4.4	5.0	4.8	1.9	3.7	6.3	—
M	5.8	2.3	5.4	6.3	5.4	6.4	6.2	6.5	7.5	3.0	4.8	11.6	—
F	2.2	1.2	3.7	1.3	2.2	1.9	2.6	3.5	1.9	0.8	2.7	—	—
1971 T	4.2	2.5	7.2	4.9	3.3	4.2	4.3	5.0	5.0	3.4	4.2	—	—
M	6.2	4.9	8.9	6.6	5.0	6.2	6.4	6.9	8.1	5.3	5.8	—	—
F	2.2	—	5.4	3.3	1.6	2.3	2.4	3.0	1.8	1.4	2.5	—	—

	Canada	Newfoundland	Prince Edward Island	Nova Scotia	New Brunswick	Quebec	Ontario	Manitoba	Saskatchewan	Alberta	British Columbia	Yukon	North West Territories
1972 T	4.0	3.0	5.3	5.0	2.5	3.7	4.1	4.7	5.7	3.1	4.3	5.3	—
M	5.9	4.4	7.0	6.5	3.7	5.8	6.1	6.9	9.5	4.6	5.4	9.8	—
F	2.1	1.5	3.6	3.5	1.3	1.5	2.2	2.6	1.8	1.5	3.2	—	—
1973 T	4.0	3.3	3.5	3.7	4.6	4.0	4.1	5.1	5.2	2.7	4.0	—	—
M	5.9	5.4	5.2	5.7	7.0	5.9	5.6	7.4	8.7	4.6	6.1	—	—
F	2.1	1.1	1.7	1.7	2.2	2.1	2.6	2.8	1.6	0.8	1.8	—	—
1974 T	4.0	3.5	3.4	4.3	3.6	4.1	4.2	4.4	4.3	3.2	3.5	—	2.7
M	5.6	4.7	5.1	6.4	5.1	6.1	5.8	5.5	5.9	4.3	5.1	—	5.1
F	2.4	2.3	1.7	2.2	2.1	2.2	2.6	3.2	2.7	2.1	1.9	—	—

Deaths from Bladder Cancer as a Percentage of All Cancer Deaths By Province and Sex, Canada 1965-1974

	Canada	Newfoundland	Prince Edward Island	Nova Scotia	New Brunswick	Quebec	Ontario	Manitoba	Saskatchewan	Alberta	British Columbia	Yukon	North West Territories
1965 T	2.9	1.8	5.3	2.0	3.0	2.6	3.3	2.4	3.5	2.5	3.0	5.9	—
M	3.7	1.9	8.0	2.6	2.8	3.4	4.1	3.7	4.3	3.5	3.5	—	—
F	2.0	1.5	1.6	1.3	3.1	1.7	2.3	0.8	2.1	1.1	2.3	20.0	—
1966 T	3.1	2.0	3.3	2.8	2.2	2.6	3.6	2.7	2.5	3.3	3.6	—	—
M	4.1	2.8	5.1	3.5	2.9	3.6	4.6	3.8	3.4	4.4	5.1	—	—
F	1.8	0.9	1.2	2.1	1.3	1.4	2.3	1.1	1.0	1.8	1.6	—	—
1967 T	2.8	3.7	3.5	2.9	3.2	2.4	3.1	2.4	2.2	2.6	2.6	—	—
M	3.5	5.4	7.0	4.0	6.1	3.1	3.8	3.2	3.4	3.3	3.1	—	—
F	1.8	1.4	—	1.7	—	1.6	2.3	1.3	0.6	1.6	2.0	—	—
1968 T	2.7	2.0	2.8	3.0	2.8	2.4	3.2	2.8	2.8	2.2	2.6	—	—
M	3.6	2.2	4.0	4.0	4.7	3.1	4.1	3.7	4.3	2.9	3.1	—	—
F	1.6	1.7	1.5	2.0	0.7	1.5	2.0	1.5	0.9	1.2	1.8	-	—
1969 T	2.9	2.9	3.7	2.7	3.7	2.6	3.0	2.7	2.3	3.0	3.1	12.5	—
M	3.9	4.7	5.6	3.2	4.6	3.5	4.1	4.0	3.6	3.9	4.1	—	—
F	1.6	0.5	1.3	2.1	2.5	1.6	1.7	1.0	0.6	1.7	1.6	33.3	—
1970 T	2.8	1.6	3.0	2.2	2.8	2.9	3.1	3.1	3.3	1.6	2.4	5.9	—
M	3.7	1.7	3.1	3.3	3.6	4.1	3.9	3.7	4.4	2.3	2.8	7.7	—
F	1.7	1.3	2.8	0.9	1.8	1.5	2.1	2.5	1.6	0.8	2.0	—	—
1971 T	2.9	2.2	4.5	3.1	2.3	2.9	3.1	3.1	3.4	2.9	2.7	—	—
M	3.9	3.7	5.3	3.9	3.1	3.8	4.0	3.6	4.5	3.8	3.4	—	—
F	1.8	—	3.5	2.3	1.3	1.7	1.9	2.3	1.5	1.4	1.8	—	—
1972 T	2.7	2.5	3.5	3.0	1.8	2.5	2.8	2.8	3.7	2.5	2.8	4.8	—
M	3.6	3.2	4.0	3.5	2.5	3.5	3.8	3.7	5.3	3.3	3.2	6.7	—
F	1.6	1.6	2.9	2.3	1.0	1.2	1.6	1.8	1.4	1.4	2.4	—	—
1973 T	2.7	2.8	2.1	2.2	3.2	2.6	2.7	3.1	3.0	2.3	2.6	—	—
M	3.5	4.1	2.6	3.1	4.8	3.5	3.4	3.9	4.4	3.2	3.5	—	—
F	1.6	1.1	1.3	1.1	1.5	1.6	1.9	1.9	1.1	0.9	1.3	—	—
1974 T	2.7	3.0	1.9	2.5	2.5	2.7	2.8	2.6	2.7	2.6	2.3	—	3.8
M	3.4	3.5	2.6	3.3	3.1	3.6	3.5	2.9	3.3	3.0	3.0	—	5.6
F	1.7	2.2	1.1	1.5	1.7	1.6	1.9	2.2	1.9	2.1	1.4	—	—

HALL REPORT RECOMMENDATIONS

Question No. 2,748—**Mr. McKenzie:**

1. Since March 14, 1977, has the Minister of Labour met with officials of the railway companies and unions in regard to the Hall Report recommendations and, if so, what position did the Minister take in such discussions?

2. Will the Minister urge the railway companies and unions to accept the recommendations?

3. Is the government taking any initiatives on behalf of retired railway employees in order to find more immediate solutions to their problems and, if so, what are they?

4. Is the Minister planning to introduce changes to the definition of "employee" in the Canada Labour Code in order to compel railway unions to bargain for pension benefits of retired employees?

5. Will the Minister urge the railway companies and the CRLA to accept greater representation of retired employees in the collective bargaining process and, if this cannot be achieved on a voluntary basis, would the Minister consider introducing legislation requiring such representation?

6. Has the Minister had any indication from railway companies as to whether or not they will accept the recommendation of the Hall Report that the trusteeship of both CNR and CPR pension plans be placed in the hands of an independent trust company?

7. If the railway companies do not voluntarily turn the pension plans over to an independent trust company, will the Minister introduce legislation to insure that the trusteeship of the plans conform with desired public policy and are brought in line with the expectations of National Revenue regulations and the Pension Benefit Standards Act?

8. Will the Minister impress upon his colleagues the urgent need to establish a body to undertake a complete and independent review of the entire pension industry and the success of pension plans in meeting retirement needs?

[Mr. Goodale.]

Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of Labour): 1. The parties are currently evaluating their bargaining priorities in the light of the Hall Report and are expected to meet shortly to explore needed pension improvements. As the unions and management are themselves in the process of establishing their own approaches and needs, I have not felt it would be appropriate or helpful to insert a third party into these proceedings.

2. At this stage, I believe that the appropriate course is to acquaint myself with the reactions of the parties to the Hall recommendations as they explore them in the light of their own priorities. The parties are in the best position to examine the options and determine their own needs.

3. While no government initiatives are planned with specific reference to retired railway employees, the government has established an Interdepartmental Committee under the joint

membership of the Departments of Finance and Health and Welfare to examine all aspects of the pension issue.

4. Before compelling unions to bargain on the pension or any other issue, I would be guided by the views and experiences of interested groups to determine the effect of such changes on the collective bargaining process. As an initial step, voluntary approaches of the type recommended by Dr. Hall would seem to deserve the attention of the parties.

5. Dr. Hall's recommendations concerning mechanisms to better involve retired employees in the collective bargaining process are being considered by the parties. As this matter is being carefully reviewed by the parties at the present time, it is premature to consider legislative mechanisms.

6. This matter is under consideration by the parties.

7. This question is hypothetical and premature as there is no indication that the railways have rejected this recommendation.

8. This matter is being dealt with by the Interdepartmental Pension Policy Review Committee referred to in question 3.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOUR—SAULT STE. MARIE

Question No. 2,800—**Mr. Symes:**

What was the total amount spent in Sault Ste. Marie from October 1972 to date by the Department of Labour?

Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of Labour): No funds spent in Sault Ste. Marie from October, 1972 to date.

[*English*]

Mr. Cossitt: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order concerning questions placed on the order paper on the first day of this session having to do with the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation and its international service. These questions were on the order paper during the last session of the thirtieth parliament for approximately six months, and have gone almost a year and a half unanswered. I cannot see why the answers to these questions have not been made available, since the questions are very straightforward: they ask for very straightforward information where a "yes" or "no" would handle almost half of them.

On top of that, the distressing fact to me is that three of the top officials named in these questions have been transferred since these questions appeared on the order paper, having been demoted to other positions with no explanation having been given the public. However, obviously the government has been taking it out on them for the mismanagement of the international service of the CBC due to pressures placed against it by the Department of External Affairs, evidence of which appears in these questions.

I cannot understand why the parliamentary secretary goes on day after day telling us how many hundreds of questions he has answered, instead of telling us why there are certain questions that he will not answer. Can he today tell me why the answers to these 10 to 12 questions concerning manipulation of the CBC and its international service by the Department of External Affairs, influencing what is broadcast to the Soviet Union and other countries behind the so-called iron curtain countries, are being suppressed by the government, and why certain men who tried to do their duty on behalf of Canada, in the interests of a free democratic way of life, were demoted because the government did not agree with them and told them they could not even mention Christmas and a number of other things because it was anti-Soviet? I think these questions should be answered. Can the parliamentary secretary now rise and tell the House whether we are going to get them before we adjourn tomorrow, on Monday or Tuesday or whenever it may be?

Mr. Goodale: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has given the House a lot of gratuitous opinion, and once again has attempted to impute motives to me, to the Department of External Affairs and to the government generally in the process of answering questions which are on the order paper. I repeat today the assurance that I have given him and other members on other occasions in the House with respect to questions appearing on the order paper—certainly all the ones that are there at the moment—and that is that we do intend to provide answers to them as quickly as possible. It is our hope that those answers will be available before this session adjourns.

Mr. Beatty: Mr. Speaker, I did not intend to rise at this point until the parliamentary secretary indicated that he wanted to assure members of the House that questions on the order paper would be answered as quickly as possible. May I bring to his attention question No. 632, which is dated October 18 but which was actually placed on the order paper in the last session of parliament. It asks the government whether the then secretary of state made a trip between Ottawa, London, and Stratford on July 9, 1976. In view of the fact that that secretary of state has come and gone and we already have another Secretary of State, and since this event took place over a year ago, can the parliamentary secretary tell me why it has taken so long to get a straightfoward answer to a very simple question, and when may I expect an answer?

Mr. Goodale: Mr. Speaker, I cannot be precise at this moment with respect to the particular question the hon. member has mentioned to me. As I recall it, I believe this may be the first time he has mentioned that question in the House. I will try and provide an analysis for him which will satisfy his curiosity respecting the timing involved in this question. But again let me say, for the benefit of all hon. members, that it is my intention to try to provide answers to all questions on the order paper before the end of this session.

Mr. Speaker: Shall the remaining questions be allowed to stand?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

CRIMINAL LAW AMENDMENT ACT, 1977

AMENDMENTS TO CRIMINAL CODE

The House resumed, from Wednesday, July 13, consideration of Bill C-51, to amend the Criminal Code, the Customs Tariff, the Parole Act, the Penitentiary Act and the Prisons and Reformatories Act, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs.

● (1510)

Mr. F. Oberle (Prince George-Peace River): Mr. Speaker, when I called it six o'clock last night I had begun to tell the House of my experience in committee regarding this particular bill which was discussed at length and in great detail. I told my colleagues of the frustrations I suffered, as a layman, being exposed to the intricacies of committee and the House of Commons. I also mentioned my shock and dismay at the interventions by groups of individuals throughout the country who came before the committee. These groups consisted of people from law societies, civil liberties associations and persons who indulged in hunting and trap shooting. All these people felt their individual rights and freedoms were being threatened.

When closure was imposed in committee it was decided that no further witnesses should be heard on this bill. It was my understanding that there were 24 applications from people who wished to have their views and concerns considered by this committee. As I said last night, I cannot understand the indecent haste which has been attached to these measures. The measures are not designed to address themselves to the critical need which exists in our society today—a need to confront organized crime. The minister hangs his hat on gun control and electronic surveillance. These measures are designed to combat organized crime which is now rampant in our country, according to the minister. We do not see any meaningful tool or purpose in Bill C-51 which addresses itself to this critical situation.

We hear much about freedom of information these days. Some of my colleagues on this side of the House, and particularly the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin), have almost exclusively concerned themselves for the last two or three years with the matter of freedom of information and openness by the government. Yet the government seems to be going the other way and feels that freedom of information will be achieved by wiretapping persons' phones. We have to ask ourselves for whom is this freedom of information laid before us in the green paper. Will the Liberal government have access to all information exchanged in this country?

As they retract into their shells and tighten up the leaks which trickle away from the ivory towers this government is operating out of these days, they want everyone else in our society to surrender some of the personal freedoms they have enjoyed. These are to be surrendered to the guardians whom they espouse to be guardians of civil rights and liberties which are to be turned over for the good of the country.

The House of Commons is representative of the people themselves. We are supposed to deal in blind trust. We are supposed to be blindly trusting of this government in their transactions, be they in business or in public spirit. All one needs to do to become a senior official of the government today is to place his holdings in blind trust. But no one ever defines what the phrase "blind trust" means. The government wants us to blindly trust them because they are all good, divine, the seraphs of this world, the angels with seven wings. They can do no evil; they can do no wrong. Recently we have learned that there are, even in that supreme group on the other side, some rotten apples.

I wonder whether the Minister of Justice (Mr. Basford) has looked seriously at all the implications of this bill before us, particularly in the area of electronic eavesdropping. As the minister has indicated, there was no law in existence before 1973 to protect us against a police officer entering our homes and placing bugs on our telephones. The police officer was prohibited from searching our homes or removing any files or property; but he could enter our residences and put electronic devices in place in order to monitor conversations. There was no law against that practice in 1973 or 1974, and thus we addressed ourselves to it. Yet we are about to pass a law now making it legal. I wonder if the minister has really thought that out. If it was legal to do such a thing at that time, can you imagine some police officer abusing his power and breaking into 24 Sussex Drive when guests are staying there who are student radicals and campus revolutionaries?

Can you imagine the telephone at 24 Sussex Drive being bugged and the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) receiving a telephone call from Bill Teron, who is the president of Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation, and the following conversation occurring, "Mr. Prime Minister, I think you should have a swimming pool. As you know, my public companies are in blind trust and I cannot talk about them. Some of my cement trucks will be running around the city and they would not mind dropping off a few loads there. I do not want you to know where the cement or the money is coming from. What do you think?" Imagine Keith Davey telephoning the Prime Minister and saying, "What do you think about calling an election? As you are aware, I am a shareholder of a little company that grows flowers. Since you wear a flower in the House of Commons, how about a contract?"

We are all human. The Prime Minister is human, Keith Davey is human, Bill Teron is human, and so is any police officer. Just because a police officer has yellow stripes on his pants does not indicate he is different. He is a human being. This blind trust is going to be abused, because human nature applies equally to everyone. It applies equally to me, to my colleagues on this side of the House and to my friends on the other side of the House. I wonder whether the minister has taken all these things into consideration.

Let me tell you about some of the things said in committee. One day several representatives of the Law Society of Upper

Canada appeared before the committee. These representatives were lawyers who established the terms of reference and the code of ethics for all benchers of the Upper Canada region, which is Ontario. They were telling us that most of the criminal lawyers who operate in the city of Toronto will no longer speak to their clients over the telephone. All too often, at great expense, a senior law counsel advises his client to meet him somewhere in the dark on a park bench. He must ask him to go to the additional expense of hiring a taxi in order to meet in a park, because he can no longer trust the telephone. This should concern all members. It concerns me and all Canadians that we are surrendering rights and privileges enshrined in the Bill of Rights and every other piece of law and human justice that we have ever conceived.

● (1520)

How far can we go in trusting this government with the rights and freedoms that we once enjoyed? Does anyone think that organized crime will worry about this wiretap law? Is anyone so naive as to think they will use the telephone when plotting their sinister schemes? Of course not. They have worked out codes. They have worked out their own delivery systems. They could not trust the mail 20 years ago, and now they cannot trust the telephone. They know how to react.

The innocent, unsuspecting, law-abiding citizen does not have the money or the technology to react to this law. His telephone will be tapped. As the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams) stated, he may want to call his doctor, who may be one of ten doctors in the clinic along with 30 nurses and five or six secretaries. One of them might be suspected of having committed a criminal act. The telephone conversations of everyone in the clinic will be tapped and be placed on the computer somewhere. Telephone companies are now producing new systems, having discovered that a person's voice is as clear an identification as his thumbprint or fingerprint. One person in 20 million can be identified over the telephone by closing the gap on the sound waves over the telephone system by computer. At this time we should be protecting ourselves, passing legislation against that kind of gadgetry which could abuse the rights of individuals. Instead, we are making all this information more accessible to the police.

The hon. member for Calgary North said there is no longer any need to do police work or operate a police academy; all you have to do is run the Bell Telephone system through the police station, have an army of people there to identify every individual who uses the telephone, and put their voices and comments in the computer. You need only push a button to get the conversation, and any judge will act accordingly. This is very frightening. Thousands of Canadians are writing to their members of parliament. Letters are pouring into our offices, as I am sure they are into the offices of the Minister of Justice and the Solicitor General (Mr. Fox). I have here two letters which I will read. They are short. I chose them for that reason. The first was sent to the chairman of the committee. I quote:

> Bill C-51 is developing within me, as a Canadian citizen, an inferiority complex due to the fact that our elected members of government fail to realize that such a bill is eroding away my freedom as a Canadian.
>
> I cannot help but ask that the complete firearms section of Bill C-51 be banished once and for all.

There are other such pieces of legislation. This kind of action is not restricted to the bills of the Minister of Justice. Other bills give this government powers beyond anything that any government in any free society has, particularly a government that works under a parliamentary system such as ours. Last week we dealt with Bill C-38. One of my constituents wrote to me as follows:

> I would like to express my grave concern regarding the proposed Bill C-38 amending the Fisheries Act. The terms of the bill are so sweeping, the definitions so broad, that anyone near or on any body of water could be deemed in violation of the act in some way. This coupled with the draconian penalties provided by the proposed amendments to the Criminal Code place very broad discretionary powers in the hands of enforcement agencies. There would appear to be little regard for the scale of damage or the cost-benefit relationships of any project that may impinge even marginally on waterways.

The search without warrant powers granted to inspectors under section 9 would seem to be an obvious infringement of basic civil liberties.

My constituent obviously does not know what has happened in the past few years—in this government's term of office. The just society, human liberties and human justice have become a myth. They are something we once knew. We expected our government to keep them in sacred trust for us. As the hon. member for Calgary North said yesterday, and as the right hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker) said, the "just society" is just for the Liberal government but not for anyone else. The hangers on are also part of the just society, the sick minds sitting on the other side of the House which have conceived and perpetrated this legislation on us.

There is no way this bill can pass this House. We cannot condone this kind of action going unchecked. We do not have to subject ourselves to this kind of intimidation. Incidentally, intimidation is one thing for which a judge can allow a wiretap to be placed on someone's telephone. I would like a wiretap placed on the telephone of the Minister of Justice, because he intimidated members on this side of the House when he appeared on the scene of an unfortunate incident.

Mr. Paproski: Ambulance chaser!

Mr. Oberle: The minister said that incident happened because of people on this side of the House. It would have been a source of comfort had the minister given some assurance that when this criminal was apprehended he would stay behind bars until we were sure be would not perpetrate the same kind of act again.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Order, please. I regret to interrupt the hon. member, but his allotted time has expired. He may continue only with unanimous consent. Does the hon. member have unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. John Rodriguez (Nickel Belt): Mr. Speaker, I have listened to hon. members who have legal experience participate in this debate in a very legalistic matter. I have listened to all the legal arguments. I thought that the voice of a layman, a neophyte with regard to legal matters, would certainly be welcome. Some plain talk from the hon. member for Nickel Belt might throw some light on what has become a very fuzzy and complicated bill.

Mr. Oberle: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I do not want the hon. member for Nickel Belt (Mr. Rodriguez) deliberately to mislead the House and insult me by saying that I am one of the legal profession. I participated in this debate as a layman, and I am proud of it.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Order, please. I suggest to the hon. member that is not a point of order, but a point of debate.

Mr. Rodriguez: Mr. Speaker, the point of order is well taken. I did not intend to label anyone in this House as a lawyer. I thought I might put before the House some ideas with regard to this bill. I am caught on the horns of a dilemma with regard to Bill C-51. The bill includes gun control legislation, wiretap legislation and some parole provisions. I am trying to protect not only the particular concerns of my constituents but the concerns and the welfare of all Canadians, and I find myself in some difficulty because in principle I believe there should be some control and proper processing of those who intend to obtain firearms and to use them. I feel that the time has come in Canada to move in that direction.

● (1530)

Accompanying Bill C-51 are the wiretap provisions. I find myself in some quandary with respect to those provisions because, on the one hand, I recognize the need of my fellow Canadians for security which can be met by controlling the acquisition of firearms and, on the other hand, I am stuck with the problem of being asked to support some provisions in Bill C-51 to provide law enforcement agencies in the country with the power to wiretap. That is the dilemma in which I find myself as a member of parliament. I would like to raise some questions. I suppose the government felt this was a pretty cute way of putting things together in one bill, which might be called an omnibus bill, and in this way to get a bill which had certain provisions which appealed to the majority of members of parliament, but also some distasteful aspects of the legislation, passed by the House.

We also have a problem in terms of the Canadian people's perception of the security of the state. Most people who have written to me about Bill C-51 have written about the gun control section. Very few people have turned their attention to the wiretap provisions. I recognize the fact that probably those who were writing on the gun control provisions are a well organized group. It is a lobby operating with the aim of persuading and convincing members of parliament that they should not pass that section of Bill C-51. But those people forget about the other part of the bill, namely, the wiretap provisions.

[The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner).]

In discussions of this matter with my constituents and other people, the response I usually get is that, after all, they do not care if the police listen to their conversations, because they are not doing anything wrong. That sort of thinking pervades the minds of Canadians. They think that in fact we should give that right to law enforcement officers and agencies to ensure the maintenance of our security and freedom. I consider this to be a very serious step. What we on this side of the House have been trying to put across to the government is that when you extend wiretapping provisions, which is what this clause in the bill will do, when you extend occasions for wiretapping and you extend the notification period, it is an extremely important step.

At present, wiretapping is permitted for the smallest of crimes, such as even the smuggling of a pair of shorts across the border. It seems to me that wiretapping should not even be contemplated, and certainly such a decision should not be made at the snap of one's fingers, because wiretapping invades the privacy not only of the individual concerned but also of the person who is contacting him. Privacy is one of the rights to which Canadians are entitled, and that right should be protected. Much is made of the right to privacy between client and lawyer, patient and doctor, and confessor and sinner. That right is greatly respected.

However, there is also the right to privacy between citizens. They should have the right to hold private conversations. When we decide to broaden the wiretapping provisions, we decide to take an extremely serious step. I think that if I were to weigh the seriousness of widening the accessibility to wiretapping by law enforcement officers and agencies against the existence of crime, I would be prepared to protect the right to privacy and recognize that there is crime in the community and that we have to find a more effective method of dealing with it. So if I had to make that trade-off, I would say there should be no wiretapping at all, for anyone—private citizen, agency, or law enforcement officer.

The question that comes to my mind is whether accessibility to wiretapping makes a law enforcement agency more effective. Would the widening of this provision make that agency more efficient? I have grave doubts about it. I argue that all it does is to encourage laziness and slothfulness. To get an order permitting wiretapping is the easy way to go about it. We can keep a 24-hour tap on somebody's phone and listen to thousands and thousands of conversations—goodness knows for how long. Is it more efficient and productive to have three-man shifts listening in on a wiretap, or is it more efficient to infiltrate organized crime and obtain evidence in this more direct way? Will it not make a law enforcement agency more efficient to develop good detective techniques, thus encouraging excellence in detective work which is so essential in ensuring that crime is eliminated in a community?

The question that occurs to me, as well, is this: What has been the experience, in terms of the conviction rate, with the use of wiretaps? Can the minister tell the House whether, in

countries which have permitted wiretapping, the conviction rate has been studied in terms of a cost-benefit analysis? Has this been a more effective means of bringing lawbreakers to heel? Has there been a higher conviction rate, and can the minister provide us with any experiences proving that?

I am prepared to listen. As the hon. member for New Westminister (Mr. Leggatt) has pointed out, we had Ramsey Clark, former attorney general of the U.S., before the committee. Mr. Clark pointed out that wiretapping is the most inefficient method of busting criminals. The minister argued that wiretapping would help us get at dons in the mafia. Surely the mafia does not use telephones to set up contracts. The technique is to go beyond the borders of countries where there is wiretapping. The mafia holds conferences where there is no wiretapping and where there are weak police forces. Is the minister prepared to tell me that where wiretapping is in effect the conviction rate is higher? Can he give me examples? If he can, I am certainly prepared to listen to his argument.

• (1540)

Citizens have the right to privacy. The statement made in many letters I have received with regard to the gun control part of Bill C-51 is that people have the right to bear firearms and that the gun control part of this bill is contrary to their rights. It seems to me that the right to privacy has been completely forgotten. The government seems to be playing on the fears of the Canadian people. It seems to imply that organized crime is taking over and that people ought to trade off their right to privacy so that the law enforcement forces can invade that privacy.

The hon. member for New Westminster has taken a strong position on the question of wiretapping. It has been pointed out that we do not need this, and that there are more effective ways of putting a stop to criminal activities. The hon. member's amendment suggests that if we are going to use wiretapping, it ought to be used in relation to very serious crimes which would be punishable on conviction by ten years' imprisonment or more. The hon. member tried to delineate that in his amendment.

I cannot impress enough upon hon. members the seriousness of extending wiretapping. The telephones of members of this House have been tapped. If this bill goes through as proposed by the government, members of parliament might never know about these things because three years down the line many of us will no longer be members of parliament. We might never find out that conversations between ourselves and our constituents which we thought were private were not private at all. I call on hon. members to consider these important matters, and perhaps the minister should answer some questions. Can he assure the House that wiretapping increases the rate of convictions? What is the rate in jurisdictions which have used wiretapping?

Can the minister show us that the use of wiretapping has made law enforcement agencies more effective? Is there a risk of taking away the privacy of individuals? Will wiretapping invade privacy? How does that stand up against the right to security within the state? Are there not more effective ways of providing security than by the invasion of privacy of individuals by law enforcement agencies? Those are important questions with which the minister ought to deal. He should not be trying to frighten us by saying that organized crime will take over tomorrow and that the mafia dons are all using telephones to put out contracts, and so forth. Even now, bookmakers are not using telephones.

Mr. Woolliams: Lawyers and doctors don't use them.

Mr. Rodriguez: I do not know what lawyers are using these days, but the lowly bookmaker uses runners. The only way to bust a bookmaking operation is through the use of undercover agents and through breaking codes. Would wiretapping provisions provide the means by which we can get at the laundering of money obtained illegally on the other side of the border? Would they help us deal with money laundered through the buying of stocks or through buying into legitimate organizations? Have we any experience which tells us that wiretapping has stopped any loansharking operation? The loanshark operates in the workplace, on the docks of Montreal and in factories. He does not use the telephone.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Order, please. I regret to inform the hon. member that his allotted time has expired. He may continue with unanimous consent. Does the hon. member have unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Leggatt: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. At the conclusion of the debate on this motion yesterday, the Minister of Justice (Mr. Basford) indicated that he would withhold his consent to my amending my motion by removing the words "mentioned in paragraph (a)". I understand that the minister is now willing to grant consent, and I assume the House will be kind enough to grant that consent. However, I understand that the minister has some reservation which he would like to explain to the House, and he would like an opportunity to speak again briefly on the motion.

Mr. Basford: Mr. Speaker, I am quite happy to accommodate the hon. member and give that consent. I wanted an opportunity to reflect. However, that amendment considerably changes the motion, and under the rules I am not allowed to speak on the changed motion. I ask for the permission of the House to make, in a short time, a brief observation on the motion as changed.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Due to the fact that the Minister of Justice (Mr. Basford) has already spoken on this motion, he requires unanimous consent to speak again. Does the minister have unanimous consent?

Mr. Woolliams: Mr. Speaker, I think the first question to be decided is whether the House unanimously agrees to the change in question. There was a typographical error. I pointed

it out last night. Our party agrees to the change. I do not object to the minister's speaking. Perhaps he has something to explain.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Does the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Leggatt) have the unanimous consent of the House to change the wording of his motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): It is so ordered. Does the Minister of Justice have the unanimous consent of the House to speak on the change of wording in the motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Basford: I assume I will speak later.

● (1550)

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Prince Albert): Mr. Speaker, I have refrained from speaking on this bill as most of the arguments I would have advanced have already been placed before the House in previous debates. In order to guard against repetition, I decided I would not speak. That view was reinforced as I read the debates that have taken place. I pay tribute to members who have made their contributions, as the arguments are clear and definite. As I say, I speak with diffidence following the various speeches that have been made. There was the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams), who has a fine record as a trial lawyer, the hon. member for Cumberland-Colchester North (Mr. Coates), and this afternoon the hon. member for Prince George-Peace River (Mr. Oberle) made an exceptionally fine speech. I think all of us would be enriched if we were able to handle the English language the way he does after only some 25 years in Canada.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Diefenbaker: I want to say a word about the hon. member for Nickel Belt (Mr. Rodriguez). In quite a remarkable example of parliamentary skill and debate he dealt with the problem as he saw it. Also, the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Leggatt) throughout the debate has delivered himself in a way that does honour to him and to his constituency.

After all, Mr. Speaker, we do not all have to see alike in everything. Whenever I hear a harsh debate such as sometimes occurs in this House of Commons, I am reminded of the answer given by Sir John A. Macdonald when he was bitterly attacked at the time of the Canadian Pacific scandal. I made a note a moment ago of what he said, and feel the quotation is entirely apt. He said, "I am not totally perfect, to my faults be somewhat blind, to my virtues ever kind." That is a pretty good rule for all of us. However, as I followed this debate I was disturbed by the attitude of the Minister of Justice (Mr. Basford).

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): The country is disturbed.

[Mr. Woolliams.]

Mr. Diefenbaker: I have heard various ministers of justice in this chamber through the years, Mr. Speaker. I think of the Hon. Louis St. Laurent, as he was then, who took the judicial view, not a narrow partisan view. I think of others who succeeded him, such as the Hon. Davie Fulton who served in my administration and who never brushed aside members of the opposition and their viewpoints by imperious attitude. I realize that in speaking I cannot hope to change anything in the mind of the Minister of Justice. He is immune to suggestion; he is insulated against realities, and I am not hopeful of bringing about any change. What shocks me, however, is that he endeavours to fool the people of Canada with the pretence that anyone voting against this bill is voting against gun control or the proper powers, as he sees them, to be granted to the police.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Some hon. Members: Shame.

Mr. Diefenbaker: In other words, he is afraid to bifurcate this bill. If he will do that, he will change my opinion very greatly. But for him to endeavour to hoax the people of Canada and have them believe that if we vote against this bill we vote against gun control, or against giving proper and appropriate rights to the police, providing the civil liberties of individuals are protected, is a smokescreen to cover the fact that he is afraid to divide the bill. I was more convinced than ever that he will not give way, by the remarks he made the other night when a terrible tragedy took place and a fine young city police officer was shot to death. He is to be buried today, and Ottawa and the nation mourns. The minister's ejaculations on that subject as he arrived at the scene of the crime were, to say the least, more pious and unctious than they were excusable.

An hon. Member: Ambulance chaser.

Mr. Diefenbaker: I cannot understand whether the observations that were attributed to him at the time were actually made in connection with blood on the hands of certain members whom he designated—

Mr. Basford: Mr. Speaker, a question of privilege, just so there is no confusion in the debate I think I should point out to the right hon. member that apparently he is prepared to say that I said certain members had blood on their hands.

An hon. Member: He did not say that.

Mr. Basford: Just so there is no confusion, Mr. Speaker, I at no time said that.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, it took the minister three or four days to bring about his denial. I am glad even now that I have been able to raise him from his seat in order to deny something that was totally inexcusable, if true. Why he has been silent so long is not for me to say. Whether he used the words or the suggestions I have made, or not, these are some of the statements he allegedly made—statements that I find hard

to credit to an experienced lawyer and parliamentarian. According to an interview with broadcast news on July 12, he said:

What I don't understand is we have a group of members, such as Stan Schumacher—

The hon. member for Palliser.

—Doug Neil—

The hon. member for Moose Jaw.

—Ritchie

The hon. member for Dauphin.

—Towers—

The hon. member for Red Deer.

—Bob Brisco from Kootenay West, who spent all day yesterday and presumably all day today debating such things as the right of people to collect and use machine guns—

That statement was not true.

—or amendments reducing the sentences for the use of guns; weakening the provisions relating to safe storage and what I just don't understand is how many people, how many policemen, how many citizens, have to be shot down in Brampton or Oshawa or Ottawa or Penticton, where they shot a tax collector—

● (1600)

I cannot understand bringing in a tax collector. I continue:

—or Vancouver, or Montreal, before parliament will react to that public situation and pass the legislation.

Sir, what unctuous hyprocrisy those words are. First, the government introduced legislation to abolish capital punishment. Then it brought in legislation to be in effect until December 31, 1977, provided that anyone who murdered a police officer or custodial officer shall be subject to the death sentence. The government contended that the existence of that death sentence would constitute a deterrent. The government brought that legislation in. Then several policemen and custodial officers were wantonly murdered. Six or seven murderers were awaiting execution. The law providing for the death sentence was in effect, and what did the Minister of Justice do? The government, including the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) wanted to find a way out of the quandary. Having brought the law in themselves, but not desiring to carry it out, they took another course.

Mr. Speaker, one of the last capital cases to come before the courts had to do with two police officers murdered in New Brunswick with unbelievable brutality.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): It was a premeditated murder.

Mr. Diefenbaker: It was premeditated and carried out in a way impossible to describe. Those murders were horrible. In that case the murderers, after conviction, were awaiting the death sentence to be carried out. They appealed. The appeal went to the Supreme Court of Canada and was thrown out. Then, suddenly, the light shone on the government. It decided not to carry out the law. Mr. Pearson had never done so. Mr. Trudeau has not done so since he became Prime Minister. They asked themselves, "What shall we do?" They said, "We shall return to the House of Commons and bring in a new law to provide that the law which was to be in effect until the end of this year shall be set aside." The various murderers of police officers became the beneficiaries of the actions of the government which, having brought in the law which made the murderers of police officers and custodial officers subject to the death penalty, the government turned around and decided it wanted to get out of the position in which it found itself.

That the Minister of Justice should now endeavour to place the responsibility for the death of the young police officer on members of the opposition is infinite gall. He should withdraw his statement publicly now.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Diefenbaker: He has not done so. I tell you this, Mr. Speaker: When there is a change of government there will be a reversal of this legislation at the earliest possible time thereafter. I see smiles on the faces of the self-satisfied members opposite who no doubt have read the results of the Gallup poll. I know something about polls. On June 8, 1957, the election being on June 10, the Gallup poll stated that it was obvious the St. Laurent government was going to be re-elected. The party opposite pointed to preceding polls, which bore an unusual relationship to what is happening today. On May 25 the poll said that the Conservatives would get 32 per cent of the vote, and the Liberals 47 per cent. I can tell you what the subsequent polls said. I do not hear Liberal members quoting those former Gallup polls of 1957 on which they put such reliance.

The polls were taken right across the country. We were told, for example, that in the maritimes the Conservative party would get 44 per cent of the vote, and the Liberal party 52 per cent. We pretty nearly wiped them out in the maritimes. It said we would get 22 per cent in Quebec and the Liberals would get 70 per cent. You know what happened there. According to the poll, in the west we would get only 19 per cent of the vote and the Liberals 34 per cent.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Order, please. I regret to interrupt the right hon. member, but suggest he should return to the motion under discussion.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, I shall do so with great pleasure. I have a strong argument to advance which may seem not connected with the subject before the House, but it is. I say this with great deference, and you know the high regard I have for you, sir. I am saying that when we come to power we shall put an end to all this nonsense, to this legislation such as the Minister of Justice continues to foist on us. Sir, I proceed and will not take long.

I cannot go into provisions concerning wiretapping because there is only one clause before the House. I ask, what happened to the wiretappers of Watergate? I remember somebody asking the Prime Minister in this House, after he had met President Nixon in Washington, if he realized his conversation had been taped. He said, "I do not care." Naturally— nothing was being said. Nonetheless, they had the finest tape system in the president's office you could find anywhere.

Only in the last couple of days a familiar case came to my attention. I will not give hon. members the particulars of it because I do not believe one should be so immodest. I have before me the "RCMP Quarterly", volume 39, No. 4, for October, 1974, and I refer to the story entitled "The cop in the closet." That is a story of a case in which I appeared. In that case they did not have any wiretapping, but they had a policeman and beautiful girl esconced in a cupboard, a small cupboard 24 inches long and 12 inches wide. The man who tells the story is the policeman. They sat there for hours, playing rummy. That is what he says. That is recorded as the first kind of wiretapping case in Canada, but it was not wires they had to tap.

Sir, I would sooner take the opinion of Canadians who believe that you do not need to destroy human rights and fundamental freedoms in order to achieve security.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Diefenbaker: I would sooner take the opinion of the 500 or 600 lawyers, experienced members of the advocate society of Ontario who, summarizing their view, said wiretapping is a serious threat to the general security and welfare of all Canadians. I will not quote newspapers, but all across the country one newspaper after another has taken a stand against wiretapping. Mr. Speaker, this is a short cut to tyranny; that is what wiretapping brings about.

The hon. member for Calgary North is the proposer of an amendment, with which I will not deal now, except to say this: you will soon put an end to wiretapping, unjust wiretapping, if you accept that amendment. The hon. member says the police can tap to their heart's content; they may gain information from that wiretapping which may help in a prosecution, but the evidence thereof shall not be admissible in a court of law. That is the only way in which you can protect Canadians.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Diefenbaker: I have not been one of those members who over the years has complained if his telephone was being tapped. I do not care if it is tapped. If it is, some people may hear things they do not like. To allow police officers to listen in to communications in a lawyers office between the lawyer and his client is a reversion to the days of the Star Chamber.

● (1610)

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Diefenbaker: I hope the minister will reconsider—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Order. I regret to interrupt the right hon. gentleman, but the time allotted to him has expired. He may continue with unanimous consent.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

An hon. Member: No.

Some hon. Members: Shame.

[Mr. Diefenbaker.]

Mr. Woolliams: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I regret that after the co-operation we endeavoured to show in the committee, and of which the Minister of Justice is aware, even though permission to call witnesses before the committee was denied, a member from Montreal—I forget his constituency—

Mr. Paproski: Who cares?

Mr. Woolliams: —should say "No" to a man who has been prime minister of this country and is one of the greatest counsel Canada has ever produced.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Woolliams: The right hon. member for Prince Albert has fought for human rights and civil liberties throughout his career. It was he who produced the Bill of Rights for this nation.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Woolliams: Not only should the Minister of Justice apologise for that lack of courtesy, but the hon. member concerned should apologise.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Basford: I rise on the point of order, Mr. Speaker. Might I simply say that, while a member on this side has refused consent, I am at the same time negotiating with one of the members of our party whose bill would be before us during the private members hour at five o'clock, to give up this hour of private members' business in the hope that progress might be made on the bill before us, and in the hope—as I believe is the desire of all members—that we may at some point in the course of this summer be able to spend some time with our wives and children. This in no way is disrespectful to the right hon. gentleman. If it is the general feeling, it will expedite passage of the bill by allowing him to speak for a few minutes longer. We would, I am sure, have no objection. But we are all trying to work with a will to make progress on this measure.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): You are not going to get it with that sort of tactic.

Mr. Basford: I am saying that I am currently engaged in conversation with one of our members, asking him to give up private members' hour in order to provide more time for this debate.

An hon. Member: That is irrelevant.

Mr. Basford: It is not. We are all making sacrifices to get on with this bill. I suggest to the House that it might be helpful if the right hon. gentleman, or the hon. member for Calgary North, were to ask for unanimous consent for the right hon. member to speak for an additional period in which to conclude his remarks.

Mr. Diefenbaker: No, Mr. Speaker. I understand well the argument advanced by the Minister of Justice, that all hon. members who have wives want to be with them. I wish I could be.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Herbert: On the point of order, Mr. Speaker. I do not think it should be any surprise to the right hon. gentleman that I should have said "No". He was in the House on the previous occasion when I told him I would be taking this action. First of all, I believe that when such extension is given to a member, it is given as a privilege and is not to be abused; it means that the member concerned shall continue to speak for only a few minutes and should not just continue to address the House without time limit. I have refused unanimous consent because of what I consider to have been an abuse of that privilege in the past.

Mr. Paproski: You should hang your head in shame.

Mr. Herbert: Possibly at some future time we should change the rules to limit additional remarks to a fixed period of time. That is for the committee on procedure to decide. In conclusion, I would suggest that the right hon. member has been here long enough that he ought to be able to say what he has to say within the time allotted to him.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Since there is not unanimous consent, I call on the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): I was not rising on the point of order; I was rising to say a few words in the debate.

Some hon. Members: Point of order.

Mr. Fraser: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I want to say, without equivocation, that as a member of the bar who has spent 17 years before the courts, I spent those years believing that one of the fundamental obligations of a lawyer in society and of the law-maker in society was to ensure that the civil liberties of our people, liberties which have been gained at great cost over many hundred years, are not lightly taken away; they must not be restricted unless there is clear, even overwhelming evidence for such a course, the burden of proof being upon those who advocate the restriction of those liberties that it is in the public interest—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Order, please. That is not a point of order. The House did not give the right hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker) unanimous consent to continue, so I recognized the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands (Mr. Douglas).

Mr. Fraser: But Mr. Speaker, let me continue with my point of order—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): The hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands (Mr. Douglas).

Mr. Fraser: I want to move, seconded by the hon. member for Calgary North, that the right hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker) be heard in this House this afternoon.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): I cannot accept the motion due to the fact that the hon. member does not have the floor. I recognized the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands (Mr. Douglas) and he has the floor.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): You just wait over there!

Mr. Woolliams: You will be here until August.

Mr. Rodriguez: You Liberals have blown it.

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, it was not my intention to take part in this debate because I felt my colleagues and my hon. friends had already expressed the position of my party. I rise, however, first of all to say how much I regret that the right hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker), who has been a consistent defender of civil liberties over the years, not only by his words but by his actions, should not have been allowed to complete his speech. He certainly deserved the right to be heard by the House and I, for one, would have liked to hear him.

• (1620)

I am also rising because I listened with dismay to the speech made yesterday afternoon by the Minister of Justice (Mr. Basford). I have always considered the Minister of Justice a very reasonable person. I have had considerable respect for his ability both as a lawyer and as a parliamentarian, but I could not help but feel yesterday that he put up a most unfair defence of a very weak piece of legislation in regard to dealing with electronic surveillance.

The minister began by setting forth the terms of the legislation which was passed in 1974. That was good legislation. It should be remembered that in 1974 we had a minority government and therefore the government was compelled to get the co-operation of the opposition groups. That legislation on the statute books was designed to stop private wiretapping and eavesdropping; to provide for police electronic surveillance under clearly stipulated conditions; and to provide that persons whose telephones were tapped were to be given notice in due course that their telephone conversations were tapped.

Yesterday the minister told the House that this legislation has not worked. He did not tell us why it has not worked. He said that it is difficult for a judge to define what is meant by "organized crime". Very well, Mr. Speaker, if that is true, the minister should have brought in some legislation more clearly defining what is meant by "organized crime". But how does allowing wiretapping to be used in evidence in court, and extending the time for reporting to those people who have been spied upon to three years, clarify what is organized crime? The minister has a responsibility to tell the House why the present

eavesdropping legislation and wiretapping provisions have not worked.

In quoting the police and the attorneys general of the provinces, the minister is implying that the judges have been uncooperative in giving authorization. Is that true? Is the minister saying that the police had difficulty getting authorization from judges? It would be a terrible indictment of the judiciary of this country. If the police have been getting co-operation, then why does the minister now need provisions allowing the tapes which are taken of a wiretap to be used in court as evidence?

The minister stated the basic principles here. First of all, he said, we are all opposed to private wiretapping. Agreed. He said we are also agreed that the police should be allowed to indulge in electronic surveillance under what he calls "proper judicial supervision". I, for one, Mr. Speaker, do approve. I think there are times when it may be that wiretapping and other forms of electronic surveillance are necessary in order to deal with criminals and to stop criminal activities in this country. That is why we voted for the legislation of 1974. But we voted for it on the understanding that these wiretapping operations would only be permitted when authorization had been granted by the courts.

The minister is now saying that he wants electronic surveillance under, to quote his words, "proper judicial supervision". How can there be proper judicial supervision when the police can wiretap and eavesdrop, and then take the tapes into court and have them accepted as evidence? Why would the police bother to go to court to get permission, if they can use the evidence in court? The simplest thing to do is to go on a witch-hunt, a fishing expedition, wire enough people and tap enough phones so that if nothing of interest is found except some petty gossip they do not need to do anything with it. That is, except to keep it on the record because it might be useful on a further occasion for a little blackmail. However, if the police do find something, Mr. Speaker, which they got illegally, by breaking the law, then they can take it into court and use it as evidence against a person who is charged.

Just where are we going, Mr. Speaker? What the minister is saying is that when you ask the question, "What is a crime?", the answer is that a crime is an illegal act which is committed by the police. If the police break the law, or if they tap phones by using eavesdropping facilities illegally, that is not a crime; the reward is that the evidence can be used in court in order to convict some individual.

I wonder whether the minister and the House realize the road down which we are travelling. At the present time, as I understand the law, the police cannot break into my house or office, or any other person's premises, in order to secure documents unless they first obtain a search warrant or writ of assistance. Is the next step going to be that they can break in illegally? There is some evidence that the police have broken in illegally, which is why the Solicitor General (Mr. Fox) has ordered an investigation into the RCMP. But if they break into premises illegally, are they to be allowed to use any documents which they find as evidence, in court? That will be the next step.

Mr. Basford: They can now. That is the present law.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): They can use evidence illegally obtained?

Mr. Basford: That is the common law.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Then the minister had better get busy and change it.

Mr. Leggatt: You should have brought that amendment in with the bill.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): The minister's interjection seems to me to point not down the road which we might travel, but down the road which we are already travelling. Surely what happened in the United States is a lesson to this country. The CIA set up its "dirty tricks" department where the "plumbers" were illegally breaking into premises, not to deal with criminals but to get political information against their political opponents. That has built up to the point where we know Edgar Hoover got private dossiers on people in public life, such as senators, congressmen and people like Martin Luther King. Is that what we want to do? There is now evidence that the CIA had assassination squads in South Vietnam. Why? On the assumption that the forces who are supposed to maintain the law can violate the law any time they pleased, it is in the interests of national security to do so. If we start down that road, we are going to find ourselves in exactly the same kind of difficulty from which the United States is now emerging.

● (1630)

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Surely, in this country, if an act is illegal for ordinary citizens it is illegal for the police.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): The police have no right to wiretap. They have no more right to break into your home or mine unless they have the proper authorization set forth in the law. To say they can wiretap or they can search my home in order to get documents and use them in court, even though they get them illegally, is a negation of the law. Louis XIV once said, "L'état c'est moi"—which means, "I am the state". In a democracy, this government is not the state; it is the servant of the state.

Some hon. Members: Right on.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): The people in this country are the state and we are here as their servants. The ministers who sit on the treasury benches are there to protect the country against any group in the community which wants to violate its rights as free men and women. What is this

government doing to protect them? It has stooped to a subterfuge which has been pointed out by the right hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker). It brings in pieces of legislation covering four or five topics—gun control, dangerous offenders, parole, and electronic surveillance. It is true that all of these measures deal with the Criminal Code. The fact that one agrees with part of this bill does not mean that one has to accept all of the bill.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): The government has taken those pieces of the bill which the great majority of us in this House support and has endeavoured to use those sections as a sugar-coating to cover the bitter pill of allowing illegal wiretapping by the police forces and allowing them to use that as evidence in the courts, thereby giving them an open invitation completely to ignore the provision that they must go to the courts, because they do not need to go to the courts. They can eavesdrop to their heart's content, knowing perfectly well that whatever evidence they secure illegally can be used as evidence in a court of law.

We have supported the minister in the past on gun control and many of the measures in regard to parole and dangerous offenders. I, for one, am not prepared to support any piece of legislation which contains provisions allowing the police forces of this country, even with the best will in the world, to go out and break the law and use the results of their illegality as a means of convicting some person in the courts of Canada.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Therefore, even at this late date the minister ought to break up this bill and give the House of Commons at third reading an opportunity to vote separately on these sections of Bill C-51. If he does not, he leaves those of us who believe in basic civil liberties of Canadian people no option but to vote against this piece of legislation.

This government has always boasted of its liberalism. This government is still smarting from the unhappy memories of October, 1970, and the War Measures Act. I would have expected that a government which burned its fingers on those anti-civil libertarian measures would now want to give the House an opportunity to deal with the matter of electronic surveillance on its merits, rather than burying it in a bill which the government hopes we will accept even though we dislike this portion. I dislike this portion of the bill so strongly that I am prepared to vote against the bill as a whole, although there are many things in the bill with which I heartily approve.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Basford: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Many members of this House regret the incident which occurred a little while ago, and I should like to ask the House to grant the right hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker) an opportunity to be heard a second time now.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Is it agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Agreed, and so ordered.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, I very much appreciate the motion of the Minister of Justice (Mr. Basford) which is in keeping with the best traditions of parliament. However, as I have already stated, I would not want to accept that, not because he has advanced it but, rather, because of the hon. member who took the stand and as a result of doing so obtained another forward step in notoriety. I would not want to remove the benefits from him.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

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

Some hon. Members: Question.

Mr. Basford: Mr. Speaker, as I said a moment ago, I want to facilitate the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Leggatt) by agreeing to his changing of the words of his amendment. I wanted an opportunity to speak very briefly on the changed amendment. I recognize that electronic surveillance is a matter upon which all members of this House hold very strong feelings. As I said yesterday, in 1974 this House examined the question very thoroughly. I ask hon. members to look at this amendment, as reworded, very carefully, because I suggest to hon. members and to the mover of the amendment that a careful reading of the amendment would make it clear that it would be "open season" for the police to investigate any activity involving two or more persons.

I know the intention of the hon. member for New Westminster. We discussed that intention very carefully in committee. It is essentially my intention, namely, that we have a list of specified offences upon which the police could obtain an authorization to wiretap, and that there be some general clause relating to organized crime allowing authorizations there. In 1974 there was the first general organized crime section that the then hon. member for St. Paul's, Ronald Atkey, a Conservative member, wrote into the Criminal Code. That general clause has not proved effective, and this is an amendment to rewrite it. This amendment deals with a number of persons acting in concert in furtherance of a commission of crime involving one or more offences. At the very least, those are confusing words. At the very most, it is "open season" for wiretapping any activity by two or more persons involved in an offence.

● (1640)

All offences must be given this general meaning. It is not restricted to Criminal Code offences, indictible offences or offences with a penalty of five years or more. The general meaning of offences is anything carrying a penal consequence. The courts would have to interpret that not only as being an offence under some federal statute but under provincial statutes and even municipal bylaws. I suspect that a very careful reading of this amendment has the most dire consequences

which are not being noted. As I say, it would be "open season" for wiretap activity against any two people involved in anything which would be an offence under a federal statute, provincial statute or municipal statute. I do not think that is the intention of the opposition or of the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Leggatt). It is certainly not my intention. I urge the House, including the members of the NDP, to defeat this amendment. As judicially interpreted, it would have very drastic consequences.

When they appeared before the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs, the Advocates' Society and other groups who appeared strenously objected to this very provision whereby one could have two or more people involved in any offence and it could be wiretapped. As I recall the evidence, they spoke of two gas station attendants who agreed on the price of gasoline who could be wiretapped under the combines act. The Advocates' Society mentioned a lot of other incidents that could be subject—

Mr. Woolliams: Like income tax.

Mr. Basford: Like income tax. I suggest very seriously to the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams) that the amendment now before the House is precisely the situation to which the Advocates' Society was addressing itself. The amendment that the justice and legal affairs committee finally agreed upon as a compromise measure had a list of specific Criminal Code offences and a section relating to organised crime involving Criminal Code indictible offences with a penalty on indictment of five years. That is far more limiting than amendment No. 29.

I ask the hon. member for Calgary North, who has a deep interest in this matter, to look very carefully at the wording of this amendment. It is precisely the situation against which the advocate society was making strong representations.

Mr. Woolliams: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Minister of Justice (Mr. Basford a question?

Mr. Leggatt: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Order, please. The hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Leggatt) must have unanimous consent, as he has already spoken.

Mr. Leggatt: Mr. Speaker, this is a point of order. It is simply to clarify the amendment that I asked the House to consider last night. In doing so, I do not put forward the explanation in any kind of great detail. I do not propose to do that now. I want to read the particular amendment into the record because the Minister of Justice is clearly in error when he says it does not apply to indictment. It clearly does. I will read it again for the minister. The motion, as amended, reads as follows:

—and any other offence created by an act of parliament for which an offender may be prosecuted by indictment—

[Mr. Basford.]

The words are clearly there. The minister is misleading the House when he says that the "tappability" would apply to all offences. The offence must be indictable. I quote:

—or that is an offence mentioned in section 3 or 20 of the Small Loans Act, that there are reasonable grounds to believe is part of a pattern of criminal activity planned and organized by a number of persons acting in concert in furtherance of the commission of crime involving one or more offences mentioned in paragraph (a) or a conspiracy to commit one or more such offences—

That is the best definition I know for organized crime. If the minister has a better definition, he should submit it. The minister said we were opening the door to everything. That is exactly what we are not doing with this amendment. We are leaving the door open only enough to handle organized crime. The minister's amendment does not deal with the question of organized crime. This amendment simply ensures that you can only tap an individual where the offence has a ten-year penalty, but with organized crime you leave it open to an indictable offence.

I do not know how the minister can come to any other conclusion from reading this motion. Bringing in this red herring of a couple of people in a gas station simply does not wash. In explanation of this, the change is clearly to allow us the capacity to tap for organized crime. I do not know of anyone in this chamber who opposes that provision. I still argue that the amendment is in order. The hon. member raised a red herring in terms of acting in concert. He clearly misunderstands. He even made the argument that it carried forward for all offences, when clearly only offences that are indictable are covered in terms of organized criminal activity.

Mr. Woolliams: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Minister of Justice a question?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): The hon. member for Calgary North on a point of order.

Mr. Woolliams: It is not a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): The hon. member has already spoken on this motion. He can only speak again with unanimous consent. Does the hon. member have unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Woolliams: Mr. Speaker, I know the minister is anxious to get this legislation through. He spoke with great affection about Mr. Chappel, Mr. Cooper and Mr. Cartwright who appeared before the committee for the advocate society and the benchers of Upper Canada. He referred to them in reference to the motion of my good friend from New Westminster (Mr. Leggatt). I have on the order paper two amendments. They state that you cannot wiretap solicitors' offices because of the privilege and confidentiality, not of the lawyers, but of the clients. The second amendment reads:

—"but all evidence derived from an unauthorized intercept and all evidence derived therefrom shall be inadmissible in any court of law."

Those two amendments were recommended by the distinguished group who appeared before the committee. Will the

minister now accept those two amendments without any further debate? He used that society to bolster his argument with reference to the amendment of the hon. member for New Westminster. If he loves their report and refers to it in the House of Commons with great affection, I ask him to accept the two main amendments recommended by the lawyers of Upper Canada.

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

Some hon. Members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): The question is on motion No. 29 in the name of the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Leggatt). Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

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

Some hon. Members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): In my opinion they nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Pursuant to Standing Order 75(11), the recorded division on proposed motion No. 29 stands deferred. We will now proceed to motions Nos. 30, 31 and 32. These will be grouped for debate. A vote on motion No. 30 will also dispose of motions Nos. 31 and 32.

Mr. Basford: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I believe there have been some discussions through the usual channels, led by the hon. member for Scarborough East (Mr. O'Connell), with regard to private members' hour. Possibly, before we start debating amendments, it might be useful to deal with that. There is a willingness on the part of the hon. member for Scarborough East, who is the sponsor of the bill to be dealt with at five o'clock, to give up this particular private members' hour providing, of course, that at some subsequent time he will have the opportunity to present it.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Is it agreed that private members' hour, to commence at five o'clock, will be dispensed with?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): It is so ordered.

Mr. Goodale: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I do not want to delay the proceedings, but it would be worth while for the House to note its gratitude to the hon. member for Scarborough East (Mr. O'Connell) who has been most co-operative both today and on other occasions.

Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Calgary North) moved:

Motion No. 30.

That Bill C-51, to amend the Criminal Code, the Customs Tariff, the Parole Act, the Penitentiary Act and the Prisons and Reformatories Act, be amended in clause 9 by striking out lines 23 to 31 at page 49 and substituting the following therefor:

"consultation with clients".

● (1650)

Motion No. 31.

That Bill C-51, to amend the Criminal Code, the Customs Tariff, the Parole Act, the Penitentiary Act and the Prisons and Reformatories Act, be amended in clause 10 by striking out lines 5 to 20 at page 51 and substituting the following therefor:

"but all evidence derived from an unauthorized intercept and all evidence derived therefrom shall be inadmissible in any court of law."

Motion No. 32.

That Bill C-51, to amend the Criminal Code, the Customs Tariff, the Parole Act, the Penitentiary Act and the Prisons and Reformeries Act, be amended in clause 10 by striking out line 35 at page 51 and substituting the following therefor:

"he may not".

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

Mr. Woolliams: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a small point of order. I notice that the Chair has linked motion No. 30, which deals with conversations between solicitor and client, and motion No. 31 which deals with the admissibility of evidence. That is like trying to mix water and oil. In light of what happened earlier this afternoon when the right hon. gentleman for Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker) was speaking, if I, for example, asked for extra time because those two motions are linked together, would I be given extra time? As it is, I am only allowed 20 minutes to speak on such a serious subject.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): In fact, you are allowed 40 minutes.

Mr. Woolliams: I ask that these two motions be separated and that we vote separately on motions Nos. 30 and 31.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): I am informed that due to the fact that the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams) moved the motion, he will be allowed 40 minutes.

An hon. Member: That's too much.

Mr. Woolliams: What about the other speakers, sir?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): On the same motion, the other speakers will be allowed 20 minutes, but the hon. member for Calgary North will be allowed 40 minutes due to the fact that he moved the motion.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[*English*]

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 40, to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: the hon. member for Halifax-East Hants (Mr. McCleave)—National Defence—Alleged differentiation in treatment by customs between forces personnel and civilians; the hon. member for Nickel Belt (Mr. Rodriguez)—Post Office—Allegation union denied access to means of communicating with members—Government position; the hon. member for Wellington-Grey-Dufferin-Waterloo (Mr. Beatty)—Farm Credit Corporation—Indictment of management in audit by Sibbald Group—Government action.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

CRIMINAL LAW AMENDMENT ACT, 1977

AMENDMENTS TO CRIMINAL CODE

The House resumed consideration of Bill C-51, to amend the Criminal Code, the Customs Tariff, the Parole Act, the Penitentiary Act and the Prisons and Reformatories Act, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs.

Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Calgary North): First of all, Mr. Speaker, I will deal with motion No. 30 amending clause 9 at page 49 by striking out lines 23 to 31 and substituting the words "consultation with clients". The clause reads:

> No authorization may be given to intercept a private communication at the office of residence of a solicitor, or at any other place ordinarily used by a solicitor and by other solicitors for the purpose of consultation with clients,

If the clause stopped at this point, that would be fine, but it goes on to read:

> —unless the judge to whom the application is made is satisfied that there are reasonable grounds to believe that the solicitor, any other solicitor practising with him, any person employed by him or any other such solicitor or a member of the solicitor's household has been or is about to become a party to an offence.

The first point I want to make is that all communications between clients and solicitor should be privileged and confidential. Otherwise, no solicitor could act for his client or use the telephone in privacy. There have been cases of telephones in courthouses being wiretapped and there have also been cases of phones in law offices being wiretapped. This means that if the police suspect one person in that office of, say, smoking marijuana or doing something within the definition of offence in the amendment moved by my good friend, and there are 100 lawyers in that law firm, 30 or 40 secretaries and several bookeepers, they can wiretap the whole office so that all the private conversations can be listened to in the hope that they can hear one sentence which would help them obtain evidence against the one person they suspect.

Let us consider a medical clinic with 20 or 30 doctors practising together, specialists in different fields. If the police were to suspect a clerk, an orderly, a nurse or even a doctor in that office, all the conversations could be tapped for 60 long days, all the most private matters that were discussed concerning our wives, our children and ourselves and concerning all other Canadians, could be overheard. As the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands (Mr. Douglas) said in his brilliant speech this afternoon, this could happen. But he could have added one sentence—namely, that this information could have been fed into a computer.

There are unfortunate cases of high school girls 14 or 15 years old becoming pregnant, calling the family doctor and telling him of their misfortune. If that clinic were wiretapped, the record of that girl's conversation could be overheard and fed into the computer. If my unmarried daughter should become pregnant, or if that were to happen to anyone else, I would not want that published in the Calgary *Herald* or the Toronto *Star*. I see a few doctors present in the House. They know how private some medical information can be, and that the privilege of confidentiality is not to protect lawyers or doctors but to protect clients and patients.

The Minister of Justice (Mr. Basford) spoke about exemptions, but there is no exemption here. It says that no authorization will be given unless the judge to whom the application is made is satisfied that there are reasonable grounds for it. Anyone can be suspected in a solicitor's office, his partner, someone working for him, someone on his staff at home, such as the gardener, the maid or the fellow who sands the floors.

As the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands pointed out, the police cannot enter your home without a search warrant or a writ of assistance, but they can smuggle in by wiretapping a telephone, by putting a bug in your front room, or even under your bed. This is what this amendment is all about. As the right hon. member for Prince Albert said this afternoon, surely the minister will show some sanity in reference to this matter. This is a reasonable amendment. I will quote from the brief in a few moments. The minister read from the brief and he said that the Advocates' Society of Ontario did not agree with my good friend, the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Leggatt). I question the fact that is an accurate statement, but even if it is an accurate statement, the Advocates' Society came before the committee on June 9 with three very intelligent legal briefs. In one of them they said:

> The present sections of the Criminal Code make no special provision for the interception of communications to and by solicitors. If there are reasonable grounds for belief that a solicitor is a person the interception of whose private communications may assist the investigation of an offence, an authorization will be granted to intercept his communications.

This is at the discretion of the judge. The minister says he trusts judges. I have a lot of respect for our judiciary, but this is not an ordinary case. This is made ex parte, which means that a law officer of the Crown or a police officer goes before a

judge with an affidavit and nobody has the right to cross-examine him, and he swears that this and that is the fact. So the judge signs the order on a busy afternoon, and the wiretap is allowed.

Mr. Fraser: Having heard only one side of the story.

Mr. Woolliams: Yes, and that side has not even been examined by scrutiny of the right of cross-examination. I cannot accept that, and neither can any other lawyer in this country. The law societies of the provinces, the Canadian bar, the Advocates' Society of Ontario, and the benchers of Upper Canada say that this cannot go on, not because lawyers should have any special protection, but because the citizens of Canada have civil rights, and they are entitled to privacy. Have we reached the stage where we can press a red, blue, pink or green button and out rolls our whole lives? What human being is without some sin? What human being does not have some little skeleton in his closet which he would rather keep locked up during his lifetime? What family in this country has not had difficulties? We as members of parliament are not immune because we are in public life. It does not matter which party we belong to; it always saddens me that our lives and the lives of our children and our wives are bared. When this bill goes through, everybody will be subject to that scrutiny, and that is not good enough.

● (1700)

Mr. Austin M. Cooper, Q.C. says:

Bill C-51 would add section 178.13(1.1) which would give specific legislative sanction to the interception of private communications at the office and at the residence of a solicitor, or at any other place ordinarily used by him and other solicitors for the purpose of consultation with clients.

Mr. Cooper, Mr. Chappel and Mr. Cartwright are distinguished legal scholars who believe in the philosophy of civil rights. Mr. Cooper said he could not talk to his clients on the telephone any more. He has to drive out into the country and hope that there is not a bug in the bush. What is the matter with Canada? Has the Liberal party lost its heart and soul?

Mr. Fraser: And common sense.

Mr. Woolliams: And common sense?

The interception may lawfully be made even if the particular solicitor whose privacy is sought to be invaded is not suspected of complicity in any crime.

The press has failed to realize that once a clinic or law firm has been wiretapped, evidence collected over a period of 60 days has to be played back in order to find one small piece of evidence. We should not give judges the right to allow that. I engage the services of a gardener once in a while. Since we have to be down here all summer, somebody has to cut our grass. My gardener is a fine fellow, but I have sometimes thought he imbibes a little too much. That is his privilege and his business. But I do not want my house wiretapped because of that person or any other person. When people call me, my telephone is used to discuss private political matters and matters relating to my duties as a member of parliament and as a senior partner of a law firm. I ask hon. members opposite, where is your heart and soul? Why do hon. members opposite support the Minister of Justice in this regard? The government brought in human rights. Is the human rights bill like the curtains around this chamber? Was that brought in to please or to buy votes, or do hon. members opposite really believe that people in Canada should have civil and human rights and that there should be no discrimination? What is the philosophy opposite? I cannot answer that; I can only draw inferences from what I see going on.

It is sufficient if his partner, or an employee of the solicitor of his partner, or a member of the solicitor's household is suspected, on reasonable grounds, of being or having been party to an offence.

It is submitted that the proposed addition to the present legislation is not limiting; on the contrary, it extends the present power—

Without this legislation, I question whether a judge would allow that; but with it clinics and law firms can be wiretapped.

If, for example a solicitor's son (a member of his household) is suspected on reasonable grounds of possessing marijuana, the same eavesdropping may be lawfully indulged in by the police at the solicitor's office and at the jail and at the courthouse.

I told the House that I once hired a psychiatrist to examine a client with regard to a question of insanity. The psychiatrist's interviews were bugged. A spy was involved. A letter went to the attorney general and the Crown attempted to use that letter. The judge threw it out, but the Crown's psychiatrist read the letter and changed his opinion with regard to the sanity of the accused. What kind of civil right is that? That is what is taking place in good old Canada.

There is no restriction on the persons whose communications with the solicitor may be intercepted. All of his clients' conversations with him may be recorded.

How can we defend anybody if the Crown has the story? We might as well adopt the Napoleonic law and say that the accused is guilty and he has to take the stand to prove himself innocent. Then he would have to undergo cross-examination on what he said or may have said or meant. The documents I quoted from yesterday pointed out that the word "No" could taken out so that something might seem affirmative rather than negative. A magnet can be used to cut three or four minutes out of a tape. We do not need Nixon's secretary to do that.

It is submitted that the proposed legislative sanction to the interception of solicitors' private communications poses a serious threat to the privacy of the client's consultations with his lawyer which has traditionally been respected and protected by the common law and by statute.

I hold in my hand "Phipson on Evidence" which, as well as "Whigmore", is a leading authority. It sets out the privilege which exists between solicitor and client. That privilege exists because if it did not a person could not have an adequate, proper and legal defence. Our jurisprudence and freedom go back to before Magna Carta. Hon. members would repeal Magna Carta. That is what they are doing today, and that is why the debate got a little hot this afternoon. We heard today from an hon. member who has much experience. He knows in his heart where he stands on civil rights. He would not have been nominated and elected to this place if he did not have some decency and understanding of civil rights and the need

for individual privacy. It does not matter to which party he belongs.

Hon. members opposite think they are all powerful. They have a majority. They want to go home for the summer, and they want to get this bill through. They say we have delayed it. I agree that the statement made by the Minister of Justice yesterday was a shabby one. In reference to the gun control part of this bill, I said that the guns which are used illegally are not the guns covered by the bill at all. I said that the minister's statement was false—and it was false. However, to get this bill through, anything goes. An old friend of my mother used to have a machine to make great sausages. This government likes to grind out legislation like sausages. It does not matter how it comes out.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Baloney, in this case.

Mr. Woolliams: It is baloney, but this is serious baloney and this bill is bad baloney.

It is submitted that the proposed legislative sanction to the interception of solicitors' private communications poses a serious threat to the privacy of the client's consultations with his lawyer which has traditionally been respected and protected by the common law and by statute. It is no consolation that privileged communications overheard by the police may not be introduced in evidence subsequently at a trial. Citizens' rights to obtain accurate legal advice and to prepare their defences in consultation with their counsel, are threatened.

I could go on and on with reference to that, because to me that section is wrong. I want to speak for a few moments on motion No. 31, which in part reads as follows:

● (1710)

"—but all evidence derived from an unauthorized intercept and all evidence derived therefrom shall be inadmissible in any court of law."

That is what the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands (Mr. Douglas) said this afternoon in his speech, and I have moved an amendment to that effect. It has also been recommended in the report submitted by Mr. Cooper, which says:

There is no requirement in the Criminal Code that the judge to whom an application for an authorization to wiretap is made be advised as to whether a previous similar application has been brought—

He goes on to discuss it. You can now do it for 60 days, and you do not have to notify the person for three years. If you do not get an order at all, you produce the evidence. The Minister of Justice says there is a section in the code. But I do not know of one police officer, since that was implemented in the code, who has gone to jail because he had made unauthorized wiretaps. There is one law for the authorities and one for the people. That is not good enough, Mr. Speaker.

I say any conversation where that application is impeccably correct in every regard and in proper order as granted by the judge should be made and the authorization should be given. The courts in Vancouver have now ruled that when you get to trial and are faced with this, you cannot even cross-examine the police officer who made the application to see if it was proper, because the Supreme Court of Canada has said, in effect, "Forget about it." The test is whether it is relevant to the issue or not.

I must quote, again, my good friend, the former premier of Saskatchewan, who spoke this afternoon and asked why we should have any authorization at all? Why not just go out and bug the telephones, run the lines through every police station in Canada, turn the computers on, and then the police can play cribbage or rummy while the computers are running? Occasionally they can check some place out and not bother about police work. Of course, the person being bugged may not have gone so far as to commit a crime but just be getting near to it.

That brings us to a police state, Mr. Speaker. What happens to our rights then? We know what happened under the Nazis. At night people listened to their neighbours whispering in their bedrooms, their front rooms and their kitchens and reported to the S.S. who came and took them away. Where did they go? All of us know the story. We know of the six million Jews who were put through the furnaces. We know the story of Anne Frank's diary and how the family lived in a little attic, how somebody whispered one day and then the police broke down the door with rifle butts and took them away. They suffered and died. We say that will not happen in Canada. They said it would not happen in Germany. What protects us here is not parliament itself, it is the rule of law.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Woolliams: When my children go to school, it is not Premier Lougheed who guarantees their safety; it is the law of Canada. When I get on an airplane to come to this House from Calgary, it is not the president of Air Canada, the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) or the Minister of Transport (Mr. Lang) who protects me; it is the rule of law. It is the rule of law that protects every Canadian. Once you give the law to the authorities, they will break it.

Mr. Speaker, I have defended the RCMP and I have defended city police in this House, but I can give instances where I have found police to have lied on the stand in very serious trials. In one murder case they lied, and those lies were brought out by cross-examination. In that trial I asked the police if they denied being in the basement of the house, and they said they were never down there. I asked, "Detective, did you ever own a Packard car?" The judge wanted to know what that had to do with anything, and I replied, "Let me finish." Then I asked the detective, "Did you ever finance it through Trader's Finance?" He said, "Yes." I asked, "If you were not in the basement, how did your conditional sales contract get there?" Then he said he was there and had forgotten. "What were you doing down there?" He said he went down to look for tea. He wanted to make himself a cup of tea, and was waiting for somebody.

I could go on and on, Mr. Speaker. I remember a police officer saying he had read all the authorities on a certain situation. I named four of five authorities that did not exist, and he said he had read them—but when I pointed to a real authority, he denied reading it. Those are the experiences of a trial lawyer, Mr. Speaker. If I sat over there as minister of

justice I would be against arming people anywhere. We are all people with certain human failings, and just putting on a uniform does not make us full of justice. I say any evidence derived from an unauthorized wiretap should be inadmissible.

Here is another trick, Mr. Speaker. The police may decide not to bother about the authorization and just wiretap. They hear something on the telephone, and in another place find an article of evidence. That is called derivative evidence and it is admissible. When they are on the witness-stand they do not say they used a wiretap to find out about the article—they just happened to walk into the building and saw a canary singing in the open window. You know what happens, Mr. Speaker, and I know what happens. Certainly, anybody who has been an attorney general in this country must know what happens. I think I would make a tough judge when it came to that kind of stuff. I do not know what happens to people when they are elevated to positions, sometimes even the bench—and I do not say this carelessly. Over the years, however, I have found they will believe police officers over anybody. A defence counsel knows that. He knows he has got to get at something to be able to discredit those people before a judge and jury.

I had one judge stop me in a murder trial and ask, "Are you trying to show the RCMP are liars?" They had denied being up in the mountains at Banff interviewing the man but they had witnessed a statement and when I brought it to their attention all of a sudden they were able to recall. I said, "It is obvious that I do not need to prove they are liars." The man, Stringer, was acquitted of murder, but it would have been different if I had not cross-examined the police. I do not know how many statements they had—the man was never sober long enough to know what he did—but they had statements yet they denied being there; they denied the crime; they denied a lot of things.

That is what has happened in my career, Mr. Speaker. Yet I defend the police. We have to defend them because we need police officers to protect the citizens of Canada. Anytime we find such a situation, however, it should be brought to the attention of the minister, the commissioner or whoever is in charge. Let me tell you another story. A man was charged with capital murder and convicted of non-capital murder of a little child. He was taken to the cells in Edmonton and the police officer said, "Here is a child murderer. I cannot get him, but you prisoners can have him." What happened? One of the prisoners slugged the police officer. He threatened to lay a charge, but the guard was honest enough to suggest he should forget the whole thing. I need not tell you I had that investigated, so I know what took place.

I do not believe we are always going to have honest affidavits when there is no right of cross-examination. Even if you get that beautiful order with a seal and a stamp—even with an authorized wiretap there will still be abuse. We must watch this kind of legislation, Mr. Speaker. I cannot understand the minister and his top lawyers. The Advocates' Society—Mr. Cartwright, Mr. Chappell and Mr. Cooper—did not come to committee with a cooked-up brief. They came as honest scholars and asked the committee and the minister not to pass this legislation. The hon. member for New Westminster, who in committee supported the amendments I am talking about, knows that the vote was nine to eight. The tie was broken by the chairman who is a member of the government. I make nothing of that. However, because that is our parliamentary system, when eight vote for the motion and nine vote against it, in the public mind that is close enough for the minister to consider it, so he brought in an amendment.

● (1720)

He said we were going to leave the whole thing to the judge's discretion. Mr. Speaker, the Supreme Court of Canada held that if it is relevant, it is admissible. Consequently, what discretion does the trial judge, magistrate or provincial judge have? He has none. If it is relevant to the issue, it goes in as evidence. If a judge or magistrate excludes the evidence, the Crown will appeal on the ground the court has not followed the Supreme Court of Canada's decision. This happens, Mr. Speaker.

Surely, in light of this fact and in light of what I set out with regard to consultations between solicitor and client, in clinics and offices, and the admissibility of evidence obtained from unauthorized wiretaps, I have made my case. Perhaps I did not need 40 minutes to make it. Earlier this afternoon the Minister of Justice referred to a similar point raised by the hon. member for New Westminster and to what certain people had said on it. He said they were right. If they were right concerning the hon. member's point, why would they be wrong concerning mine? How can you explain the distinction? I suggest you cannot explain it.

I conclude that the minister is becoming the prisoner of his department's officials, and any clauses they draw up for him he must push through this House or risk losing their confidence. The Minister of Justice, as did his predecessor, likes to stand in this House and say what the law is. I remember Mr. Turner, now the director of many companies, trying to tell us the exact state of the law concerning abortion. He was not right. Mr. Speaker, the law is not what the Minister of Justice says it is. He does not interpret the law. Our judges, provincial courts of appeal and the Supreme Court of Canada, interpret the law. What the minister is recorded as saying in *Hansard* has no bearing on the law, because the courts cannot refer to anything reported in *Hansard* when interpreting the law. The law is interpreted according to the language in which it is written. A penal statute should always be interpreted in favour of the subject, in accordance with sound law.

Having said that, I seek the support of the government and of the minister. We could end this debate immediately. My good friends in the New Democratic Party say they will support my motion. Therefore, only the government stands in the way. By accepting the motion the government could end this debate which became somewhat heated this afternoon, and rightly so. I say to the minister, give in for once; be flexible; as the Minister of Justice, be big.

Mr. Stuart Leggatt (New Westminster): Mr. Speaker, I will try to be brief. First, I tell the House that the New Democratic

Party supports not only motion 30, in the name of the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams), but, as well, motions 31, 32, 33 and 34. The acceptance of each one of those motions would make a significant contribution to the protection of the privacy of each citizen of this country.

Why does the minister sit in this House and pretend, "Here I am, really a civil libertarian, folks?" He sits there, with a kind of wounded innocence, saying, "Why are you attacking me? After all, I am doing nothing very serious. We are just going to change a few rules in the wiretap law, get after those bad people out there in the world and put them in jail." If that is the minister's position, that is hypocrisy of the worst kind. I want the minister to stop hiding behind his cloak, to stop pretending he is a civil libertarian. He is becoming the enemy of every civil libertarian in Canada because of his approach to this bill.

If the minister is interested in controlling crime, as we are, and interested in reducing preventable homicides, which we can do under the gun control provisions, he can stand in this House right now and agree to sever the wiretap provisions from this bill. If he does this, I assure him that my party, and I think the Conservative party, will say, "Good. Let us put the matter to the vote now." I say, let us send these wiretap provisions back to committee. Perhaps they can be examined in the fall. Let us take another look at them.

It is clear that the people who drafted this bill and its wiretap provisions knew exactly what the minister wanted. The minister has failed in his primary obligation, which was to protect the liberty of the citizen against the encroachment of a police state. It is his duty not to listen only to the whispers of the commissioners of the RCMP with regard to increases in power; it is his duty to examine that question objectively and then come down on the side of the citizen. But he has not done that. He has not done it because this is an old, tired government, largely in the hands of its bureaucracy. We look for greater things from ministers of the government. We want them to act objectively and independently. We do not want them to accept the advice, holus-bolus, of a bureaucracy grown fat, sassy and arrogant.

The motion before us deals with the legislative sanction the minister would give to the wiretapping of solicitors' offices. At first blush people may say, "Oh, you lawyers are trying to protect yourselves." The fact is, the privilege associated with consultation is the privilege of the citizen. We want to make sure that every Canadian has the right to consult with someone in private without his conversation being overheard. People talk of the insidious growth of police power and the loss of the citizen's freedom. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to be a member of the legal profession because that profession is one of the last bulwarks remaining against encroachments of the police state.

Mr. Fraser: Right on.

Mr. Leggatt: Similarly, the motion now before the House would, if accepted, also be a bulwark against the encroachment of the police state. The ordinary citizen has not the time to read complicated law, to familiarize himself with its provisions, to tackle our bureaucrats and learn all the rules of the game. The little guy cannot do that. He needs someone to represent him in his dealings with the minister or the bureaucracy, or with the authorities. The minister would jeopardize his ability to consult in private.

It is the duty of the legal profession to protect its clients against "Big Brother", the big state. That is why the motion the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams) has proposed is so important. Perhaps it is the most important motion moved so far in relation to this bill. Surely it should be every person's right to talk to his solicitor in confidence, without fear of being overheard.

If the minister wants to be known as a civil libertarian, why cannot he stand in his place today and say, "I agree with you in principle. I agree with the hon. member for Calgary North's amendment in principle." It is a reasonable amendment, and he can say he supports it. But he does not do that. He has not done so. He sits in his seat and tries to play both sides of the street, as it were. The Canadian people will not let this government get away with it. After I had proposed the previous amendment, the minister stood up and said, "Oh, the hon. member for New Westminster would open the door to allowing everybody to be tapped. His definition is not narrow enough." I ask the minister, how would his officials draft that clause? How would they draft the definition to narrow the question down to organized crime? I will accept such a definition. If the minister's position is that my definition is too wide, I will accept his version.

The minister's staff has examined my motion. I will accept the minister's version if he accepts the principle that we should tap wires in cases involving organized crime and indictable offences, but not tap the conversations of little old ladies who may have brought an extra bottle of wine across the border. I think the minister knows what we want to accomplish. If the minister were to bring forward amendments in this regard which he will support, I would quit talking now. We will be happy to accept the minister's proposal concerning that offence section. But the minister will not do that. He sits in the weeds and plays little word games with this motion.

● (1730)

We must support this amendment to the wiretap provisions. It is vital that we wake up the Canadian people to this insidious attack on their freedom. The minister is representing only one section of the community, that which has the obligation of apprehending criminals. It is a very important part of the community but it should not dictate the laws of Canada. That is a job for legislators who can see both sides of the question, and the sooner the minister wakes up to this, the sooner he will have a more successful career.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. John A. Fraser (Vancouver South): Mr. Speaker, in following the member for New Westminster (Mr. Leggatt) I want to say that while we are in different parties I am extremely proud to be able to advise the House that the hon.

member, who has been my personal friend for many years, was my classmate at law school in the University of British Columbia and, as far as I am concerned, in the conduct of my colleague in the House and in committee on this bill, the class of which I was a member has every right to be very proud of the hon. member for New Westminster.

I want to say also, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of Justice (Mr. Basford), while not in my class at law school, was at the same law school, albeit a few years behind myself, and that his class would not be very proud of the conduct he has shown in the last few days.

Having spent some years as a practising lawyer in the courts, as a civil lawyer, as a prosecutor in criminal cases, and as a defence counsel in criminal cases, I am appalled that a product of a Canadian law school, a member of parliament who has practised law, albeit not for too many years, who has sat as a legislator on the government side and in the cabinet of the Government of Canada for a number of years, and has served with some distinction, and who now occupies the most important post connected with law enforcement and the protection of the rights of Canadians in the whole of the Dominion of Canada, as Minister of Justice, should take the position he does. How can the hon. gentleman so misunderstand the issue now before the House as to stay stubborn, to stay adamant, or as my hon. friend from New Westminster said, to stay in the weeds and try to play it down both sides of the street?

A number of the amendments which have been brought in are important. The amendment of my friend from New Westminster was important. But the two amendments which have been introduced by my colleague, the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams), are absolutely vital. It is all very well for the Minister of Justice, and perhaps some other members in this House and also, occasionally, for people outside this House to say, "How dare you fetter the right of the police to go and catch criminals?" Mr. Speaker, that has been the argument the police in every country in the world have always used to invade the rights of privacy and the civil rights of ordinary citizens. That argument is not new. It has been used over and over again. And it will continue to be repeated over and over again.

There are two places where one can check that argument. One is among the lawyers of a country who understand their role, which is not only to uphold the law—because they are called upon to administer justice according to their oath—but to ensure that the law is not transgressed so that the liberties and rights of the Canadian people are taken away from them unless there is overwhelming evidence that those rights ought to be restricted in the public interest. That evidence has not been produced here.

The other place that can protect the rights of Canadians is this Chamber. Lawyers are not the only people in the community who have a special and intimate understanding of law. Legislators have that, too. All hon. members in this Chamber know exactly of what I speak. Many of the members of parliament are not legally trained, but they have because of their service in this House, developed a special relationship with the law because they serve as members of parliament. We all know it and the public knows it, too. With that special understanding and relationship with the law goes a very definite and important responsibility which says that no matter what party you belong to, you have an obligation to look extremely carefully at provisions which take away the rights of Canadians by either impairing them or restricting them.

As other hon. members have pointed out, the privilege which exists between a client and his or her solicitor is not the privilege of the lawyer. It has nothing to do with putting lawyers into a special category, as I heard one member of the government party say in committee some weeks ago. It has nothing to do with that at all.

It has to do with the right of Canadians to have the confidence to consult with their lawyers with respect to their problems relating to the law. And they must be free to speak on the most intimate matters which are, at times, of great import to them and would often lead to great embarrassment if such information came to the knowledge of their neighbours. That is what privilege is all about. It is not good enough for the Minister of Justice to say, "Well, up until a few years ago you could do this, and it was not even against the law. All we have done here with this amendment is to improve things a bit because now you need a judge to say you can go ahead and tap a lawyer's telephone if the judge thinks you have a reasonable case against an accused." This is to be done by this legislation whether the suspect is a lawyer, a fellow lawyer in the office, or an employee of the lawyer.

I have practised in a number of different places, Mr. Speaker. I was first called to the bar in the city of Victoria and I practised in a small law firm. I later practised for several years on my own, associated with a bigger firm, but still I was on my own in the small town of Powell River in the riding of my hon. friend from Coast Chilcotin (Mr. Pearsall). Then I joined larger law firms, and when I was elected to parliament I was a senior member in a very large law firm. There were over 30 lawyers and nearly 100 employees. Can you imagine what would happen if some junior clerk were accused or suspected of a criminal offence and that, as a result, the police put a tap on the main telephone line into that firm the result of which could be that all the communications for 60 days of every client who came to that law firm—information which belongs to the citizen who comes to the lawyer, not to the lawyer—was in the hands of the police? Not everybody who would be privy to that information would be a sworn police officer. What about the staff? What about the people who file the information? What about the people who type it all out? What about all the people who might just take some of it and put it through a Xerox machine? What about the potential for blackmail?

My hon. friend from Calgary North has made it quite clear. That, to use the old adage: "Who among us is not without a little sin?" Police constables have been known in the past to be tempted. Some have been more than tempted. Some have committed crimes. We know that this will happen. But this is

not an indictment against policemen in general, any more than it is an indictment against any other group in the community. I ask all hon. members: what is so very difficult about admitting that in this case the government is stretching too far? What is wrong with that? Is there anything wrong with admitting that one has made a mistake, or being persuaded by the House of Commons that the position should be adjusted? Is that not what this place is all about? This is not even a partisan debate. You can see an amazing coalition of people here from different parties.

● (1740)

I wish now to refer to the other motion moved by my hon. friend from Calgary North who is now talking about the terrible danger of allowing evidence to be used which, while illegal in itself because it is not properly authorized as a wiretap, amounts to information which then allows the police to get some other evidence, and the police can then bring the other evidence into court. Putting aside wiretapping, the present law is that evidence, even illegally obtained, if it leads to other evidence can be accepted by the court if it is relevant to the issue of truth.

However, when you come in with new powers like wiretapping, if you want to safeguard the community against the abuse of wiretapping, then, as other hon. members have pointed out, you have to say right across the board that you cannot use derivative evidence. You have to take away from the police authorities the temptation to get what they want to know illegally so that later they can get further information to bring in against a person.

I believe in law and order, Mr. Speaker. I believe you have to have order in society. But it has to be under the rule of law. The attention that we pay to the quality of our rule of law is the real determinant of the quality of our life and of our liberties.

The hon. member for Calgary North said something today which ought to be remembered by every member of this House and the public. He said: "What is it that secures your liberties? It is not the Prime Minister, it is not the premiers, it is not even this Chamber; it is the rule of law". The state of the rule of law is of absolute importance to every member of this House. If that rule of law is impaired to the point where any group in the community can take undue advantage of other groups in the community, if privileges and rights which we have fought and worked for over centuries are to be whittled away or in any way impaired, unless for great cause, then the rule of law is cheapened and it will no longer protect us. Once the rule of law is gone, there are no other protections. Then citizens have to take the law into their own hands, and with that there is a breakdown of the civil community.

I say, Mr. Speaker, with all the feeling I can muster, but also having had considerable experience, that this is a very dangerous provision which the minister is asking us to accept. These amendments proposed by the opposition are proper amendments. Nay, they are more than proper, they are essential. There has to come a time in this Chamber, in dealing with matters which, no matter to which party we belong, we have to accept and believe in, namely our fundamental rights; there has to be a time when the government must admit that it is not just a meek surrender or a collapse but is common sense and is sensible and right to listen to those people of wisdom and of conscience who are trying to persuade even this government that it has reached too far.

[Mr. Fraser.]

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, may I just say a few words. I know that both the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams) and the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Leggatt) have condensed their remarks, but I should like to make a few comments because of what has been said, although this question was extensively covered in the minutes of the proceedings of the committee.

May I give the background to this whole situation? The amendments to the Criminal Code in 1974, which provided the legislative regime for electronic surveillance, dealt with the question of privileged communications in only one respect, namely, that tapes of privileged communications could not be introduced in evidence.

The law at that time did not make provision for the actual surveillance of privileged communications. It did not provide any regime other than the normal regime for that situation. As a result of some rather unpleasant incidents, one in Sault Ste. Marie, Ontario, where the barristers' telephone in the courthouse was bugged, and another in Manitoba involving the wiretapping of judges—both authorizations, I want to make clear, which were authorized in the normal way by judges—concern was expressed by many, including myself, that the law relating to electronic surveillance of lawyers should be changed.

The solicitor general and I immediately reviewed the guidelines which are published for the RCMP and for Crown agents setting out a regime by which they would not apply for authorizations against lawyers except in very special circumstances. Several other attorneys general in the provinces did the same thing. But because we were dealing at the time with the wiretap amendments in this bill, I said that this was an opportunity to provide some amendments relating to electronic surveillance of lawyers' telephones.

Obviously the question arises whether there should be some blanket exemption or whether there should be some special rule. I opted, as did the justice and legal affairs committee, for special rules relating to those communications.

I want to emphasize that there are on the committee, members on this side of the House who are knowledgeable on the question of wiretap. I point particularly to the chairman of the justice and legal affairs committee, who unfortunately is out of Canada on parliamentary business, the hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville (Mr. MacGuigan), who was an active member of the previous parliamentary committee and has been active obviously in this committee. His credentials as a protector of human rights are, I think, unchallenged in this House. Also the hon. member for Lafontaine-Rosemont (Mr. Lachance) was very active and concerned on the question of

wiretap. He examined every word of these amendments very carefully, both with me and my officials.

In working out the amendments I met, in the course of discussion of this whole bill, with a group consisting of the criminal justice chairman of the Canadian Bar Association, with Mr. Borovoy of the Canadian Liberties Association, and with Arthur Whaley, president of the Criminal Lawyers Association of Toronto. In their brief they were very critical of some aspects of the wiretap amendments, and I should like to read to the House what they said:

Apart from the welcome restrictions on the bugging of places ordinarily used by solicitors, nowhere do these amendments even confront the dragnet impact of electronic surveillance. On the contrary, the government bill would increase even further the ambit of permissible surveillance and decrease even further the safeguards for personal privacy.

That was said before further amendments were made to the bill. They went on to say:

Unfortunately, the new restriction on the bugging of places used by solicitors could not even cope—

and so on. They went on to say:

Even if all of these government amendments had been in force at that time, there would have been nothing to prevent the eavesdropping which took place on the conversations of all the other lawyers and their clients. At a minimum, in our view, the law should be further amended so as to prohibit the interception of privileged communications beyond those which a court has expressly authorized.

I examined those people and Mr. Borovoy made it very clear to me, speaking I take it on behalf of the Canadian Liberties Association, that it would be improper to give a blanket exemption against wiretapping to the legal profession and that they were opposed to it. The position that the civil liberties general counsel took was that we had to put into legislation a special regime to safeguard lawyers' communications and privileged communications on the basis, obviously, that the administration of justice requires that the citizen have an unfettered access and right to advice and counsel by a lawyer. That is precisely what is being done in this bill, and was precisely what was done in the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs where further amendments were made.

* * *

● (1750)

THE ROYAL ASSENT

Mr. Speaker: I have the honour to inform the House that a message has been received which is as follows:

Ottawa, July 14, 1977

Sir:

I have the honour to inform you that the Honourable Jean Beetz, Puisne Judge of the Supreme Court of Canada, in his capacity as Deputy Governor General, will proceed to the Senate Chamber today, the 14th day of July, at 5.45 p.m. for the purpose of giving the Royal Assent to certain bills.

The Royal Assent

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your obedient servant,
Pierre Trottier
Deputy Secretary to the Governor General

A message was delivered by the Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod, as follows:

Mr. Speaker, the Honourable the Deputy Governor General desires the immediate attendance of this honourable House in the Chamber of the honourable the Senate.

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

● (1800)

[*Translation*]

And being returned:

Mr. Speaker informed the House that the Deputy Governor General had been pleased to give, in Her Majesty's name, the royal assent to the following bills.

Bill C-9, An Act to approve, give effect to and declare valid certain agreements between the Grand Council of the Crees (of Quebec), the Northern Quebec Inuit Association, the Government of Quebec, la Société d'énergie de la Baie James, la Société de développement de la Baie James, la Commission hydro-électrique de Québec and the Government of Canada and certain other related agreements to which the Government of Canada is a party—Chapter No. 32.

Bill C-25, An Act to extend the present laws in Canada that proscribe discrimination and that protect the privacy of individuals—Chapter No. 33.

Bill C-20, An Act respecting the office of the Auditor General of Canada and matters related or incidental thereto—Chapter No. 34.

Bill C-38, An Act to amend the Fisheries Act and to amend the Criminal Code in consequence thereof—Chapter No. 35.

Bill C-49, An Act to amend the Canada Pension Plan—Chapter No. 36.

Bill C-18, An Act to amend the Bretton Woods Agreements Act—Chapter No. 37.

Bill C-5, An Act to amend the Currency and Exchange Act and to amend other Acts in consequence thereof—Chapter No. 38.

Bill S-3, An Act to amend the Canadian and British Insurance Companies Act and the Foreign Insurance Companies Act—Chapter No. 39.

Bill C-283, An Act respecting the Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act (Beauharnois-Salaberry)—Chapter No. 40.

Bill C-427, An Act respecting the Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act (Blainville-Deux-Montagnes)—Chapter No. 41.

Bill C-392, An Act respecting the Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act (Brampton-Georgetown)—Chapter No. 42.

Bill C-433, An Act respecting the Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act (Cochrane)—Chapter No. 43.

Bill C-394, An Act respecting the Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act (Huron-Bruce)—Chapter No. 44.

Bill C-406, An Act respecting the Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act (Kootenay East-Revelstoke)—Chapter No. 45.

Bill C-418, An Act respecting the Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act (Laval)—Chapter No. 46.

Bill C-405, An Act respecting the Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act (Lethbridge-Foothills)—Chapter No. 47.

Bill C-422, An Act respecting the Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act (London-Middlesex)—Chapter No. 48.

Bill C-428, An Act respecting the Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act (Saint-Jacques)—Chapter No. 49.

Bill C-429, An Act respecting the Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act (Saint-Léonard-Anjou)—Chapter No. 50

Bill C-393, An Act respecting the Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act (Wellington-Dufferin-Simcoe)—Chapter No. 51.

Bill C-1001, An Act to incorporate Continental Bank of Canada.

Mr. Speaker: It being six o'clock, I do now leave the chair until 8 p.m.

At 6.06 p.m. the House took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 8 p.m.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

CRIMINAL LAW AMENDMENT ACT, 1977

AMENDMENTS TO CRIMINAL CODE

The House resumed consideration of Bill C-51, to amend the Criminal Code, the Customs Tariff, the Parole Act, the Penitentiary Act and the Prisons and Reformatories Act, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs.

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, when we were interrupted at 5.45 p.m. by Black Rod I was concluding my speech. I said on this amendment that there were two questions: whether a lawyer should have a blanket exemption or whether we should write into the bill a special legislative regime to protect privileged communications which it is essential we protect. After a long discussion in the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs, the government put forward proposals and a number of amendments were introduced to provide additional safeguards which are set out in Clause 9 and section 178.13(1)(1.1) and (1.2) of the Criminal Code. These sections set out a legislative regime which protects solicitor-client communications and at the same time does not provide a blanket exemption, which, I believe, would be contrary to public policy. That is the purpose of the bill. This has been worked out in committee, and I think the amendment should be resisted.

Mr. Arnold Peters (Timiskaming): I am surprised at the minister's reluctance to accept these changes. The one that I am not particularly concerned about is motion No. 30 which refers to consultation with clients. I think that both lawyers and clients are crooks, as certainly the court finds on occasion, so I am not concerned about that clause.

Mr. Leggatt: That's a dumb statement.

Mr. Woolliams: I think so too.

Mr. Peters: I think that some of the clients are guilty and some are not guilty.

[Mr. Speaker.]

Mr. Leggatt: They are respectable people and you should not say such things in the House.

Mr. Peters: Not being very rich—

Mr. Leggatt: But you're dumb.

Mr. Peters: Not being very rich, I—

Some hon. Members: Dissension in the ranks.

Mr. Peters: —for my own part I know I am innocent—I thought everybody would know that. It is when I am guilty that I want a good lawyer, the best I can find.

Mr. Woolliams: That is nonsense.

Mr. Peters: I know this is strictly limited to lawyers and those interested in the law and that lay people are not supposed to get involved in that. There are not many lawyers, it seems to me—

Mr. Basford: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I am having considerable difficulty in hearing the hon. member for Timiskaming (Mr. Peters) and I hope the House will allow him to make his speech in peace and quiet so that I can hear him.

Some hon. Members: Ha, ha!

Mr. Peters: The point I was making and that the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Leggatt) is so touchy about is that I feel no compulsion to speak on motion No. 30 because I figure the lawyers will take care of the relationship between lawyers and clients. In the only case I ever heard of where the lawyer's telephone was tapped for the purpose of listening to the client, there was a court case, the evidence was found to be admissible, and not only the client but the lawyer also was convicted. So I am not concerned about that motion. Everybody knows about that case because it took place fairly recently.

• (2010)

I am concerned that the evidence obtained from an illegal wiretap can be admissible. I would have thought that we would have been happy enough to allow the police to wiretap illegally as they have done in the past and then use the evidence obtained. If crooks are caught, good; if not, that is fine too, but that evidence should not be used in court. Evidence illegitimately obtained should not be used. I do not know very much about law, but there are precedents which indicate that just because you steal something does not mean you can keep it. Usually you have to give it back, if it can be found. If it cannot be found, there are other penalties. The little boy who steals from a store keeps what he steals, but he is fined, and that is what we are doing with illegal wiretapping. We are letting the police keep the evidence obtained while we say it is illegal.

Mr. Leggatt: Don't accuse all my clients of being guilty.

Mr. Peters: I thought we had left motion No. 30. Quite frankly, I admit I came out of that a little worse for wear. I will leave motion No. 30 alone. I want to deal with motion No. 31.

Mr. Woolliams: It doesn't matter if you listen to everybody in the world.

Mr. Peters: That is my point. I have always suspected that many of the phones in this building were tapped, and there are reasons to think they were. That is a very easy thing to do. It was easy to tap telephones in the building for a long time because the lines ran through my office. To indicate how easy it was I attached my tape recorder on to them once and recorded a couple of conversations.

Some hon. Members: Shame!

Mr. Peters: I am trying to prove my point. I did not know whose conversations they were because I am not familiar with the telephone exchange system, but I am sure that after a couple of weeks of listening I could have found out. It is very easy to tap a telephone.

Mr. Woolliams: What about bugging front rooms or kitchens?

Mr. Peters: The caucus room of the NDP was once bugged.

Mr. Woolliams: Then you should support every amendment.

Mr. Peters: A couple of weeks ago a microphone in our caucus room was left on after a committee meeting. I looked at it and tried to turn it off. I could not turn it off, so I left it on. Nobody cared one way or the other. In most cases people do not care about listening in or eavesdropping. But they do care if action is taken as a result of that eavesdropping. Worse still, information can be used for blackmail.

Mr. Woolliams: Are you using this debate because of the unemployment insurance bill?

Mr. Peters: I presume the hon. member has not been paying much attention. I do not want to get involved in answering that question.

Mr. Woolliams: I am right in that regard. All you are doing is using this debate. You know nothing about it. You don't want the unemployment insurance bill.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Order, please. Hon. members who wish to debate this motion may rise in their places and be recognized in due course. Right now the hon. member for Timiskaming (Mr. Peters) has the floor. I think we should listen to him.

Mr. Boulanger: He has nothing to say.

Mr. Peters: If the hon. member for Mercier (Mr. Boulanger) makes a speech, it will be the first time he has done so for a long time. The other hon. member who is doing the yapping thinks he knows much about the law. If he knows as much as he thinks he does, he will do all right.

Laymen have something to say and, whether hon. members like it or not, I have something to say. If we agree with the minister's proposition, we will change our whole system of justice.

Mr. Woolliams: Any time you make a change in the Criminal Code, you change our system of justice.

Mr. Peters: That is like hearing somebody recite from the almanac. Perhaps I do not put things in a legalistic and impressive way, but if something is taken away illegally, it usually has to be given back. Most of the other countries in the world agree with that.

Mr. Woolliams: History has not proved that to be true.

Mr. Peters: In Geneva there is a world court which makes decisions, and just because the police are charged with maintaining law and order they should not be able to do so in any way they want. The last amendments we passed regarding the legal use of some form of wiretapping contained some fairly large concessions. It was a little bit like the camel in the tent. The camel asked the Arab if it would be all right to put his head in the tent because it was cold outside. When he got his head in, he wanted his shoulders in, and soon the Arab was outside. It seems to me that that is true with the police. They have 30 days in which to report wiretaps, and I do not know if they report them or not.

People do not know when their telephones are tapped. Not too long ago I was involved in a matter in which a wiretap was used. A cabinet minister was also involved. I do not know if that cabinet minister was notified that his telephone was tapped.

Mr. Woolliams: What is his name?

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Honourable.

Mr. Peters: An honourable minister.

Mr. Woolliams: I know he was honourable, but what was his name? Let's get the facts.

Mr. Peters: I do not want to get that particular gentleman in trouble, but after making inquiries I was under the impression that a third party telephone had been tapped. My conversations would have been involved, and I said to the inspector of the RCMP that he did not need me to tell him anything. He had the tape. As it turned out, he did not have the tape. The tap was not on the right telephone.

Mr. Woolliams: Then you are in favour of the motion.

Mr. Peters: Many conversations were on that tape because the tap was in place for a long period of time. Most of the conversations were not of a questionable nature.

• (2020)

Despite the volatile nature of the mover of this amendment it is one that I think all members, not only those in the legal profession but those interested in the rights of the individual, could bring themselves to support.

I honestly believe that the general public is not concerned about the police using wiretaps if they go through the procedures that are required for other kinds of searches. I do not think they are violently opposed provided there is some justification.

Mr. Woolliams: You mean for the police or for the wiretap?

Mr. Peters: On a normal Friday night or Saturday night in Ottawa—

Mr. Woolliams: What about an abnormal Saturday night?

Mr. Peters: An abnormal one would be one the hon. member is involved in, and it would probably be pretty abnormal—subnormal, maybe.

As I understand it, 19 or 20 warrants would be issued for searches, and in some places they do not have warrants but they must have permission from somebody to do the search. I hear very little objection from anybody, even those who are guilty—I do not have that kind of relationship with them but I do not hear them complaining—

Mr. Woolliams: There is one thing about you; you are making the most intelligent speech I have ever heard here.

Mr. Peters: The ones who do not go to a lawyer are the ones who do not worry because they do not think they are guilty. That is true as well with the people who are involved in a respectable way—

Mr. Woolliams: What about unemployment insurance? Are you against the baby bonuses?

Mr. Peters: Mr. Speaker, I have not been in a position to worry about baby bonuses for sometime so that subject does not concern me as it does some other people. I believe that if a warrant is obtained and there is some reason for it, there would be no outcry from the public. I think the public would violently disagree with the government's proposal to allow the police an almost unlimited use of wiretapping, however, simply on the basis that if they find anything they would be able to use it. If they did not find anything there would be no point in doing it.

I am one of those who believes that the police will wiretap if they want. In most police departments they will shortly be in a position to eavesdrop without wiretapping as such. When that comes about there will be few places where criminals habitually gather that the police will not be able to obtain information.

I believe the country is really in a pretty stupid state when it will agree to this kind of extension. It has been used, it has been tested, and it has not proved very valuable.

I think the Solicitor General (Mr. Fox) recently indicated the number of wiretaps executed by the force he is responsible for, and the number of convictions that came as a result. It was not a large number.

Mr. Woolliams: It was 1,062 wiretaps and 13 convictions.

Mr. Peters: It is really a very small number of reported wiretaps—only three per day all across the country. It is not very extensive.

Mr. Woolliams: Then you are going to vote against the amendment?

Mr. Peters: Mr. Speaker, is there something wrong with my equipment?

Mr. Woolliams: There certainly is.

Mr. Peters: I keep getting an echo that is not really an echo, Mr. Speaker. It is distorted as it comes back to me. We should try to cut down the echo in the Chamber. I know it is not going to produce any results, but I do know something—

Mr. Woolliams: What do you mean by that?

Mr. Peters: The hon. member is going to lose the amendment because he is working so damned hard to muck it up himself. I think he is going to lose it, and I think it is a very good amendment. It is the kind of amendment the Canadian public should think about very seriously. I do not think the Minister of Justice (Mr. Basford) should ask for this kind of power unless there is a demonstrated need. I do not think the bill as it is worded should pass, but I think this amendment should receive the support of all hon. members.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Max Saltsman (Waterloo-Cambridge): Mr. Speaker, I was sitting very quietly in my seat and had the privilege of listening to my colleague, the hon. member for Timiskaming (Mr. Peters), who served to arouse the intellectual juices, as it were, and I felt called upon to deal with some of the serious issues he has raised.

I intend to vote against the amendment though not out of any disrespect for the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams) whom I respect very highly and who, I am sure, has given very careful thought to the wording of the amendment. I should like to outline my reasons.

Mr. Woolliams: Which amendment?

Mr. Saltsman: Motion No. 30, the one dealing with lawyers. Most people—and that includes me—do not like the idea of wiretapping. For that matter, do they like the idea of getting a ticket or being stopped by police for no reason?

People want the most freedom that is available to them. I can understand the desire for unlimited freedom, but on the other hand most people also want society to have a sense of security. Most people want a police force that has adequate

means at its disposal to deal with crime. Most people want both things, and the dilemma for people who are framing our laws, or for legislators responsible for laws, is to find some kind of balance between unlimited freedom and the need for security. Society walks that constant tightrope of choice.

What bothers me about much of what goes on in the debates or interventions I have heard on this subject, is the refusal to recognize that you cannot have both conditions. You cannot have the unlimited freedom that all of us would desire, you cannot do away with wiretapping, you cannot do away with policemen, you cannot do away with surveillance, and still have the security you want. The question is: what kind of balance do you strike, and do you strike that balance fairly?

I think up until recently our society has tended to go in the direction of absolute freedom. To a very large extent we have been a civil libertarian society; virtually every piece of legislation introduced has increased the protection of the individual and has tried to diminish the role of the police officer.

I think the time has come when society says that precious as those absolute freedoms are, the need for security in our society is also important, and in fact the police have been hamstrung. We have gone too far in terms of preventing the police from doing their job. This is what needs to be faced openly. Just look at the dilemma; you cannot have both things at the same time. It is easy enough to say we are all for the police, we are all for security, we are all for civil liberties. We must make this decision. Trade-offs, never pleasant, popular or easy to make, must be made. Members must be honest with themselves and say what they are doing. I shall try to do this.

• (2030)

I admit that once I was much more fearful of authorities than I am today, much more apprehensive of the police and of the kinds of institutions which existed when I was born, than I am today. I have worked hard all my life to restrict some of the unlimited power those institutions wielded. Those powers needed restricting. The concern for civil liberties was not strong in our society. I take a moment to pay tribute to those who fought for civil liberties, and fought for some of the changes which have come about in our society. But like everything else in society, the pendulum never comes to rest in the middle. It swings too much one way or the other, and must be brought back to the middle, as it were. And that is the dilemma, or crisis if you like, which faces law makers. That is the dilemma which faces people like me who, at one time, may have been considered radicals, who were against authority, who tried to curtail the power of authority. But there comes a time when you ask if our authorities have enough power to do the job they are supposed to do, in order to deal with our society's problems. Frankly, I do not think they have, and they ought to have such power.

Mr. Woolliams: Surely you should be the last person to say that.

Mr. Saltsman: Mr. Speaker, I do not suggest our society is more lawless than societies preceding it. I do not think it is. I think our society is probably more law-abiding than any I can recall in history. People talk of the good old days, as though the good old days were secure old days. They were not. I think the public's desire for security has increased enormously. Our people want security in terms of social security measures like old age pensions and hospital insurance, and in terms of protection from crime. Actually, to some extent society has changed and our legislation reflects the changes which have taken place in society.

Basically, the question we must decide comes down to this: do we trust the police of Canada? Do we trust the courts of Canada?

An hon. Member: No.

Mr. Saltsman: Voices at the back say, no. They don't trust the police; they do not trust the courts. I want to go on record as saying the courts are not always right and the police are not always right, but if you cannot trust them, what is to become of society?

If your police force is not effective you must change it.

Mr. Woolliams: Yes, and appoint Liberals to the Bench.

Mr. Saltsman: But at some point you must say if you have confidence in our society and confidence in the people who were appointed to positions of authority.

Mr. Woolliams: That's what the Germans thought. The hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Leggatt) does not agree with the hon. member's opposition. The Germans put trust in their law, police and courts, but we cannot say we should have trust in the system.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Order, please.

Mr. Saltsman: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the strong positions some members take on this question. Unfortunately, some of their arguments involve *non sequiturs*. Anyone who advocates giving the police more powers, is in favour of increased security and expresses confidence in our courts is immediately tagged as being in favour of a Nazi state. Members who argue this way are grossly unfair and dishonest. I have not questioned their motives. I have not said that adoption of the hon. member's amendment will lead to all women on our streets being raped, or to the breakdown of law in our society.

At one time people talked of extreme authoritarianism, but now people speak of extreme civil libertarians. If you propose measures they do not like, they immediately accuse you of being in favour of a Nazi state. They are wrong and not fair. Mr. Speaker, I spent five years in the war; I saw Buchenwald and Dachau. I had a personal involvement, and nobody fears the Nazi state more than I do. And if I thought that in order to avoid the Nazi state we need to live more insecurely, I would advocate more insecurity. But, Mr. Speaker, we can have security. It is possible to respect the police and our institutions and not live in a Nazi state.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Saltsman: On the contrary, as those who know history will tell you, the Nazi state arose because there was disrespect for parliament in the Weimar republic, because the people had disrespect for the police and disrespect for the courts. Their society broke down, which is why those camps came into existence.

Mr. Woolliams: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order, which the hon. member may appreciate. Surely he knows that the Nazis burned the Reichstag and blamed the fire on the Communists.

Mr. Saltsman: I appreciate the interventions of my colleague for Calgary North, but suspect he is dealing with some other debate, because I do not know how his remarks are germane to this one.

Mr. Woolliams: You, yourself, raised the subject.

Mr. Saltsman: I appreciate the hon. member's knowledge of history. At least he knows some names, if not the facts or the events.

We face certain difficulties. I will stick my neck out. I have stuck my neck out previously and, no doubt, the press will castigate me tomorrow as will my colleagues opposite. I disapprove of those who say, "You must not listen to authority, because it is always wrong; you must oppose the courts, because they are always wrong, you must oppose the police, because they are always wrong." Such sentiments are destructive of our society. I do not mind standing up and taking flak for my views, for I put them forward sincerely.

I intend to vote against the amendment, and have set out some of the reasons for my position. I have been of this opinion for some time now, and have no hesitation in saying that if events prove me wrong, which they may—

Mr. Woolliams: They will.

Mr. Saltsman: —I shall be of a contrary opinion. If this legislation leads to abuses, we shall change it.

Mr. Woolliams: It will be too late.

Mr. Saltsman: If we are not in this House, others will be; they will fight the legislation or amend it. Parliament does not end with us. It does not end tomorrow. We have seen bad legislation passed, and amended it.

It is time to give our courts and police the authority they need to fight organized crime and the other problems in society. Hardly a day goes by without some member of this House, in the opposition or on the government back benches, rising to castigate the government for insensitivity to organized crime, or for allowing organized crime to flourish. You will hear these sentiments time and again. I do not mind members castigating the government. It deserves it. But when the chips are down and the government brings in a measure with which we can fight organized crime effectively, it is the opposition's responsibility, after scrutinizing and criticizing, to say, yes, this legislation will do good. You cannot advocate stricter control of organized crime, and resist legislation which seeks to control it.

• (2040)

You cannot have it both ways. As a member of the opposition I have to say this. I have a bee in my bonnet that it is time for me to release, and it has to do with capital punishment. I have been here for three votes on capital punishment. On each one I took enormous political risks, as did others who voted in favour of abolition. What concerns me is that many of the people who voted for abolition and were gung-ho for capital punishment, which would not have done a damned thing for the security of this country by taking a few crazy people and hanging them after the fact—

An hon. Member: How do you increase security by doing that?

Mr. Saltsman: Sure, it makes you look great. It makes you feel fine, but it does not help the security of the people. When you bring in a piece of legislation like this, one which will increase the security of the people—sure, it is not dramatic like hanging someone; it isn't so expurging—they suddenly become libertarians. They suddenly become extreme civil libertarians. They are willing to hang, but they are not willing to wiretap.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Saltsman: I find it a strange situation, Mr. Speaker, and I apologize to you, Mr. Speaker, for some of the language I have used. It is not often I use language of that kind, but I get angry at some of these things. I think, sometimes, that anger can be excused.

I have gone through a heck of a lot with regard to capital punishment. I have been accused of being a fascist, or a Nazi, or as being in favour of a Nazi state because I believe policemen should be trusted and because I believe the courts should be trusted. I have had enough of it.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Saltsman: Let us deal with one other fact. Lawyers, it is argued, should be exempt. Why lawyers? Lawyers are admirable people. But are they so admirable that they should be exempt? I listened to the hon. member for Prince George-Peace River (Mr. Oberle) who talked about those people with yellow stripes down the sides of their pants. They are nice people—but they are only people; they are only policemen and they have to be watched. Are lawyers not also only people who occasionally have to be watched? What kind of special confidence exists between a lawyer and his client that should be denied to me an M.P. between me and my constituent? Yet I am not exempt under this legislation.

What kind of special confidence is there between a lawyer and his client that does not exist between a man or a woman and a priest? Yet a priest is not exempt.

What kind of confidence exists between a lawyer and his client that is denied to the psychiatrist and his patient? Yet they are not exempt. Why should lawyers be exempt?

I do not believe lawyers should be spoken of any more harshly than any other group of people. Yet I do not think they are entitled to privileges which are not available to other people.

Mr. Leggatt: Expand the exemption then.

Mr. Saltsman: My hon. friend says "expand the exemption". That is perfectly logical. It is a logical position for an extreme libertarian to take. I respect my hon. friend for that. But that is not what the amendment is saying. And for those reasons, Mr. Speaker—I have a few others—I do not think the amendment should be supported. I do not think the amendment makes a great deal of sense—at least not to me.

Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North): Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to take part in this debate. Like my desk mate, the hon. member for Waterloo-Cambridge (Mr. Saltsman), I am not a lawyer, but I do not think civil liberties, democracy, and freedom are the exclusive preserve of lawyers and that it is only lawyers who can talk about the basic principles which are contained in this bill.

As I listened to the hon. member for Waterloo-Cambridge speak I thought he must have gone to sleep two or three years ago and not heard or read about what has gone on. I am not talking about nazi Germany. I think members who compare what this bill will do, amended or unamended, with what happened in nazi Germany are way off course. I do not think there is any relationship, either today or in the foreseeable future, with what happened in nazi Germany, whether this bill is amended or not. But surely what we have learned in the past two years or so as a result of events in Canada, the United States and other countries, should have convinced us of one thing. I have in mind the dictum that power corrupts and that absolute power corrupts absolutely. We know this happens in countries which are governed by authoritarian regimes. We know this is what happens in fascist countries or communist countries. But we need only look at democratic countries to see that the same thing could happen there to a lesser degree.

It is only five or six years ago that there was complete confidence in the incorruptibility of the RCMP, in the perfection of the RCMP, and if one reads letters written to newspaper editors one realizes there was the same confidence in the United States in the FBI and the CIA. The American people have now learned from bitter experience that nobody can be given complete power, that no person or agency can be entrusted with absolute power. This is what the hon. member for Waterloo-Cambridge forgot to say. Nobody, lawyer or no lawyer, should have a protection which other people do not enjoy.

Mr. Woolliams: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I appreciate that the hon. member is delivering a very good speech, but I want to point out that nobody on this side, or even in his own party, suggested lawyers should enjoy any special privilege. The privilege is not for lawyers but for Canadian citizens generally who deal with doctors, lawyers, and psychiatrists. I hope the hon. member will quote us correctly in that regard. I don't give a damn about lawyers.

Mr. Orlikow: If the hon. member had waited for a few minutes he would have heard me say precisely what he suggested I say. Citizens of the United States have learned through bitter experience that the police can make mistakes, that police can be involved in activities which are not only immoral but which are illegal. They learned this as they have learned about practices in which the FBI were involved. In the last few weeks senior officials in the national police force in Great Britain have been convicted of crimes and sentenced to prison terms of five to eight years for taking bribes. Some of these things may, indeed, have happened in Canada. After all, the Solicitor General (Mr. Fox) has admitted that the RCMP carried out an illegal break-in of l'Agence Presse in Montreal. It is now obvious that if the RCMP itself was not involved in a break-in and theft of documents in Toronto at the Praxis organization, it was in receipt of stolen documents and kept them for seven years. They did not report that they had possession of those documents either to the organization whose property had been burglarized or to the metropolitan police in Toronto.

• (2050)

We do not yet know what role the RCMP played in Alberta, but we do know that as a result of the hearings of the Laycraft commission the attorney general of Alberta has expressed some very serious misgivings about the activities of the RCMP in that province. The chief of police of Winnipeg has also expressed some very sharp criticisms about what the RCMP may or may not have done in that city in connection with the Alberta inquiry. There have been press comments on supposed activities of the RCMP in Nova Scotia. I have a great deal of respect for the RCMP, as I have for all police forces in this country. They do a very necessary and valuable job. But I believe, as does the Solicitor General (Mr. Fox), that the RCMP, like any other agency of government, should be responsible to the people of this country.

I am not a lawyer but I have read something of the history of this country, and I have what seems to me to be the mistaken assumption that one of the basic principles of British justice is that a person is considered innocent until he is proven guilty. I would assume that a person in difficulty with the law, or a person who believes he may be charged with some offence by the police, would want an opportunity, whether he be innocent or guilty, to discuss what he should do and how he should act so far as the police are concerned, with his lawyer, knowing that the consultation he has with that lawyer will be kept private between the two of them. He should assume that he has the right to tell his lawyer everything without somebody listening in on the conversation.

My seatmate for Waterloo-Cambridge wants me to assume that the police will take action to tap a lawyer's telephone only when they are 100 per cent certain there is guilt, that they

would not do so unless they had good reason. I would assume that is correct, Mr. Speaker, and I accept that that will be their intention. But the police are only human and I have every right to believe that, being human, the police will sometimes make a mistake. So long as the police, like everybody else, are capable of making a mistake, I say that we must protect the innocent. We must protect the right of people to discuss their situation with their legal counsel, confident that they will not be listened into by somebody else.

I simply cannot understand how the Minister of Justice can ask the members of this parliament to accept a provision which provides that the police can listen in on a telephone conversation with a lawyer if they have reason to believe that someone is involved in something which is illegal, provided they get the approval of a judge to do so. One does not have to be a lawyer, or to be in court every day or every week, to know that in every city in this country there are judges and judges. Some judges will be extremely careful in how they use the authority the minister proposes to give them in this provision of the bill, judges who would want a complete explanation from the police who are asking for permission to wiretap—

Mr. Woolliams: No, no, no, that is not the law.

Mr. Orlikow: I am saying "if" this is the law.

Mr. Woolliams: Mr. Speaker, may I rise again? I like my good friend's speech and I can see that his party is divided, that its members are fighting, but the law is not that way. We have just had a case in the courts of British Columbia which says that you cannot look behind—no, don't get up, Mr. Speaker, please.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Order, please.

Mr. Woolliams: The hon. member is making a misstatement of the law. He is absolutely wrong.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): I am sure the hon. member is very serious about what he wants to discuss, but I fail to see a point of order; the hon. member's point is mostly a point of debate. I suggest we listen to the hon. member.

Mr. Woolliams: I want to finish what I was saying, with the greatest respect. The law is that the judge says that you cannot cross-examine even in reference to the application for authorization.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Order, please.

Mr. Woolliams: That is the law. But please let us not have this drivel.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Order, please. The hon. member for Winnipeg North (Mr. Orlikow).

Mr. Orlikow: Mr. Speaker, I wish the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams) were not so possessive in regard to his amendments to the bill as to feel it necessary to correct every member who tries to say a few words. If indeed I have mistated or misinterpreted one of the sections of this clause, I am sure I am not the first member today to do so, and I am certain I will not be the last. I am simply saying that in my view, and on the basis of what I have read and heard, there are judges and judges. Some will co-operate with the police much more quickly and easily than others.

If this section is left in, I am sure that the police, whether the RCMP, provincial police or municipal police, in any city would be able to find a judge who would authorize any and every request for permission to wiretap which is made. I cling to what may be an old-fashioned and no longer valid conclusion, that if the law leans in the direction of favouring a person it should lean in the direction of protecting the few innocents rather than convicting a few more of the guilty.

● (2100)

I would suggest to the hon. member for Waterloo-Cambridge (Mr. Saltsman) that he ought to take the time to read the evidence given by a former attorney general of the United States, Ramsey Clark, who managed that department in a country which has, unfortunately, a great deal more crime than we have in Canada, and who made a very simple and plain statement that the use of wiretap by the police in that country was virtually useless in terms of the conviction of criminals, including criminals who are part of organized crime. The proposal to permit wiretapping with the permission of judges does not meet the needs of this country. We do not have a democratic society in which we have gone too far in the direction of giving people civil liberties. Democracy requires giving people the fullest possible rights and protections.

To my knowledge there is not a member in this House who has followed the counsel given in the United States by very competent and highly respected organizations such as the American Civil Liberties Union, which is opposed to all wiretapping. That is not the case here in this parliament. Not a single member has advocated the complete abolition of wiretapping.

Those of us who support this amendment are not opposing the police any more than did members on both sides of the House who ignored the advice of the police when they voted for the abolition of capital punishment. All those members who voted for the abolition of capital punishment were singularly unimpressed by the arguments of the police in favour of retaining capital punishment. Just as I was prepared to listen and reject the advice of the police on capital punishment, I have listened to the advice of the police on this question, and to the advice of others, and I have come to the conclusion we need to restrict much more the rights of the police to engage in wiretapping. Therefore I intend to vote for this amendment, and I suggest to the hon. member for Waterloo-Cambridge that he should re-examine the evidence that has been given on this question.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gilbert Rondeau (Shefford): Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words about the amendments introduced by the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams) dealing with Bill C-51.

First, I would like to make it clear that we have always been in favour of law and order—there is no doubt about that. We back perhaps 100 per cent the police departments to maintain law and order in Canada, and we are also in favour of establishing courts of justice and for security. On the other hand, when we examine the history of all those countries where with the same arguments that are being made, namely in the name of security, they want to put up wiretaps and make them available to all police departments in Canada, we fully realize that this gives opposite results.

Mr. Speaker, police reforms are currently under way in Quebec. Everybody knows that municipalities and cities today have lost, not control over police departments but the sense of democracy in that they can no longer from a practical point of view fire those policemen who no longer meet the needs of those municipalities. There are hundreds of cases in Quebec where city councils wanted to fire policemen. Those problems have been before our courts for several years and are not over yet. I could give striking examples, Mr. Speaker.

Furthermore, there is talk at present of taking away from Quebec municipalities the authority they now have over police departments to transfer that authority to the government of Quebec. In that way, the police departments in our municipalities and cities will become with respect to discipline and for all other areas responsible to the government of Quebec. That means that the further away we move authority from the people, the less security we have. This legislation will only trouble ordinary people because criminals, bandits, those who may fear bugging are smart enough not to use the telephone to consult their lawyers. On the other hand, 99.9 per cent of the people—honest people—will have to fear consulting their lawyer because they will not know if his office is not bugged when it is the bandits who should be under surveillance.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation will only bother people as a whole, but it will not solve anything as far as crime is concerned because those who will be directly concerned by this legislation will be smart enough to find ways to elude wiretapping of any police force. Mr. Speaker, municipalities in the province of Quebec—because it will be an ever more critical issue in that province—will have less and less power over police forces and authority will be more and more in the hands of the state. It is also established that the more we rely on the state for our security, the less the ordinary citizen is protected.

For all these reasons and many others, particularly because this legislation will do nothing but annoy honest people in the province of Quebec as well as in other provinces, without changing anything in the crime situation in Canada, I have an obligation to vote for the motion, not out of fanaticism for civil rights, but for liberty alone. I will have an obligation to vote for the amendments of the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams).

[*English*]

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

Some hon. Members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

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

Some hon. Members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Pursuant to section 11 of Standing Order 75, the recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

Motions Nos. 33 and 34 will be grouped for debate and will be voted on together.

Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Calgary North) moved:

Motion No. 33.

That Bill C-51, an act to amend the Criminal Code, the Customs Tariff, the Parole Act, the Penitentiary Act and the Prisons and Reformatories Act, be amended in clause 12 by striking out lines 30 to 33 at page 52 and substituting the following therefor:

"which the authorization was given, notify in".

Motion No. 34.

That Bill C-51, an act to amend the Criminal Code, the Customs Tariff, the Parole Act, the Penitentiary Act and the Prisons and Reformatories Act, be amended in clause 12 by striking out lines 44 to 47 at page 52 and lines 1 to 27 at page 53.

● (2110)

He said: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the applause, particularly that from the government side. I hope they will put their applause with their votes.

Mr. Fox: Count on it.

Mr. Woolliams: The hon. lady shakes her head, but her grandmother would not agree. She is a real Conservative and the hon. lady knows that. Let us get down to the gritty facts.

An hon. Member: Gritty facts?

Mr. Woolliams: That is right, gritty. What we are doing here is talking about notice. As the Code now stands, within 90 days notice must be given to the person who is the object of a wiretap. I think I covered the subject pretty fully this afternoon. The amendments before us now allow a period of three years. It is within the discretion of the judge. What will happen? There will be a form affidavit which they sign and swear to, a form order, and the police will get the right to wiretap everybody for 60 days. It is a 100 per cent gain. The person being wiretapped does not have to be notified for three years. That is what it is all about.

This afternoon I spoke for almost 40 minutes. Notification does not have to be given for three years. Let me put it in very broad terms. By that time the lawyer may be dead, the accused may be dead, the judge may be dead, and even those who put on the wiretap may be dead.

Mr. Peters: Do you expect a nuclear bomb?

Mr. Woolliams: I am going to quote the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands (Mr. Douglas) and then resume my seat. He was premier of my home province. I did not always agree with him. However, he was a distinguished scholar, distinguished as an academic, and distinguished as the premier of my province. He put his finger on the whole matter, He said forget about authorization and wiretap everybody, because it is going to be evidence any how. Regardless of whether notice is given, it will not make any difference.

When I spoke this afternoon, I expended a lot of energy. I will not waste the time of the House tonight. However, as I watch the division in the NDP—

Mr. Leggatt: There is no division here, only a tiny crack.

Mr. Woolliams: It is not. The hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Leggatt) certainly disagrees with the hon. member for—

Mr. Leggatt: Waterloo-Cambridge (Mr. Saltsman).

Mr. Woolliams: Right. Thank God they don't think alike. If we all thought alike, there would be no thinking. We are always criticizing the press. There they sit, two out of 70. I say this to them. Once in a while the Tories do not agree. They think that is a terrible thing if you do not agree. They think we should all be like the Liberals. They all agree and they have a great party. I say thank God we have some disagreement in our party. If we all thought alike, there would be no thinking.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Woolliams: I was very proud of the NDP tonight. That is something I have always admired about them. They did disagree. That is healthy. I hope the press will be as fair with them as they have been with us.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Hnatyshyn: What a wonderful line.

[Mr. Woolliams.]

Mr. Woolliams: I realize that. I will tell you why tonight is the greatest debate. Let me be really honest. I will tell you why the debate is better than average. Members opposite were at a big party tonight in the office of the Minister of Justice (Mr. Basford). There was a big party in room 200 for the Conservatives. That is very healthy. We meet and we think.

I made my speech this afternoon. I repeat that if we extend the notification from 90 days to three years, God help the law abiding citizens.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Stuart Leggatt (New Westminster): Mr. Speaker, I wish to refer the House to the existing legislation that we are presently trying to amend through amendments which the Minister of Justice (Mr. Basford) has presented. The existing legislation deals with the question of notice. The Minister of Justice has been up in this House over and over again saying, "Have faith in our judges, have faith in our police." The hon. member for Waterloo-Cambridge (Mr. Saltsman), when speaking about five minutes ago, said have faith in our judges, have faith in our police. I want to read to the Minister of Justice and the House the law that he is seeking to change. I quote from page 17:

> —to the judge who granted the authorization that the investigation is continuing and the judge is of the opinion that the interests of justice require that a delay of a determinate reasonable length be granted, in which case the judge may grant a determinate reasonable delay."

I do not know whether the House is in the mood to listen to something that is as mundane as the law we are attempting to amend. I know that is a bit mind-bending for a lot of people here tonight. What we are trying to do with the amendment the Minister of Justice has presented to this House is to take away the discretion of the courts and say that the notification period shall be up to three years.

I would rather trust the judges of this land, and that is what the hon. member for Calgary-North (Mr. Woolliams) is attempting to do with the amendment we have before us. There is no reason in the world to change the law as it stands. It has worked well. It gives the courts a review process that is absolutely vital and necessary in terms of wiretapping. The trouble with this debate is that it gets so simplistic no one looks at what we are trying to change.

I have great respect for the hon. member for Waterloo-Cambridge. I have respect for his intelligence and intellect. He is an extremely astute member. However, what he has failed to perceive is that liberty is a very delicate flower. The species has developed liberty in a unique and unusual way. Somebody has to defend liberty once in a while because the trends are all against liberty.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Leggatt: Unless somebody waters and fertilizes the flower, it will die. The Minister of Justice, the government, and the Liberal party have thrown salt on that delicate flower. They are going to kill that flower.

● (2120)

An hon. Member: Salt or Saltsman?

Mr. Leggatt: I ask you, Mr. Speaker, and I ask the House to think of what you are doing in terms of this wiretap legislation. Why not leave it up to the judges to exercise their discretion to determine the notification period? Then the judges can protect the liberty of the subject. I do not have any confidence in the Minister of Justice protecting the liberty of the subject, none at all, so I support the amendment, and so does my party.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): The question is on motions Nos. 33 and 34. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motions?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): All those in favour of the motions will please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

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

Some hon. Members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Pursuant to section 11 of Standing Order 75, the recorded division for the proposed motions stands deferred.

Motions Nos. 35, 36, 37 and 38 will be grouped together for debate. The vote on motion No. 35 will dispose of motions Nos. 36 and 37. The question on motion No. 38 will be put separately.

Mr. Stuart Leggatt (New Westminster) moved:

Motion No. 35.

That Bill C-51, An Act to amend the Criminal Code, the Customs Tariff, the Parole Act, the Penitentiary Act and the Prisons and Reformatories Act, be amended in Clause 24 by striking out lines 37 to 45 at page 68 and lines 1 to 12 at page 69.

Motion No. 36.

That Bill C-51, An Act to amend the Criminal Code, the Customs Tariff, the Parole Act, the Penitentiary Act and the Prisons and Reformatories Act, be amended in Clause 26 by striking out lines 32 to 37 at page 70 and substituting the following therefor:

"'"11. Notwithstanding anything in this or any other Act, the Board shall be required, in considering whether or not parole should be granted or revoked, to conduct a hearing in accordance with the principles of natural justice."'

Motion No. 37.

That Bill C-51, An Act to amend the Criminal Code, the Customs Tariff, the Parole Act, the Penitentiary Act and the Prisons and Reformatories Act, be amended in Clause 29 by adding immediately after line 14 at page 73 the following:

"(4) Where a case is referred to the Board pursuant to subsection (3), the Board shall within 30 days from the date of the reference either cancel suspension or hold a hearing pursuant to section 11."

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motions?

Mr. Leggatt: We have now considered the wiretap provision and are on questions of parole, which form a very significant part of this legislation.

I am surprised there was not more interest on the part of parliamentarians about the subject of the penitentiary system. I might say that I appreciate the fact that an all-party committee has reported on the question of penitentiaries in this country. It is an important report. I am glad to see the Solicitor General (Mr. Fox) here tonight listening to the debate with some interest.

With regard to the amendments before us under Bill C-51, only one of them relates in any way to the recommendations made by the all-party committee on changes in the penitentiary system, and I am disappointed that at this point we have not yet seen more action.

Perhaps, first of all, I could deal with motions Nos. 35 and 36. Motion No. 35 simply asks that the Parole Board act in accordance with the principles of natural justice in making its determination. I have left the motion general because the principles of natural justice are easily defined by the courts. It is again an attempt to allow the courts an opportunity to exercise their discretion. It is an opportunity to allow the judges to take a look at the parole provisions and ensure that the Parole Board is acting in a fair way. I am not suggesting that we superimpose a whole new set of jurisprudence on the Parole Board. I am only suggesting, in view of the disruption that we have seen in our prison systems, that the Parole Board act in accordance with the principles of natural justice so that there can be more peace and calm within the prison system.

I am not suggesting that the Parole Board should be any more lenient than it is. My argument is that it should have been stronger in some cases. The board leans in the other direction. That does not mean it should not also act in accordance with the rules of natural justice. So, quite simply, motions Nos. 35 and 36 ask that the general principle of the rules of natural justice apply to the operations of the Parole Board.

Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Calgary North): It gives me a great deal of pleasure to support the motion of the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Leggatt). Let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, what has always been my concern with regard to the Parole Board. It is that many times the Parole Board is blamed for weekend leaves which are granted by the wardens of penitentiaries. If these amendments are accepted, hearings will be held, as they should be, in every penitentiary in Canada. There are one million unemployed in Canada. We do not have enough people to process the applications. Perhaps this is where we should employ some personnel and train them to listen to reason when hearing the evidence of the incarcerated. I say this is a good amendment and I support it 100 per cent. My party will vote for it.

Hon. Francis Fox (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, may I say briefly that, as I see it, motion No. 36 requires the board to conduct hearings when it has decided to grant, deny or revoke parole. Motion No. 35 is consequential since it would delete the power of the governor in council to make regulations, prescribing when a hearing must be held, the information to be furnished prior to the hearing, the entitlement to assistance at the hearing, and the occasions on which reasons for decisions would have to be given by the board.

It is a matter of principle on the question of the hearing, and there is no dispute. The question is whether it should be in the regulations or in the statute. I believe it is in the interest of the inmates that it be left in the regulations. If we put it into the statute, because of the high number of people who would be involved—I only have to mention, for instance, the number of day parole hearings that would have to be held, or to mention the number of people on short sentences in penitentiaries and provincial prisons where hearings would have to be held to conclude that if we put it into the statute, we would be delaying the procedural safeguards which the board is now maintaining and which it should continue to maintain. That deals with motions Nos. 35 and 36.

With regard to Motion No. 37, the amendment would add a subsection on the procedure to be followed on suspension of parole and subsequent review. The subsection would make it mandatory for the board to hold a hearing as to whether parole would be revoked, unless the board, within 30 days from the date it had the matter referred to it, chooses to cancel the suspension.

This motion is along the same lines as motion No. 36 in that it attempts to incorporate into the legislation a right that the board contemplates will be dealt with under the regulations. The board will be recommending to the governor in council, and so will I shortly, regulations that will require a hearing to be commenced within 30 days following a reference to the board by the person effecting the suspension. I believe once again that this is another occasion where the only difference between what is proposed by the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Leggatt) and what we will be proposing is the method by which the inmate is to be given certain rights. I believe it will be easier to proceed faster in this regard by keeping in the hands of the governor in council the power to make regulations in this regard and to make progress as soon as possible. I understand, however, that the hon. member will be speaking on motion No. 38.

Mr. Leggatt: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I must beg the indulgence of the House. I did not realize you would group all the motions together. I had assumed that the motions I spoke to were grouped together because they were on the same subject, but obviously the Solicitor General (Mr. Fox) has referred to motions Nos. 37 and 38, which I did not realize would be grouped. With the leave of the House, I should like to spend a moment to explain the reasons for those motions.

[Mr. Fox.]

• (2130)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Is the House in agreement?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Leggatt: Motion No. 37, to which the Solicitor General referred, deals with the problem inherent in the revocation of parole under the existing law. The revocation of parole, when made, would now be subsequently referred for review by the Parole Board. However, no time limit is provided for the Parole Board in terms of reporting, and my amendment would require that the board report within 30 days so that the inmate would at least have some hope of knowing what decision there would be in the long run. It seems to me that that is a matter which would encourage peace within institutions. The board would have some responsibility not to delay its reports indefinitely. The minister's legislation does not provide for any time limit with regard to that, and I think that that is really a matter of cleaning up the legislation. Perhaps the minister will accept that amendment, which is fairly reasonable.

With regard to motion No. 38, in the past a parolee who violated his parole, subsequently had the time spent on parole added to his sentence. The result could be that a person serving a two year sentence could ultimately spend three or four years in jail because of his violations. Appropriately, the government has attempted to solve that problem by proposing that the time spent on parole not be added to sentences. The difficulty is that the government has failed to include those people who presently are serving time on parole. It seems reasonable to me that they should not be discriminated against by the passage of this legislation, which would apply only to persons being paroled subsequent to the passage of the legislation.

I am asking the Solicitor General to apply the worth-while rule which he has brought into the legislation to parolees who are now on parole. This would not affect those whose parole was previously violated and revoked and who have been recommitted to prison. I am asking the Solicitor General not to discriminate between those who are now properly on parole and not violating their parole and those who may subsequently be paroled. It seems to me that it would be a fairly logical step for the Solicitor General not to discriminate between those two classes.

I support the amendment, but we are discriminating against those who are presently on parole. We are allowing the legislation to apply only to those who are subsequently paroled.

Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Calgary North): Mr. Speaker—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Does the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams) have the unanimous consent of the House to speak at this time?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Woolliams: Mr. Speaker, we support this amendment, but I want to bring to the attention of the House that the

person who is now charged with the murder of a police officer in Ottawa was on parole, and if we had had this kind of intelligent law, perhaps a different decision would have been made. That person was on parole, and let us make it very clear that long guns were used in that incident, and they are not included in this bill. Any statement differing from that is false and untrue.

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

Some hon. Members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): The question is on motions Nos. 35, 36 and 37, in the name of the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Leggatt). Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motions?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): All those in favour of the motions will please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

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

Some hon. Members: Nay.

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

Mr. Leggatt: On division.

Motions No. 35, 36, and 37 (Mr. Leggatt) negatived.

Mr. Stuart Leggatt (New Westminster) moved:

Motion No. 38.

That Bill C-51, An Act to amend the Criminal Code, the Customs Tariff, the Parole Act, the Penitentiary Act and the Prisons and Reformatories Act, be amended in Clause 31 by striking out lines 44 and 45 at page 73 and substituting the following therefor:

"(a) any time spent on parole;".

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

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

Some hon. Members: Nay.

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

Some hon. Members: On division.

Motion No. 38 (Mr. Leggatt) negatived.

Hon. Francis Fox (Solicitor General) moved:

Motion No. 39.

That Bill C-51, An Act to amend the Criminal Code, the Customs Tariff, the Parole Act, the Penitentiary Act and the Prisons and Reformatories Act, be amended in Clause 41

(a) by striking out line 30 at page 77 and substituting the following therefor:

"24.1 (1) Every inmate who, having been";

(b) by adding immediately after line 42 at page 77 the following:

"(2) The Governor in Council may make regulations providing for the appointment by him or by the Minister of a person to preside over a disciplinary court, prescribing the duties to be performed by such a person and fixing his remuneration."

He said: Mr. Speaker, the motion I am proposing is the direct result of the unanimous report which was submitted to me by the subcommittee on penitentiaries in Canada. It deals with giving the governor in council the power to appoint independent persons to chair over disciplinary courts in penitentiaries.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Adrien Lambert (Bellechasse): Mr. Speaker, referring to motion No. 39, I suggest that the Solicitor General is being given rather extraordinary powers. I concede that the report was unanimous but in any case, we might have to regret some day having followed its recommendations—

Mr. Fox: Your party was in favour of this.

Mr. Lambert (Bellechasse): All things considered, the Solicitor General is given an extraordinary power under motion No. 39. It is an issue where the rendering of justice is at stake. I do not want to question the good faith of the present Solicitor General who is here today, but it could be someone else tomorrow. All things considered, the Solicitor General is being granted extraordinary powers and maybe someday we will realize, I think, that we have gone a bit too far, because Parliament must always keep a monitoring power since it is, in my opinion, the very essence of our democracy. Our democracy will survive so long as we retain the principle that the ministers are accountable to Parliament. Quite sincerely, I believe that this amendment should be suppressed in order to let parliament exercise more monitoring power with regard to the way justice is carried out in this country.

● (2140)

[*English*]

Mrs. Simma Holt (Vancouver-Kingsway): Mr. Speaker, as a member of the subcommittee which inquired into the constant crises in penitentiaries, the violence and the hostage taking, I am pleased to support the motion of the Solicitor General (Mr. Fox). It is indicative of the seriousness with which the Solicitor General views the problem facing taxpayers and the problems in penitentiaries. The Solicitor General

has taken the opportunity to use Bill C-51 to incorporate this important measure which can keep our prisons from exploding again. In view of the fact that all parties were unanimous and non-partisan in the committee, I hope this motion will be passed unanimously.

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

Some hon. Members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

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

Some hon. Members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): In my opinion the yeas have it.

Some hon. Members: On division.

Motion No. 39 (Mr. Fox) agreed to.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Since all motions at the report stage have been considered, the House will now proceed to the outstanding recorded divisions on those motions.

Call in the members.

And the division bells having been rung:

● (2310)

Mr. Speaker: The first question is on motion No. 25 in the name of the hon. member for Moose Jaw (Mr. Neil).

The House divided on motion No. 25 (Mr. Neil) which was negatived on the following division:

(*Division No. 85*)

YEAS

Messrs.

Baker (Grenville-Carleton)	Elzinga	MacDonald (Miss) (Kingston and the Islands)
Beatty	Epp	Malone
Brisco	Fraser	Marshall
Cadieu	Grafftey	Mazankowski
Caouette (Villeneuve)	Halliday	McCain
Clark (Rocky Mountain)	Holmes	McCleave
Coates	Huntington	McKinnon
Crouse	Jarvis	Mitges
Darling	Johnston	Neil
Dick	Kempling	O'Sullivan
	Lambert (Bellechasse)	Paproski
	La Salle	

Messrs.

Patterson	Rondeau	Towers
Peters	Schumacher	Whiteway
Pigott (Mrs.)	Scott	Whittaker
Ritchie	Stanfield	Woolliams—(45)

NAYS

Messrs.

Abbott	Goodale	MacFarlane
Appolloni (Mrs.)	Goyer	Maine
Basford	Gray	McIsaac
Bégin (Miss)	Guay (St. Boniface)	Milne
Blais	Guay (Lévis)	Munro (Hamilton East)
Blaker	Haidasz	Nicholson (Miss)
Blouin	Harquail	O'Connell
Boulanger	Herbert	Orlikow
Breau	Hogan	Ouellet
Bussières	Holt (Mrs.)	Parent
Caccia	Hopkins	Pearsall
Cafik	Joyal	Penner
Campagnolo (Mrs.)	Kaplan	Philbrook
Caron	Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre)	Portelance
Chrétien	Lajoie	Poulin
Clermont	Lalonde	Railton
Cullen	Lamontagne	Raines
Dawson	Landers	Roberts
De Bané	Lang	Rodriguez
Demers	Langlois	Rompkey
Dionne (Northumberland Miramichi)	Lapointe	Roy (Laval)
Douglas (Bruce-Grey)	Lee	Saltsman
Duclos	Lefebvre	Sauvé (Mrs.)
Dupras	Leggatt	Savard
Duquet	Lessard	Sharp
Ethier	Loiselle (Chambly)	Smith (Saint-Jean)
Foster	Lumley	Tessier
Fox	MacDonald (Cardigan)	Trudeau
Francis		Trudel
Gilbert		Watson
Gillespie		Young—(90)

● (2320)

Mr. Speaker: I therefore declare motion No. 25 lost.

The question is on motion No. 29.

The House divided on motion No. 29 (Mr. Leggatt) which was negatived on the following division:

(*Division No. 86*)

YEAS

Messrs.

Baker (Grenville-Carleton)	Hnatyshyn	McCain
Beatty	Hogan	McCleave
Blackburn	Holmes	McKinnon
Brisco	Huntington	Mitges
Cadieu	Jarvis	Neil
Caouette (Villeneuve)	Johnston	Orlikow
Clark (Rocky Mountain)	Kempling	O'Sullivan
Coates	Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre)	Paproski
Crouse	Lambert (Bellechasse)	Patterson
Darling	La Salle	Peters
Dick	Leggatt	Pigott (Mrs.)
Elzinga	MacDonald (Miss) (Kingston and the Islands)	Ritchie
Epp	Malone	Rodriguez
Fraser	Marshall	Rondeau
Gilbert	Mazankowski	Schumacher
Grafftey		Scott
Halliday		Stanfield
		Towers
		Whiteway
		Whittaker
		Woolliams—(53)

NAYS

Messrs.

Abbott
Appolloni (Mrs.)
Basford
Bégin (Miss)
Blais
Blaker
Blouin
Boulanger
Breau
Bussières
Caccia
Cafik
Campagnolo (Mrs.)
Caron
Chrétien
Clermont
Cullen
Dawson
De Bané
Demers
Dionne
(Northumberland-Miramichi)
Douglas
(Bruce-Grey)
Duclos
Dupras
Duquet
Ethier
Foster
Fox
Francis
Gillespie
Goodale
Goyer
Gray
Guay
(St. Boniface)
Guay
(Lévis)
Haidasz
Harquail
Herbert
Holt (Mrs.)
Hopkins
Joyal
Kaplan
Lajoie
Lalonde
Lamontagne
Landers
Lang
Langlois
Lapointe
Lee
Lefebvre
Lessard
Loiselle
(Chambly)
Lumley
MacDonald
(Cardigan)
MacFarlane
Maine
McIsaac
McRae
Milne
Munro
(Hamilton East)
Nicholson (Miss)
O'Connell
Ouellet
Parent
Pearsall
Penner
Philbrook
Portelance
Poulin
Railton
Raines
Roberts
Robinson
Rompkey
Roy
(Laval)
Saltsman
Sauvé (Mrs.)
Savard
Sharp
Smith
(Saint-Jean)
Tessier
Trudeau
Trudel
Watson
Young—(86)

Mr. Speaker: I therefore declare motion No. 29 lost.

The question is on motion No. 30. This also disposes of motions Nos. 31 and 32.

The House divided on motion No. 30 (Mr. Woolliams) which was negatived on the following division:

(*Division No. 87*)

YEAS

Messrs.

Baker
(Grenville-Carleton)
Beatty
Blackburn
Brisco
Cadieu
Clark
(Rocky Mountain)
Coates
Crouse
Darling
Dick
Elzinga
Epp
Fraser
Gauthier
(Roberval)
Gilbert
Graffitey
Halliday
Hnatyshyn
Hogan
Holmes
Huntington
Jarvis
Johnston
Kempling
Knowles
(Winnipeg North Centre)
Lambert
(Bellechasse)
La Salle
Leggatt
MacDonald (Miss)
(Kingston and the Islands)
Malone
Marshall
Mazankowski
McCain
McCleave
McKinnon
Mitges
Neil
Orlikow
O'Sullivan
Paproski
Patterson
Peters
Pigott (Mrs.)
Ritchie
Rodriguez
Rondeau
Schumacher
Scott
Stanfield
Towers
Whiteway
Whittaker
Woolliams—(53)

NAYS

Messrs.

Abbott
Appolloni (Mrs.)
Basford
Bégin (Miss)
Blais
Blaker
Blouin
Boulanger
Breau
Bussières
Caccia
Cafik
Campagnolo (Mrs.)
Caron
Chrétien
Clermont
Cullen
Dawson
De Bané
Demers
Dionne
(Northumberland-Miramichi)
Douglas
(Bruce-Grey)
Duclos
Dupras
Duquet
Ethier
Foster
Fox
Francis
Gillespie
Goodale
Goyer
Gray
Guay
(St. Boniface)
Guay
(Lévis)
Haidasz
Harquail
Herbert
Holt (Mrs.)
Hopkins
Joyal
Kaplan
Lajoie
Lalonde
Lamontagne
Landers
Lang
Langlois
Lapointe
Lee
Lefebvre
Lessard
Loiselle
(Chambly)
Lumley
MacDonald
(Cardigan)
MacFarlane
Maine
McIsaac
McRae
Milne
Munro
(Hamilton East)
Nicholson (Miss)
O'Connell
Ouellet
Parent
Pearsall
Penner
Philbrook
Portelance
Poulin
Railton
Raines
Roberts
Robinson
Rompkey
Roy
(Laval)
Saltsman
Sauvé (Mrs.)
Savard
Sharp
Smith
(Saint-Jean)
Tessier
Trudeau
Trudel
Watson
Young—(86)

Mr. Speaker: I therefore declare motions Nos. 30, 31 and 32 lost.

The question is on motion No. 33. This will also dispose of motion No. 34.

The House divided on motion No. 33 (Mr. Woolliams) which was negatived on the following division:

(*Division No. 88*)

YEAS

Messrs.

Baker
(Grenville-Carleton)
Beatty
Blackburn
Brisco
Cadieu
Caouette
(Villeneuve)
Clark
(Rocky Mountain)
Coates
Crouse
Darling
Dick
Elzinga
Epp
Fraser
Gilbert
Graffitey
Halliday
Hnatyshyn
Hogan
Holmes
Huntington
Jarvis
Johnston
Kempling
Knowles
(Winnipeg North Centre)
Lambert
(Bellechasse)
La Salle
Leggatt
MacDonald (Miss)
(Kingston and the Islands)
Malone
Marshall
Mazankowski
McCain
McCleave
McKinnon
Mitges
Neil
Orlikow
O'Sullivan
Paproski
Patterson
Peters
Pigott (Mrs.)
Ritchie
Rodriguez
Rondeau
Schumacher
Scott
Stanfield
Towers
Whiteway
Whittaker
Woolliams—(53)

NAYS

Messrs.

Abbott
Appolloni (Mrs.)
Basford
Bégin (Miss)
Blais
Blaker
Blouin
Boulanger
Breau
Bussières
Caccia
Cafik
Campagnolo (Mrs.)
Caron
Chrétien
Clermont
Cullen
Dawson
De Bané
Demers
Dionne
(Northumberland-Miramichi)

Messrs.

Douglas (Bruce-Grey)	Lajoie	Ouellet
Duclos	Lalonde	Parent
Dupras	Lamontagne	Pearsall
Duquet	Landers	Penner
Ethier	Lang	Philbrook
Foster	Langlois	Portelance
Fox	Lapointe	Poulin
Francis	Lee	Railton
Gillespie	Lefebvre	Raines
Goodale	Lessard	Roberts
Goyer	Loiselle (Chambly)	Robinson
Gray	Lumley	Rompkey
Guay (St. Boniface)	MacDonald (Cardigan)	Roy (Laval)
Guay (Lévis)	MacFarlane	Saltsman
Haidasz	Maine	Sauvé (Mrs.)
Harquail	McIsaac	Savard
Herbert	McRae	Sharp
Holt (Mrs.)	Milne	Smith (Saint-Jean)
Hopkins	Munro (Hamilton East)	Tessier
Joyal	Nicholson (Miss)	Trudeau
Kaplan	O'Connell	Trudel
		Watson
		Young—(86)

● (2330)

Mr. Speaker: I therefore declare motions Nos. 33 and 34 lost.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I thought a vote was called for motion No. 35.

Mr. Paproski: It was disposed of on division this afternoon.

Mr. Speaker: Our records indicate that motion No. 35 was negatived on division.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): That is correct.

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Justice) moved that Bill C-51, to amend the Criminal Code, the Customs Tariff, the Parole Act, the Penitentiary Act and the Prisons and Reformatories Act, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs be concurred in.

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: When shall the bill be read a third time?

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): At the next sitting of the House.

* * *

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I wonder if I may ask the parliamentary secretary if he knows what we will be dealing with tomorrow and in what order the business will be called, and if he has anything else he would like to add we would be delighted to hear it.

[Mr. Speaker.]

Mr. Goodale: Mr. Speaker, it is our intention to begin tomorrow with Bill C-17, the Air Canada legislation, which is at the report stage. We are optimistic that that bill will be dealt with expeditiously. There are two other items for consideration tomorrow, the third reading stage of Bill C-51 and the third reading stage of Bill C-27. It can be the subject of further discussion with respect to the specific order in which those two items might be called, but it would be my expectation now that we would proceed after Bill C-17 with the third reading of Bill C-51.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[*English*]

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 40 deemed to have been moved.

NATIONAL DEFENCE—ALLEGED DIFFERENTIATION IN TREATMENT BY CUSTOMS BETWEEN FORCES PERSONNEL AND CIVILIANS

Mr. Robert McCleave (Halifax-East Hants): Mr. Speaker, what brings us together is my question of the other day to the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Danson) and the Minister of National Revenue (Miss Bégin) about the practices of the Armed Forces in dealing with people moving through customs, namely, National Defence people, and about whether they should have to make a declaration if it is felt they had made purchases abroad of $50 or less. The practice for the population as a whole is that they do not have to make any declaration or they may make an oral declaration, and they do not have to fill in any forms. In maritime command personnel do have to fill in a form. Having looked at the documents I can say that somebody in the department has misinterpreted the practice in general, and maritime command people have been required to fill in the form, whereas the rest of the personnel can move back and forth and be treated as civilians.

I am somewhat hampered in this debate because I have probably mislaid the document I once had. I have looked for it in my office and here in my desk. I cannot find it. In any event, a directive was sent out by maritime command stating that these forms did have to be filled in, but the rest of National Defence was not required to do so. I think there is a misunderstanding, and when I raised this matter the other day the Minister of National Revenue and the Minister of National Defence thought one thing, but when I showed the Minister of National Defence the documents, he indicated to me that probably in one part of National Defence there had been a mistake, and that was going to be corrected. I have probably taken more of the time of the House than I originally intended. I think the parliamentary secretary will straighten this up, and I thank the House for its indulgence.

Mr. Maurice A. Dionne (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the hon. member's brevity, considering the fact that it is past ten o'clock. Perhaps we could ask search and rescue to find his document for him, but in this case I have the answer to his question, and I think it will alleviate his justified concern.

Canadian Forces administrative orders state that goods valued at $50 and under may be declared verbally unless a customs official requests a written declaration.

Apparently in the past customs officials have been requesting written declarations from service personnel, but as a result of an interdepartmental inquiry the Department of National Revenue has agreed to process service personnel in the same manner as civilians.

● (2340)

The message referred to by the hon. member was issued from maritime command headquarters on June 23, 1977, and contravenes the Canadian Forces administrative order in so far that it "directs a requirement for written declarations" without qualification that goods valued at $50 or less may be declared orally except when directed otherwise by a customs official.

Maritime command has been directed to clarify the instruction and to ensure that the procedures outlined in the Canadian Forces administrative order issued by National Defence headquarters are adhered to. Maritime command will change the message and will adhere to the Canadian Forces administrative order.

POST OFFICE—ALLEGATION UNION DENIED ACCESS TO MEANS OF COMMUNICATING WITH MEMBERS—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. John Rodriguez (Nickel Belt): Mr. Speaker, when I raised questions concerning the Post Office on July 4, the Postmaster General (Mr. Blais) answered that he had no idea of the reasoning behind the breakdown in negotiations and that his department had never interfered with the union in the carrying out of its duties.

I would like to refresh the minister's memory tonight in regard to that interference, and perhaps in that way he may be better able to understand the labour unrest which is current in the Post Office.

Perhaps I should start by reminding the Postmaster General of the case in Charlottetown, P.E.I., last April where a union steward was "counselled" and threatened with dismissal for submitting grievances. In other words, management threatened to fire him for doing his job.

Then there is the case in Sydney, Nova Scotia, of a Mr. J. Legge. Mr. Legge is the local CUPW president and he was ordered by postal authorities to remove union bulletins from the premises of post offices. These bulletins, Mr. Speaker, had already been initialled by the employer. But the employer changed its mind and ordered them removed to prevent communication in the union.

The cases get more serious. There is the case of Wayne Mundle, a union official from the Halifax area. On May 17 he tried to enter a post office on union business. At that time he was denied access to the building. When he asserted his right to be there as a representative of the union he was ejected from the building. The result of that was that assault charges have been laid against the post office official responsible.

But to make matters even worse, yesterday Wayne Mundle was suspended from his job for three months. The reason given was that he had no right to be in the building. In other words, the Post Office is suspending union officials from jobs in a post office for the crime of trying to work for the men and women they represent.

The Post Office made its attitude even more clear recently when its district director, W. L. Ryan, informed the regional director of the union, Mr. D. W. Tingley, that he would not entertain any correspondence with him and that he would not be allowed to enter postal installations in Nova Scotia. This means that Mr. Tingley will not be able to represent unionists in the matter of grievances or anything else. The government is flatly denying the right of the union to be represented by its elected officials.

This is surely in keeping with the Post Office Department's campaign of misinformation over the years. They have sent their senior employees kits calling certain CUPW officials marxists and separatists. They have sent conflicting bulletins to different parts of the country, and I have copies of these here.

It is small wonder that we have labour difficulties in the Post Office with the attitude and actions shown by the employer. In fact it is a wonder there is as much industrial peace as there is.

The government has had the opportunity to set matters right. It signed a contract last year which should have helped in the matter of technological change and casual employees. But it refused to honour the provisions of that contract, Mr. Speaker, and today in Toronto there are actually more casual or temporary employees than there were at the time the contract was signed.

The union wanted to reopen the bargaining early this year, in January 1977, as they had done in the past, to clear up some of these outstanding problems. The government would have nothing to do with an early bargaining. So now again we are faced with labour trouble in the Post Office, and again the government does nothing to clean up its own mess, choosing instead to propagandize and attack the union leadership. Mr. Speaker, there is one way in which the matter can be settled.

The union has called for a royal commission into the Post Office to find where the problems lie. If the government is so confident the union is to blame, why will it not hold such a commission and give an undertaking that it will carry out its recommendations? Is it afraid that a royal commission will take the road of all past independent commissions and blame the way the Post Office has been managed, or mismanaged

over the years? These are questions the government must answer.

Mr. Walter Smith (Parliamentary Secretary to Postmaster General): Mr. Speaker, it has been suggested in this House that the breakdown in negotiations between the Canadian Union of Postal Workers and the Post Office Department is the result of alleged interference in communication between that union's national executive and its membership. I would like to make it absolutely clear there is no truth in this allegation.

For about nine months now the Post Office Department has been communicating with employees—all employees at all levels—on a wide variety of topics. Those topics include the current status of negotiations with each of the five postal unions, the results of union elections, international art exhibitions, hockey tournaments, and the retirement of long-serving employees. Whatever the subject matter, these messages report substantiated facts; they do not express opinions; they do not indulge in name calling. These messages are not addressed to rank and file emloyees, but to all levels of management, including first-level supervisors. The only motive behind this system of communication is the need to have a well-informed management, so that they can either pass this information along or respond to questions from the people they supervise or manage.

On one occasion a message containing an incorrect statement was sent out. The error was quickly spotted and corrected within hours. The correction was identified as such. Therefore that one hon. member should suggest that the Post Office Department issues "conflicting bulletins" is a complete distortion of the facts. No doubt the CUPW has its own reasons for refusing to return to the negotiating table, but interfering with the union's communications is most certainly not a reason. The union has repeatedly been invited to resume bargaining. Its executive has refused to do so for reasons which may become clear later. They are certainly not clear at present.

It has been further suggested in this House that the Post Office Department has refused to allow union publications to be posted and distributed to the membership. I assume the hon. member is referring to unsubstantiated charges made before the Public Service Staff Relations Board.

In fact the union, through its legal counsel, has now been before the board for seven days and has not yet addressed itself to the charge made against the Post Office Department under article 20 of the staff relations act. The chairman of the board has more than once urged the union to present the proper evidence, but it has not yet done so. Largely because of this, the staff relations board has had to schedule a further nine days of hearings which will last up to October 6 next, with still no certainty that the union's case will be made even by then.

A reasonable man might conclude that the union, in stating it cannot resume bargaining until the hearing is concluded, is just stalling.

[Mr. Rodriguez.]

I understand CUPW is having its convention in Halifax on July 25 and I wish them success in their deliberations, Mr. Speaker.

FARM CREDIT CORPORATION—INDICTMENT OF MANAGEMENT IN AUDIT BY SIBBALD GROUP—GOVERNMENT ACTION

Mr. Perrin Beatty (Wellington-Grey-Dufferin-Waterloo): Mr. Speaker, it is almost midnight and, like members in this House, the members of the press gallery are tired. Therefore I shall try to be brief. However, I must raise one matter of considerable importance.

For several days I have tried to raise in the House of Commons questions concerning difficulties of the Farm Credit Corporation. For years farmers in all parts of the country highly regarded the Farm Credit Corporation, which provided farmers with low interest loans and money with which farmers could expand their operations, stay in business, or even go into the business. In recent years the corporation has encountered increasing difficulties. In 1975 it ran out of funds, and many farmers were unable to secure the loans the corporation had promised them. Last year the government actually showed restraint in one area. It cut back the authorized lending capital of Farm Credit Corporation, putting the squeeze on the agricultural sector of the economy. In the last two years senior management personnel have resigned from the corporation. That is a sign of malaise within the corporation.

In April, this year, the Sibbald Group released the results of an audit and study of Farm Credit Corporation. It showed that within the corporation there was poor morale, and moonlighting by employees on company time. Employees were taught to learn French and then sent to areas where no one spoke French, with the result that the taxpayers' money was wasted. The report showed that there was poor administration at all levels. It was a very blunt report, extremely caustic in its assessment.

● (2350)

Let me put on record these quotations having to do with management. The first is from page 33 of the report. It says:

> The number of references to management problems during the interviews was too great to ignore. Here are complaints about lack of credibility, lack of confidence in leadership, lack of communication, and mystery regarding corporate objectives at almost all levels of the corporation.

At page 59 the report states:

> Corporate senior leadership is widely viewed at all levels as being less than adequate. This feeling is more pronounced and widespread the higher one probes the corporate ladder.

It is vital the government should disclose what steps it is prepared to take to provide leadership to the corporation. After all, this is a $306 million organization. The taxpayers have a right to expect that it will be wisely managed; the employees have right to expect that proper direction will be given to them, and that they will be in a position to understand the direction senior management wishes to take. Most important of all, the farmers of Canada have a right to expect that

the corporation will provide them with the best possible service.

I hope the government is prepared to extend the terms of the motion under Standing Order 43 which I sought to move today, and in respect to which unanimous consent was refused. It would have referred this report to the Standing Committee on Agriculture and given the minister an opportunity to indicate whether he was prepared to accept his responsibility to restore control and direction to the corporation.

Mr. Walter Smith (Parliamentary Secretary to Postmaster General): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have this opportunity to clarify some of the comments which have been made about the Farm Credit Corporation and the studies carried out by the Manitoba Institute of Management Incorporated and the Sibbald Group. Unfortunately I cannot reply to all of the allegations which the hon. member for Wellington-Grey-Dufferin-Waterloo (Mr. Beatty) has made in recent days. Therefore I shall respond briefly to those which seem to have been uppermost in his mind when the questions were being asked.

I should first caution the hon. member about the manner in which this report was prepared. A number of FCC employees from all levels of the organization conducted interviews with fellow employees and clients of the Farm Credit Corporation. From these interviews the report was written, without allegations and charges having been pursued in detail to verify their validity. Therefore much of the report is hearsay and in several instances most misleading. As the report was only intended as an internal document to assist management, this approach was quite reasonable.

Insofar as moonlighting is concerned, I am advised the corporation does have strict guidelines against such a practice and that any instances brought to its attention will be dealt with accordingly. There would, however, appear to be some confusion insofar as this allegation is concerned. In 1969 the Farm Credit Corporation reached an agreement with the Department of Finance that FCC employees would value rural properties for banks considering loans to farmers under the Farm Improvement Loans Act. As it is the corporation which is reimbursed for this activity, it is normal procedure that such appraisals should be conducted as part of the employees' duties.

The Farm Credit Corporation does not send people on French language courses when its clients do not indicate a need for service in the second official language. However, it is the policy of the corporation to serve its clients in the language of their choice wherever possible. The confusion in this instance may have been caused by an occasion when an individual occupying a bilingual position was sent on French language training. Upon his return to the field he applied for, and was successful in winning, a competition in a unilingual area. It is not the policy of the corporation to restrict the advancement of its employees because of additional language abilities.

The comments about lack of credibility arose primarily because of the financial restrictions placed on the corporation when the anti-inflation program was commenced by the government. Unfortunately, at the same time, increased farm incomes were resulting in a very significant increase in the demand for farm loans. The combination of these two factors resulted in certain loans that had been approved in one fiscal year not being made until the following fiscal year.

The allegations concerning lack of leadership result primarily from the new system of management introduced by the present chairman. Under this system decision making became a participatory process with input being welcomed from several sources. In addition to this group decision making, authority was decentralized from the head office to the branches.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Order, please. I regret to interrupt the hon. gentleman but his allotted time has expired.

Mr. Beatty: With unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, might he continue?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Order, please.

Motion agreed to and the House adjourned at 11.57 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Friday, July 15, 1977

The House met at 11 a.m.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

SPORTS

PROPOSED FEDERAL-PROVINCIAL CONFERENCE TO DEVELOP POLICY ON FITNESS AND SPORT—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Bruce Halliday (Oxford): Mr. Speaker, I rise under the provisions of Standing Order 43 on a matter of urgent and pressing necessity. In view of the failure of the Minister of State for Fitness and Amateur Sport, in spite of ten months in her new portfolio, to develop a credible national policy on amateur sport and physical fitness, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Joliette (Mr. La Salle):

That this House calls upon the minister to convene a federal-provincial conference to deal with this matter.

Mr. Speaker: Presentation of such a motion requires the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

REQUEST FOR PROGRAM OF TRAINING AND FINANCING FOR ATHLETES TO PREPARE FOR OLYMPICS—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Paul Yewchuk (Athabasca): Mr. Speaker, I rise under the provisions of Standing Order 43 to move a matter of urgent and pressing necessity. In view of Canada's anticipated participation in the Olympics at Moscow in 1980, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Joliette (Mr. La Salle):

That under the supervision of a federal-provincial committee, a complete program of training and financing be established for Canadian athletes so as to allow them to prepare adequately for the Olympic games in Moscow.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: Presentation of such a motion for debate can be done only with the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

SUGGESTED PAYMENT TO EMPLOYEES FOR EXTRA HOURS WORKED THIS SESSION—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. John Rodriguez (Nickel Belt): Mr. Speaker, I rise under the provisions of Standing Order 43 on a matter of urgent and pressing necessity. In view of the fact that the summer break of the House of Commons this year will be the shortest in recent years, and in view of the fact that this will mean the staff of the House of Commons and the Library of Parliament will be working a much larger proportion of the year on longer hours than is usual, and in view of the fact that these employees have already been penalized this year by wage increases which were less than the present rate of inflation and much less than those given people in the Public Service, I move, seconded by the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Leggatt):

That this House recommend an extra sum of money be allocated to the employees of the House of Commons and the Library of Parliament to cover the amount of extra hours they will have to work this summer.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. In order for such a motion to be presented, it would require the unanimous consent of the House. I have some misgivings about the administrative responsibility of this matter. It does not concern the government, but rather the Chair.

An hon. Member: It is for you, too.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Parliament can express itself.

Mr. Speaker: I do not know if I can classify myself as an employee of the House of Commons for the purpose of the motion. Presentation of such a motion for debate requires the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Paproski: The Liberal government said: "No."

Old Age Security Act

FINANCE

PROPOSED COMMITTEE STUDY OF REASONS CANADIANS INVESTING IN UNITED STATES REAL ESTATE—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Dan McKenzie (Winnipeg South Centre): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a matter of urgent and pressing necessity under the provisions of Standing Order 43. My motion is prompted by the alarming amount of money which is leaving Canada through Canadian investment in United States real estate, which has gone from $300 million in 1972 to a high of $2.5 billion this year, to the point where Canadian investors own 30 per cent of the major apartment complexes in Seattle, Washington and Canadian firms have developed 17 major complexes in United States cities. Since this mass exodus of money into United States real estate is due to relatively poor political and economic times in Canada, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Saskatoon-Biggar (Mr. Hnatyshyn):

That this House instruct the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs to conduct an immediate investigation into the amount of money leaving Canada by way of Canadian investment in United States real estate, and to bring forth recommendations on how this trend can be reversed.

Mr. Speaker: Presentation of such a motion for debate can be done only with the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

* * *

● (1110)

OLD AGE SECURITY ACT

SUGGESTED AMENDMENT TO END DISCRIMINATION AGAINST PERSONS OF SINGLE STATUS BETWEEN AGES OF 60 AND 65—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, because I believe the time has come for this motion to be accepted, I ask leave to move it, seconded by the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands (Mr. Douglas). I therefore move:

That this House urges the government to introduce without further delay an amendment to the Old Age Security Act to end the discrimination therein against persons of single status between the ages of 60 and 65 by providing for the equivalent of the spouse's allowance to be paid as well to widows, spinsters, widowers, and bachelors between the ages of 60 and 65, provided they are out of the labour market.

Mr. Speaker: Presentation of any such motion requires the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

[Mr. Paproski.]

METRIC CONVERSION

SUGGESTED IMPROVEMENT OF INFORMATION SUPPLIED TO GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Bob Brisco (Kootenay West): Mr. Speaker, I rise under the provisions of Standing Order 43 on a matter of urgent necessity. In view of the fact that this week a farmer from Salmo, British Columbia was denied the right to purchase grain from Purina Mills of Spokane, Washington, because the mill stated they deal only in bushels, not in kilograms, and in view of the fact that the farmer returned empty-handed as a result of this false impression created by the Metric Commission in the United States grain industry, and in view of the fact that inquiries by my office with a senior official responsible for metric conversion revealed a total ignorance of the subject, and that I was only enlightened by the provincial Department of Agriculture of British Columbia, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski):

That the government improve its information policies with its own officials and with the Metric Commission and with U.S. grain handling officials, or withdraw Bill C-23 so that farmers will not be denied vital grain supplies as a result of information failures.

Mr. Speaker: Presentation of such a motion for debate requires unanimous consent. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[*Translation*]

SPORTS

SUGGESTED ADOPTION OF POLICY OF FITNESS AND SPORT—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Roch La Salle (Joliette): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of State responsible for Fitness and Amateur Sport.

Considering that last September the government appointed a minister responsible for amateur sport and physical fitness, that, consequently, the Canadian public could rightfully expect an overall and urgently needed physical fitness policy, that the minister has failed to submit positive ideas in this respect, being somewhat satisfied with administering the few millions of dollars which the Department of National Health and Welfare had already placed at her disposal and which are definitely inadequate, could the minister tell us, after holding this portfolio for nearly a year, whether she intends to develop, through legislation or otherwise, a credible national policy in line with the expectations of the Canadian public.

[*English*]

Hon. Iona Campagnolo (Minister of State (Fitness and Amateur Sport)): The policy is in its final stage of preparation.

Some hon. Members: Oh!

[*Translation*]

Mr. La Salle: Mr. Speaker, on a supplementary.

As everyone else, Mr. Speaker, on this side of the House we of course have had occasion to see the minister give news conferences and speak of her good intentions, but in the interest of all Canada we feel that an overall policy should be adopted. At the time of the speech from the throne, the government did give cause for expectations in Canadians, so I put my question again to the minister to give her a chance to reply if she really wants to be taken seriously by the country. Does she intend to introduce in this Parliament an over-all policy in which, of course, the provinces would co-operate? What are the real intentions of the minister: will she limit herself to giving a few news conferences to give illusions to the Canadians, as is the case now?

[*English*]

Mrs. Campagnolo: When the policy is prepared I shall be very pleased to share it not only with the hon. member but with all the people of Canada.

[*Translation*]

Mr. La Salle: Mr. Speaker, as we all know that the government is responsible for allowing all Canadians to develop in any field of endeavour, according to their tastes and talents, has the minister actually looked into the possibility of financing the basic facilities that are required in all areas of our country? If so, what kind of budget does she intend to present, what financial recommendations does she intend to make, if she wants to have any credibility with regard to an overall policy?

[*English*]

Mrs. Campagnolo: Mr. Speaker, I understand the hon. member is trying to determine whether or not the federal government is going to go into capital expenditures for provision of facilities across the country. I would remind him that at present Loto Canada is supplying 12.5 per cent of its total revenue to the provinces which is utilized for the provision of facilities. In addition, at this time it is not my intention to provide capital funds for facilities. However, if this should change, I would certainly be the first person to advise the hon. member.

CONTINGENCY PLANS IN EVENT FUNDS NOT SUPPLIED BY LOTO CANADA

Mr. Howard Johnston (Okanagan-Kootenay): Mr. Speaker, considering the extent to which the minister's plans for the future of sport in Canada depend on revenue derived from Loto Canada, what contingency plan has the minister developed to meet the near collapse of Loto Canada in the face of provincial lottery competitions?

Hon. Iona Campagnolo (Minister of State (Fitness and Amateur Sport)): I do not see at the present time that the collapse of Loto Canada will rest with the decision of one province, and certainly there are contingency plans, but I do not think this is the appropriate time for that to be discussed, since I do not have the time to delineate them during the question period.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Johnston: Mr. Speaker, all we want to hear is some reassurance that the minister is aware of conditions that are before us already and two years in advance of her anticipation.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Johnston: In light of the declining Loto Canada revenues, does the minister anticipate a round of conferences with the provinces to obtain a share of their lottery revenue, or will she rely on private endeavours from organizations with which she has already interfered in a startling attempt to use sport to bolster the government's political policies?

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Some hon. Members: Shame.

Mrs. Campagnolo: First of all, Mr. Speaker, I would like to make it extremely clear to the hon. member that Loto Canada has no intention of laying down and dying.

An hon. Member: Don't be bumptious, and answer the question.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Woolliams: Watch your grammar, Iona.

Mrs. Campagnolo: We always like your grammar, Eldon.

On the second part of the question which the hon. member has raised regarding interference in the sports world, I feel that the reference is ill-advised. When it comes to his reference to the sports governing organizations of the Organization of African Unity, I cannot believe that the hon. member would find it more suitable that Canada should be in favour of apartheid in sports.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

* * *

MANPOWER

NEW PLANS TO DEAL WITH UNEMPLOYMENT—DATE OF ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Manpower and Immigration. Three days ago the minister acknowledged outside this House that he would be introducing new employment programs to reduce the high level of unemployment in all of Canada's regions. Can the minister indicate to the House

whether he is now able to announce the details of the new programs, and if not, will he give us an assurance that he will do so when the House meets during the pipeline debate?

Hon. Bud Cullen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): I would recommend to the hon. member a careful reading of precisely what I said on that occasion. I did comment on the second phase of the winter works projects and the announcement of $225 million for this particular winter on that particular project.

Mr. Orlikow: In the press release issued by Premier Schreyer last Friday he said that the Prime Minister had indicated to him that "job creation plans for the coming months were already close to completion". Did Premier Schreyer understand the Prime Minister correctly in his assumption that there are new programs, or is the minister saying that the only program which the government has considered to deal with unemployment is the release of the rest of the money for the Canada Works Program, as indicated?

● (1120)

Mr. Cullen: No, Mr. Speaker, we indicated that we had a job experience training program with a summer component. We were looking to establish a winter component on that one, and we were looking to other programs with different mixes. We found that particular programs such as co-operative education might win some favour with the provinces, and we hope to work with them on that particular aspect. It is an on-going project at all times, and we want to improve on what is already a very splendid system.

Mr. Orlikow: Are hon. members of this House to understand that despite the fact that unemployment has been substantially higher in each month of this year compared with the same months last year, there is no money for any employment programs contemplated by the government except that which was allocated by the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Manpower and Immigration for Canada Works and Young Canada Works?

Mr. Cullen: No matter what was said, I am sure that is what the hon. member would probably propagate across the country. However, I have indicated that we are constantly looking at our programs to monitor which ones work and which do not and to decide where more money can be put. That is what we propose to continue doing.

* * *

[*Translation*]

CONFEDERATION

INQUIRY OF NUMBER OF MEMBERS ON TASK FORCE ON UNITY PROPORTIONAL TO POPULATION OF EACH PROVINCE

Mr. Gilbert Rondeau (Shefford): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the right hon. Prime Minister.

Can the Prime Minister tell the House how many members will form the task force on national unity, and can he tell us at the same time if this number will be proportional to the population of each province?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, we do not intend to have proportional representation. We want the task force to be composed of members from various groups and various regions.

Mr. Rondeau: Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask a supplementary question.

Is it true that there will be only one representative from the province of Quebec, if ever one can be found, within this task force?

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member had listened to my previous answer, he would understand that we do not intend to have one representative by province, no matter its population. We want Canadians concerned with the matter of national unity irrespective of the statistical problems which seem to bother the hon. member.

* * *

[*English*]

SPORTS

ESTABLISHMENT OF NATIONAL COACHING SCHOOL—REASON FOR DELAY OF ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. Paul Yewchuk (Athabasca): Mr. Speaker, I would like to get back to the minister who is becoming known as the minister responsible for fatness and spectator sports—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Yewchuk: In view of the lack of an over-all policy dealing with fitness and amateur sport, and in view of the up-coming Olympics and the importance of developing athletes I would like to ask the minister a specific question. When her budget was discussed in the committee on March 29 the minister indicated that she would make an announcement by June 1 with respect to the establishment of a national coaching school. Six weeks have now gone by, and the minister has remained totally silent on this subject. I wonder if she can offer the House an explanation for her silence.

Hon. Iona Campagnolo (Minister of State (Fitness and Amateur Sport)): Mr. Speaker, members of the opposition seem to want it both ways. They do not want me to give press conferences, but they do want me to make announcements.

An hon. Member: Make them in the House.

Mrs. Campagnolo: On the matter of athlete support in Canada—

Mr. Paproski: You mean athletic support.

Mrs. Campagnolo: Athlete support. I am quite sure the hon. member recalls the other kind.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Paproski: We are going to gild one for you.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mrs. Campagnolo: Do hon. members opposite want to hear what the athletes of Canada have in the way of support or not? My branch has an operation called Game Plan. Game Plan used to be subsidized by the private sector to a much larger degree than it is now, and as a result of the private sector's having removed some support, it has become necessary for the government to make up that financial loss. This has been done through Loto Canada.

The hon. member wants to know when the national coaching school will be launched. The first part of it will be launched September 1. In other areas of athlete support we have the national coaching television program which will be begun this spring. If hon. members opposite want to know what moneys the people of Canada are paying to support athletes, they need only ask, and I shall supply them with the amounts allotted to each of the athletes who are being supplied with basic funding by the people of Canada.

ESTABLISHMENT OF NATIONAL COACHING SCHOOL—CONSULTATION WITH PROVINCES

Mr. Paul Yewchuk (Athabasca): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Could the minister tell the House whether she has been able to achieve any sort of understanding with the provinces since their co-operation will be necessary in so far as the establishment of a national coaching school is concerned? If she has achieved understanding why has she not informed the House?

Hon. Iona Campagnolo (Minister of State (Fitness and Amateur Sport)): Mr. Speaker, this is a rather delicate matter. There have been two scheduled meetings of federal-provincial conferences on sport. The first was to be held last November but was subsequently cancelled, the last was held in June and I was not invited to attend. When the provinces do wish to speak to me, I am most anxious to speak to them.

Mr. Paproski: They do not want you to go into the locker rooms.

* * *

[*Translation*]

CONFEDERATION

SUGGESTED ESTABLISHMENT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON NATIONAL UNITY

Mr. Heward Grafftey (Brome-Missisquoi): Mr. Speaker, I would like to know whether the right hon. Prime Minister is now prepared to accept the suggestion of the opposition concerning the establishment of a joint parliamentary committee on national unity involving all hon. members of the House of Commons.

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, as I indicated during the debate, I think, it seems to me that we are a bit too far into the session to establish such a committee. We hope the House will be able to adjourn within a matter of days and I do not really see the need for debating the resolution mentioned by the hon. member if the session is to end in a few days.

* * *

[*English*]

ATOMIC ENERGY OF CANADA LIMITED

SALE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR TO ARGENTINA—RESPONSIBILITY FOR MARKETING POLICY

Miss Flora MacDonald (Kingston and the Islands): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources. I should like to refer to testimony given by the Chairman of Atomic Energy of Canada Limited before the Porter Commission on July 12. When questioned about the marketing practices of AECL and specifically when questioned on the Argentinian reactor sale he replied:

The government of Canada is responsible for the marketing policy.

He went on to say with regard to the Argentinian deal that that would slip into the kind of category of a loss leader to get into a market. Given those statements by the Chairman of AECL in which he denies responsibility for marketing practices, given the letter written by Dr. Foster to the hon. member for Vegreville in which he denies responsibility for the marketing practices of AECL, in light of the $130 million loss, the fiasco sustained in the Argentinian deal, would the minister tell the House whether it was he or his predecessor in that portfolio who sanctioned this marketing policy attributed to the government by the Chairman of AECL when he described it as a loss leader sale?

Hon. Alastair Gillespie (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, if one listened carefully to the hon. lady's question one would note a good deal of confusion, perhaps intended, on her part. At one point she talks about marketing policies and at the next point about marketing practices and she confuses them completely with a view to trying to confuse an already difficult situation. With respect to the sale of reactors, the policy of the government has been to sell reactors. That is the marketing policy question; with respect to the marketing practices, that is a corporate policy.

Miss MacDonald: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I should like to ask the minister if he is denying the statements made by the Chairman of AECL before the Porter Commission in which he was asked particularly about the marketing practices and attributed them to the government of Canada.

Mr. Gillespie: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. lady will look at *Hansard* and re-read her first question she will see it concerned marketing policy but not marketing practices.

Oral Questions

INQUIRY AS TO PRESENT DUTIES OF MR. FOSTER

Mr. Don Mazankowski (Vegreville): I have a supplementary question for the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources, Mr. Speaker, which arises out of the dismissal of Mr. John Foster, chief executive officer of AECL and a letter he directed to me in which he indicates he is still an employee of AECL. He further indicates that he accepts no responsibility for the mismanagement of AECL. I ask the minister to say what are Mr. Foster's present duties, and since he is no longer chief executive officer, has his salary been cut?

● (1130)

Hon. Alastair Gillespie (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, Mr. Foster has no duties at present; he is on leave. As I told the House, I hope we shall succeed in working out some technical consulting assignment for him. I expect that may happen, and negotiations may take place in a couple of months.

Mrs. Simma Holt (Vancouver-Kingsway): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Manpower and Immigration. On July 12 I attended, for the Government of Canada and on behalf of the Minister of Justice, the official opening of a magnificent and desperately needed extended care hospital in the riding of a Tory member who is not working hard—

Mr. Paproski: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege—

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

Some hon. Members: Order. Sit down.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Saskatoon-Biggar.

* * *

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

REVIEW OF ISSUANCE OF WRITS OF ASSISTANCE—REQUEST FOR REPORT

Mr. Ray Hnatyshyn (Saskatoon-Biggar): Mr. Speaker, thank you for recognizing another Tory member who works damned hard.

Mr. Paproski: We all work hard on this side.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: The minister may recall that for the past six months I have been concerned about writs of assistance. The minister said in March he was having the entire question reviewed thoroughly and would consider amendments to legislation which allows writs of assistance to be granted. Since his position on Bill C-51 has blown to smithereens his former reputation, such as it was, as a civil libertarian, has the minister good news for us with respect to writs of assistance?

[Mr. Gillespie.]

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, my officials have been conducting the review I requested and informed me this week it has not yet been completed.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Within what time frame does the minister anticipate announcing his intentions? The matter has been before the minister some six months. Surely he has had the opportunity to come to a decision on this fundamental question, writs of assistance.

Mr. Basford: Mr. Speaker, it is impossible to come to a decision until the review is completed, at which point changes either in policy or legislation can be decided. If legislative changes are contemplated they will be announced in the usual way in this House by way of the introduction of legislation.

* * *

LABOUR CONDITIONS

STRIKE AT TELEGLOBE CANADA—REQUEST FOR REPORT ON NEGOTIATIONS

Mr. John A. Fraser (Vancouver South): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Labour. I gave him notice of it yesterday. It concerns the serious labour-management dispute between the Canadian Overseas Telecommunications Union and Teleglobe Canada. Some weeks ago the union took the unusual step, for a union, of asking for arbitration. Given that this union between 1950 and 1976 did not go on strike, relations being good, and given that Teleglobe Canada, a Crown corporation, has refused arbitration and said in a letter dated May 16, "... we however feel that the area of disagreement is not such as to lend itself to arbitration" even though the strike is in its seventh week, what is the minister's department doing, and has the minister been able to consult with the Minister of Communications with whom I raised this issue some weeks ago?

Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for giving me notice of the question and advise him that within an hour or two I may have good news for him. The parties met until 3.30 this morning. A proposal has been approved, subject to ratification. It is going before the general membership now. Naturally, I hope they accept it.

* * *

PENITENTIARIES

RESPONSE TO COMMITTEE REPORT—PERSONS RESPONSIBLE FOR ASSESSING REPORT

Mr. Stuart Leggatt (New Westminster): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Solicitor General may I direct my question to the parliamentary secretary? It is now five weeks since an all-party committee tabled in this House a report on penitentiaries and many members of that committee, of which the parliamentary secretary was one, are anxious to see action

taken on that report? When will the government respond to that report on penitentiaries? Who is assessing the report? One of the major recommendations of the report concerns the bureaucracy and structures which must be changed within the penitentiary system. Is any bureaucrat whom the report criticized involved in assessing the report which criticized him?

Mr. Art Lee (Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, I am sure all hon. members will join with me in congratulating the Solicitor General for implementing one of the committee's recommendations yesterday by way of an amendment to Bill C-51. I refer to the concept of the independent chairman of disciplinary hearings. The minister is actively considering the matter and in due course the minister will inform the hon. member of his position.

REASON FOR FAILURE TO RESPOND TO RECOMMENDATION COMMITTEE MONITOR IMPLEMENTATION OF REPORT

Mr. Stuart Leggatt (New Westminster): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. That one recommendation, incorporated in Bill C-51, was one of the most minor in the report. The recommendation that an all-party committee have a continuing mandate to monitor the implementation of the report so that we can determine how fast it is being implemented is easy to comply with. Can the parliamentary secretary say why we have not had a response even to that simple recommendation which said that the justice subcommittee should have a continuing mandate to monitor the implementation of the report? Why are we refused that request?

Mr. Art Lee (Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, that is a subject matter for the House to deal with. The minister cannot presume what the House of Commons intends to do.

POSSIBILITY COMMISSIONER ASSESSING COMMITTEE REPORT

Mr. Stuart Leggatt (New Westminster): A final supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. One of the committee's major and important recommendations concerned the role of the commissioner and the role of a board to manage the prison system. Is the commissioner, who was involved so intimately in this matter and whom the report criticized, assessing the report of the all-party committee? The parliamentary secretary did not answer my initial question. Are the members of the bureaucracy whom the report criticizes assessing the report which criticizes them? Is that the kind of response the Solicitor General will give us?

Mr. Art Lee (Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, I think I answered that question. I said the Solicitor General takes the report most seriously. The hon. member suggests that the introduction of the provision concerning the independent chairman of disciplinary hearings is a paltry one, but I should like him to ask those individuals facing disciplinary hearings in their penal institutions what they think of it. I think that will show you the serious way in which the Solicitor General approaches this whole matter. In due course he will make known his intentions to the hon. member and others in this House.

* * *

ENERGY

NATURAL GAS EXPORTS TO UNITED STATES—REQUEST FOR DETAILS OF SWAP ARRANGEMENT

Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Calgary North): Mr. Speaker, my question for the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources arises from what he told the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands yesterday about gas contracts with the United States. I should like the matter to be made clear. I understand we have made a deal with the United States whereby we shall export so many thousand cubic feet of natural gas and get, in return, so many thousand cubic feet of natural gas. Are we to deal in dollars and cents, or in cubic feet of natural gas. If we export natural gas to the United States, because gas prices to consumers are rising will we receive in return an equivalent number of cubic feet of natural gas instead of dollars and cents?

Hon. Alastair Gillespie (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands asked a hypothetical question.

Miss MacDonald: The minister treats all questions, apparently, as hypothetical.

Mr. Gillespie: He wondered what would be the government's approach to a particular situation which might develop. I tried to say as best I could that there is a possibility of swaps over time, which I think is the basis of the hon. member's question. The National Energy Board, in its report to the government tabled some ten days ago, raised this possibility. The details of any time swaps have not been worked out, but I think the principle of a time swap should be examined.

● (1140)

I recognize with the hon. member that we would want to protect the Canadian interests, as did the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands, so that we would not be in the position of selling at today's prices, relatively cheap, a certain quantity of natural gas and then buying it back at a later date at a very much higher price. Obviously, that would not make any sense.

Mr. Woolliams: Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the minister in this regard. Is he saying to me, and I do not know whether the House appreciates this, that the deal is going to be on cubic feet of gas if Canada gives gas today and gets gas back from the United States? Will it be in cubic feet or in dollars and cents? That is what the consumer wants to know. Let us cut out the rhetoric.

Mr. Gillespie: Mr. Speaker, this has to be answered on the basis of a hypothetical question because we have not received

any application for these kinds of swaps. The National Energy Board even raised the possibility of a time swap. I gave an answer which indicates we have to protect the Canadian consumer on the basis of true value. I cannot do more than that at the present time, other than to say we will look at any application which is considered by the National Energy Board. That is the process of elimination, as the hon. member must know.

* * *

[*Translation*]

HEALTH

PROPOSED STUDY WITH UNITED STATES OF PRODUCT LAETRILE—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. F. A. Philbrook (Halton): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of National Health and Welfare. In view of the controversy concerning the pharmaceutical product called Laetrile used for the treatment of cancer, is the government cooperating with the Canadian Medical Association and the United States authorities to determine the medical and legal status of that product as far as its efficiency and its security is concerned.

Hon. Marc Lalonde (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, the Department of National Health and Welfare shares the views of American authorities and the Canadian Medical Association about the pharmaceutical product called Laetrile; to wit that there is nothing to indicate that the drug is effective or sure against cancer.

In addition, I would like to point out that we are in close contact with American authorities; indeed two of my officials recently were in Washington to discuss the matter with American authorities, but I can say to the hon. member that we have no reason to alter our position and we have no indication that Laetrile can be effective for individuals suffering from cancer.

* * *

[*English*]

CANADIAN WHEAT BOARD

METHOD OF FINDING REPLACEMENT FOR CHIEF COMMISSIONER

Mr. Gordon Towers (Red Deer): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the minister in charge of the Canadian Wheat Board. When Mr. Vogel retires as Chief Commissioner of the Canadian Wheat Board, will the minister advertise across Canada for the best salesman available to replace him or will it be a cabinet appointment?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, the legal provision requires an appointment by order in council. Obviously, we will search for the very best person if that vacancy does in fact occur.

Mr. Towers: In view of the continuing cheap verbal shots that the minister is firing at the Premier of Alberta concerning the selling policies of the Canadian Wheat Board, and in view of the fact that the deputy premier of that province is a brother of the Minister without Portfolio, can the minister state whether or not he has discussed this issue with the latter and what his stand is on it?

Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, I do not think we need to be concerned about any relationship with regard to these statements. I have not been making cheap shots in relation to the Premier of Alberta. What I have been doing is defending the Canadian Wheat Board against rather unfounded attacks by him. I would like members opposite in the Conservative party in this House to say whether they support the Canadian Wheat Board as a selling agency or want interference from provincial politicians.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

* * *

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

DEVELOPMENT OF NEUTRON BOMB—DISCUSSIONS WITH UNITED STATES

Mr. Allan B. McKinnon (Victoria): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister. Will the right hon. member tell the House what discussions or consultations he has had in his role as an elder statesman of NATO with President Carter about the implication of the United States decision to proceed with the development of the neutron bomb.

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): None, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. McKinnon: Does the Prime Minister support the development of the neutron bomb which appears to be in line with a philosophy that a limited nuclear war is possible, bearing in mind that acceptance of a limited nuclear war posture by NATO may itself have a destabilizing effect?

Mr. Trudeau: I have not analyzed the problem, Mr. Speaker.

* * *

NATIONAL DEFENCE

POSSIBILITY NATO WILL ACCEPT NEUTRON BOMB—CANADIAN POSITION

Mr. Allan B. McKinnon (Victoria): Mr. Speaker, I will direct my final supplementary question to the Minister of National Defence who recently attended a nuclear planning group in Ottawa for NATO. Is the government position now that our forces in Europe will not hold or display neutron bombs, although we have artillery equipment there capable of firing such weapons? If NATO accepts the nuclear limited philosophy, will our forces be dependent on other nations for this type of support?

Hon. Barney Danson (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member knows we do not possess a nuclear capacity in NATO and have no intention of doing so. The consultations with reference to the neutron bomb have not taken place. I think the hon. member knows as much from the newspaper as I do on the neutron bomb per se.

* * *

REGIONAL ECONOMIC EXPANSION

REVISION OF FORMULA SO AREAS OF HIGH UNEMPLOYMENT CAN QUALIFY

Mr. W. C. Scott (Victoria-Haliburton): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion. In light of announcements last week which indicated that northern British Columbia and northern Alberta had been designated for DREE assistance, and information received in recent weeks concerning some additional $880 million in DREE funds payable to the province of Quebec, will the minister indicate when he will revise the formula by which areas qualify so that other parts of Canada with high unemployment problems can also benefit from the legislation?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Marcel Lessard (Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): Mr. Speaker, we did sign these agreements but I would like to correct the figure quoted by the hon. member—some $800 million in expenditures incurred in Quebec recently. I think that figure is somewhat exaggerated, to say the least. As to the assistance given by my department to other parts of Canada, as far as I know the entire province of Manitoba is designated for receiving our department assistance. We have signed several ancillary agreements with the government of Manitoba that are in effect and other negotiations are being held right now. But concerning the act that allows grants to companies, it is available to the province of Manitoba as a whole.

* * *

[*English*]

CONFEDERATION

PROPOSED JOINT COMMITTEE ON NATIONAL UNITY—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Walter Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Prime Minister. In answer to a question by the hon. member for Brome-Missisquoi on the possibility of a joint committee, the Prime Minister indicated that his reason for suggesting it was not appropriate was that we were near the end of the session. We hope that is so. Does the Prime Minister recall the commitment made by this party that, notwithstanding the fact that parliament may not be sitting, the members of this party are prepared to participate in such a committee because of the importance of the question of national unity, throughout the summer if necessary, and make a report? Is the Prime Minister concerned about the matter because of the unwillingness of members of his own party to dedicate the summer months to this matter or is there some other reason which the Prime Minister chose not to state in his answer to the hon. member for Brome-Missisquoi?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): No, Mr. Speaker, the answer was for the reason I gave. As to people on this side promoting and concerning themselves with national unity, I know from various discussions I have had individually and with caucus that they are intending to do so during the course of the summer. The difference is they do not feel they need a prop from the other side in order to do it.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): I have indicated the willingness on our side of the House. The Prime Minister has indicated there is no lack of willingness on the other side of the House. Therefore, I can only conclude that the Prime Minister has decided as a matter of policy to work through a bureaucracy that will report internally with respect to national unity rather than involving all members of this House and the people of Canada on a continuing basis in that debate. If that is his attitude, it is reprehensible and should not be condoned in this country. Is the Prime Minister prepared to examine that attitude, one which I think is dreadful? Is he prepared to give the House a commitment that when we return in the fall the House will have an opportunity of aiding to the extent it can the bureaucracy which has not been established respecting national unity, a bureaucracy which has not been able to find a member to serve on behalf of one very important part of the nation, the province of Quebec? I think that says something. There are a number of members of this House from the province of Quebec who can perhaps make a contribution—

• (1150)

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): —so I suggest the Prime Minister think about that.

Mr. Joe Clark (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question. I was a little concerned that the Prime Minister should state that it is the view of the government of Canada that parliament is a prop in looking at the question of national unity. I should like to ask the Prime Minister whether it is the policy of the government of Canada that the House of Commons and the Senate of Canada should not be given a formal role to play through a special committee that can make continuing inquiries into the question of national unity and issue a public report. If it is not the policy of the government of Canada to rule out a continuing role for parliament, then why will the Prime Minister not establish a joint committee of the Senate and House of Commons to inquire on a continuing basis into the problems of national unity?

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, I believe I gave the answer of the government in my answer to the hon. member for Brome-Missisquoi, when I indicated that it was not our view that we

should set up a committee now, just before the end of this part of the session.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): You could do it tomorrow if you wanted to.

Mr. Trudeau: The House leader of the Tory party is willing to crowd in business all the time. We would take him as a man of his word if he were indeed able to deal with the business now before the House.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): We have done a little better than you have this session.

Mr. Fraser: If you keep on this will be your third speech in a year.

Mr. Trudeau: We did bring the issue of national unity before the House in a resolution, but the opposition had many, many days during which it could have brought up this subject if indeed it felt it to be important.

Returning to the question put by the Leader of the Opposition, I repeat that the possibility of having a joint parliamentary committee in the next session of parliament is not precluded, but we do not think that at this point in the session we should spend time setting up such a committee and debating it and asking it to operate for the remaining days of this part of the session.

As to the role of members on this side, all I meant was that they are self-starters. They do not have to feel supported by members of the opposition in concerning themselves with national unity. Hon. members opposite can be self-starters, too. You can do it if you try, boys.

Mr. Clark: Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister continues to play party games.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Clark: He claims that he is worried about the time it would take. I can give him the guarantee of the official opposition that we would approve in a minute the establishment of a joint committee.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Clark: I want to suggest to the Prime Minister with all respect that it is not an adequate response to a question regarding policy to say that the government has not precluded the possibility of giving the Parliament of Canada, which is the only agency which can resolve this question, a continuing role to play in the discussions on this subject. I ask the Prime Minister as clearly as I can why he will not take the initiative now, which he knows will be supported by the House of Commons, and establish today a joint committee of this House and the other place to inquire on a continuing basis into questions of national unity. We are prepared to start work this summer; why is the Prime Minister not?

[Mr. Trudeau.]

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to hear from the Leader of the Opposition that he is prepared to start work on the problem of national unity.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Paproski: Get off the arrogance. Shameful. You are a coward.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: Next time we will break your arm.

Mr. Trudeau: Why don't you do it right after we come out of the House? Mr. Speaker, I consider that the opposition is in a somewhat contradictory position. They were just telling us last week that national unity is not just one simple subject, it is a matter of how parliament and government deal with the problems of the country. We consider that every day of the year we are dealing with the problems of national unity.

Mr. Paproski: Lalonde says one thing in Quebec and another thing in western Canada. Hypocrites, traitors.

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, I think they are a little "hyped up" over there; I will let them catch their cool and perhaps we will have some traditional questions.

Mr. Clark: Mr. Speaker, I think it is fair to say that parliament and the people of Canada have become resigned to this kind of evasion and game playing on the part of the Prime Minister on most questions, but the question of the future of our country is too important for the Prime Minister to play games with.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Clark: He pretends that he gives priority to resolving this problem. Why will the Prime Minister not demonstrate that priority and demonstrate the central role which parliament must play in resolving national questions in a way with which we agree by establishing a joint committee which will act now to give parliament a continuing role to inquire into the resolution of the problems of national unity which face the country?

Mr. Speaker: Order. The second question is a repetition of the first.

* * *

ENERGY

EXPORT OF NATURAL GAS TO UNITED STATES—INQUIRY AS TO APPLICATIONS AND BASIS OF SWAP ARRANGEMENT

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, my question was for the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources who unfortunately has left the chamber, so I will direct it to his parliamentary secretary in the hope that he can cast some light on the problem raised by the hon. member for Calgary North. In answering the question from that member the minister said that the question I had asked

yesterday with respect to applications for the export of gas on a possible swap arrangement was hypothetical.

● (1200)

I should like to point out that yesterday's *Globe and Mail* definitely indicated that the TransCanada Pipelines has applied to the National Energy Board for a permit to export gas and to enter into swapping arrangements. Surely, this is not a hypothetical question. Can the parliamentary secretary tell the House if such applications have been made by TransCanada Pipelines and Pan-Alberta Gas? Has the government laid down any policy with respect to whether increased gas exports will be permitted and whether they will be on a swap basis? If they are on a swap basis, will it be on the quantity of gas or on the price of gas?

Mr. Maurice Dupras (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, the minister has already dealt with that question in answer to the question of the hon. member for Calgary North by saying that it was a hypothetical question.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, surely that is a ridiculous answer. If the newspaper report is correct, the application is now before the National Energy Board. Surely the government, and particularly the minister and the parliamentary secretary, keep in touch with what is happening at the National Energy Board. Are such applications before the board? If so, has the government discussed with the chairman of the National Energy Board whether the government is in favour of increasing our exports of gas, and if so, on what basis?

Mr. Dupras: Mr. Speaker, it could very well be that the application is before the National Energy Board, but it does not mean it is before the minister.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member knows perfectly well I am not suggesting that the application is before the minister. I am assuming that in any well run government—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): —a minister would keep in touch with the agencies for which he is responsible, in the same able way that he kept in touch with AECL and what it was doing.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): We should not get up some morning and find out that the National Energy Board has embarked upon a policy which will sell our scarce gas at cheap prices in return for buying back Alaskan gas at high prices. Surely we can be told whether such applications are before the board and what attitude the government is taking with respect to advising the board as to government policies in regard to the export of gas.

Mr. Dupras: Mr. Speaker, I take the representation of the hon. member as notice.

Mrs. Holt: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. During the question period you prevented me from asking a question—

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Paproski: Sit down.

An hon. Member: At least you can be polite.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: A female Mortimer Snerd.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Interference at any time, with any hon. member during the question period, is always a subject to which I am prepared to listen. I am always prepared to listen to any hon. member in circumstances in which a question has been put that might be subject to some different interpretation. I stopped the hon. member today on her preamble, and I will not hear her on either privilege or order with respect to that particular preamble.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Epp: Mr. Speaker, you called my riding today in order that I might ask a question. After the intervention, you recognized the New Democratic Party. I am wondering whether it was an oversight, or what the reason was.

Mr. Speaker: I do not recall the incident the hon. member is describing. Is he indicating that I called him and something else intervened?

An hon. Member: Yes, it was his leader.

Mr. Speaker: It was not an intentional oversight. I was attempting to balance the representation among the parties. I had the hon. member for Provencher on my list, and I would have recognized him. At the end of the question period, his House leader and the Leader of the Opposition sought the floor, which caused me to divert from the plan I had in mind at that time. They used the remainder of the question period on a very important subject, which unfortunately prevented me from completing the list of speakers in the official opposition, the next one of whom was the hon. member for Provencher.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

LABOUR, MANPOWER AND IMMIGRATION

Fourth report of Standing Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration—Miss Nicholson.

[*Editor's Note: For text of above report, see today's Votes and Proceedings.*]

Labour Education

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order in regard to the bill which is included in the report that has just been tabled. As Your Honour knows, the way the rules are set up it would be technically possible for the government to ask the House to proceed on Monday with the report stage of Bill C-24. On previous occasions when this has happened on a Friday, Your Honour has taken the view that it is the clear intention of the rules that hon. members shall have one clear day in which to get copies of the reprinted bill and to draft and file their report stage amendments. I express the hope that that practice, which has been followed in the past when a bill has been tabled on Friday, will be followed in this case and that members will have until six o'clock on Monday to file their report stage amendments to Bill C-24, which has to do with immigration.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I assume there is no comment to the contrary, or other contributions to be made to the point of order. It is a valid one and one we have taken into consideration on previous occasions. Technically, the operation of Standing Order 75 dealing with report stage amendments would be such that the lapse of 48 hours would permit taking into consideration the report stage of the bill. Within that period, 24 hours would be set aside as a deadline for the filing of report stage amendments. Report stage amendments are a very important aspect of our proceedings with respect to any bill. When a bill is reported to the House on a Friday, as has been done this morning, the operation of that rule would permit, on the face of the language, taking into consideration the report stage of the bill beginning at three o'clock Monday afternoon, or as an order of the day on Monday.

If that were permitted, it would compress the time for the filing of report stage amendments, particularly on a bill of this scope and magnitude, effectively to five o'clock this afternoon or when the administration is able to receive such filings. It seems to me that would clearly frustrate the spirit of the rule, if not the letter of the rule.

The spirit of the rule is to give opportunities to hon. members to reason out their report stage amendments, which are very important aspects of the deliberation of a bill. Therefore, I have no hesitation in keeping with past practices and orders which I have made on previous occasions. I indicate that this bill ought not to be taken into consideration until Tuesday as an order of the day, which will give hon. members an opportunity until six o'clock on Monday to prepare and file report stage amendments.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

* * *

LABOUR

TABLING OF AGREEMENT BETWEEN CANADIAN LABOUR CONGRESS AND GOVERNMENT RESPECTING LABOUR EDUCATION

Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, I wish to table, in both official languages, the report on the agreement between the Canadian Labour Congress and the government with respect to labour education, which I was requested to do some time ago.

* * *

ANTI-INFLATION BOARD

TABLING OF REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATOR

Mr. Bob Kaplan (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 41(2), and on behalf of the Minister of Finance, I should like to table, in both official languages, two references from the Anti-Inflation Board to the administrator, pursuant to subsection 17(2) of the Anti-Inflation Act, one dealing with Alberta Government Telephones, and the other dealing with St. Boniface school division No. 4, on executive employees.

* * *

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk)

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, the following questions will be answered today: 749, 754, 812, 1,169, 1,529, 1,898, 2,313, 2,337, 2,363, 2,541 and 2,751.

[*Text*]

DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE—EXPENDITURE FOR FURNITURE AND FIXTURES

Question No. 749—**Mr. Stevens:**

1. What was the total expenditure for (a) furniture and fixtures (b) decorative plants and wall accessories for the Department of Finance offices in Place Bell Canada?

2. (a) For which items were the contracts awarded for decorating (b) to whom were the contracts awarded (c) what was the amount?

3. What is the average expenditure per employee for furniture and fixtures?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): I am informed by the Departments of Finance and Public Works as follows: 1. (a) $1,669,668. This amount is the aggregate amount purchased between FY 1971-72 and FY 1976-77. It includes: Furniture, $638,843; Fixtures including wall partitions, lighting fixtures, door frames, doors, drapes and blinds $832,400; Wall units and filing equipment, $198,425; Total expenditures for a six year period, $1,669,668. (b) Decorative plants, including maintenance and replacements, $58,000.; Wall accessories, $2,700.

2. (a) Contracts were awarded for all items of decorating. (b) (i) Decorative Plants: Fines Flowers Ltd. Eric Jensen Greenhouses Limited (ii) Wall accessories: Olympia & York Developments Limited. (c) (i) $45,000; $13,000. (ii) $2,700.

3. Furniture, $778.13; Fixtures, $1,013.88; Wall units and filing equipment $241.69; Total, $2,033.70. The information covers expenditures since occupancy of Place Bell Canada in

fiscal year 1971-72, including initial set-up costs for furniture conforming to the design of the building. Thus the average expenditure per employee relates to the six fiscal years from 1971-72 to 1976-77. The amount of $832,400 for fixtures include fixtures used by Joint Administrative Services which serves the Treasury Board Secretariat.

TREASURY BOARD OFFICES—EXPENDITURE FOR FURNITURE AND FIXTURES

Question No. 754—**Mr. Stevens:**

1. What was the total expenditure for (a) furniture and fixtures (b) decorative plants and wall accessories for the Treasury Board offices in Place Bell Canada?

2. (a) For which items were the contracts awarded for decorating (b) to whom were the contracts awarded (c) what was the amount?

3. What is the average expenditure per employee for furniture and fixtures?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): I am informed by the Treasury Board Secretariat and the Department of Public Works as follows: 1. (a) $1,217,895. This amount is the aggregate amount purchased between FY 71/72 and FY 76/77. It includes: furniture, $609,470; fixtures including wall partitions, lighting fixtures, telephones, door frames, doors, drapes and blinds, $410,000; wall units and filing equipment, $198,-425; total expenditure for a six year period, $1,217,895. (b) Decorative plants, including maintenance and replacements, $55,000; wall accessories, $2,900.

2. (a) Contracts were awarded for all items of decorating. (b) (i) Decorative Plants: Fine Flowers Ltd., Eric Jensen Greenhouses Limited. (ii) Wall accessories: Olympia and York Developments Limited. (c) (i) $45,000; $10,000. (ii) $2,900.

3. Furniture, $729.03; fixtures, $490.43; wall units and filing equipment, $237.35; total, $1,456.81. The information covers expenditures since occupancy of Place Bell Canada in fiscal year 1971-72, including initial set-up costs for furniture conforming to the design of the building. The average expenditure was arrived at by dividing the total expenditure for the six fiscal years from 1971-72 to 1976-77 by the current population.

CMHC FUNDING FOR LOW RENTAL HOUSING PROJECT, HAMILTON, ONTARIO

Question No. 812—**Mr. McGrath:**

1. Did Hamilton contractor Mr. Dominic Morganti apply for CMHC funding for a low rental housing project at (a) Main Place, Main Street West (b) York Place, Queen Street North, Hamilton, Ontario and, if so, on what date?

2. Were Mr. Morganti's applications (a) turned down by CMHC and, if so, for what reasons (b) accepted by CMHC and, if so, what were the arrangements?

3. What are the names of the CMHC officials who made the decisions affecting the financing of the projects?

4. What is the name of the solicitor for Mr. Morganti who negotiated with CMHC?

5. What were the amounts and dates of the advances of all monies made by CMHC to Mr. Morganti from the time CMHC approved the initial loan until CMHC foreclosed on York Place?

6. Were any requests for additional funds for Mr. Morganti for York Place (a) refused and, if so, on what dates (b) accepted by CMHC and, if so (i) in what amounts (ii) on what dates were they approved (iii) what were the details of CMHC's arrangements with Mr. Morganti?

7. Which officials had the ultimate authority for approving the additional amounts granted to Mr. Morganti for York Place?

8. Were there any liens or claims on York Place prior to the additional funds being approved and/or advances being made on the original amount and/or advances being made on the additional amounts approved and, if so, what are the details?

9. (a) What are the names of the solicitors who acted for CMHC with regard to York Place (b) what other work have they done for CMHC and what amount was paid to each (c) are there any claims by CMHC against them and, if so, what are the grounds (d) did the same solicitors work for any other Crown corporation, department or agency and, if so, which Crown corporation, department or agency and what was the amount paid in fees to each?

10. Did CMHC, at any time, receive complaints or protests from any sub-contractors that they were not being paid for their work at York Place and, if so, what action, if any, was taken?

11. Was York Place ever used as collateral on Main Place and, if so, what are the details?

12. From the time the first monies were advanced by CMHC to Mr. Morganti for York Place, did CMHC rank as first mortgage holder in all respects until the time CMHC foreclosed on York Place and, if not, what are the details?

13. Is the mortgage on York Place held by Messrs. Saul Kelner and James Leibel and, if so, what are the details?

14. How much does CMHC estimate it will cost to finish York Place?

15. What is the current assessed value of York Place?

16. Is CMHC satisfied that all the funds approved and advanced to York Place were actually used in York Place?

17. At the time CMHC foreclosed on York Place, what percentage of it was occupied by tenants?

18. At the time York Place first began to accept tenants, was CMHC satisfied with the standards of work throughout the building and, if not, what are the details?

19. Has CMHC received any complaints about the standard of work throughout York Place from officials or authorities representing provincial and/or municipal bodies or agencies and, if so, what are the details of such complaints?

20. As of this date, what is Mr. Morganti's financial and legal relationship with York Place?

21. Does Mr. Morganti hold an undischarged mortgage on York Place and, if so, what are the details?

22. Have there been any charges laid against any officials of CMHC with regard to improper acts relating to the construction of York Place and, if so, what are the details?

Hon. André Ouellet (Minister of State for Urban Affairs): I am advised as follows by Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation: 1. (a) CMHC received an application from Main Place of Hamilton Limited on March 7, 1972 for a student housing loan under Section 47 of the National Housing Act. (b) CMHC received an application for a loan under Section 15, NHA from York Place (Hamilton) Limited on November 4, 1971. The name of the company has since been changed to York Place of Hamilton Inc.

2. (a) The application from Main Place of Hamilton Limited was rejected. The reason for the refusal is not known, the file having been destroyed since the retention period for an unapproved application had elapsed. (b) A loan was approved to York Place of Hamilton Inc. under Section 15 of the NHA. The arrangements included the standard operating agreement used at that time on projects financed under Section 15.

3. Under the procedures in force at the time this loan was approved, the Executive Committee of CMHC gave the final authorization for financing the project, with the commitment to the sponsor being issued by the Manager, Hamilton Office.

4. Solicitors for Mr. Morganti were not involved in the negotiations on the original loan application. Mr. John C. Pelech was involved in making submissions on behalf of Mr. Morganti with respect to the two loan increases.

5. CMHC makes advances on its direct loans jointly to its solicitors and the borrower, but details of mortgage transactions are considered to be privileged information between borrower and lender.

6. (a) A request for an increase on the loan was refused on June 10, 1976. (b) (i) and (ii) An increase of $475,000 was approved on August 27, 1973, and a second increase of $1,054,500 was approved on December 13, 1974. (iii) These increases were subject to the retention of sufficient funds at all times by CMHC to ensure the completion of the project, and the first mortgage to include the personal convenant of Mr. Morganti.

7. See answer to 3 above.

8. Yes, any liens or claims of which CMHC had knowledge were either satisfied at the time the advances were released by its solicitor, or the names of the lien holders or claimants were added as payees to the advance cheques.

9. (a) The solicitor who was acting on behalf of CMHC for the mortgage on York Place of Hamilton Inc. was Stanley F. Dudzic. (b) Mr. Dudzic has handled the mortgage documentation for seven other loans for CMHC, where the borrowers paid the legal fees. (c) CMHC has not made any claims on Mr. Dudzic. (d) CMHC is not aware of any work which Mr. Dudzic may have received from federal departments or agencies or from other Crown corporations.

10. Yes, see answer to 8 above.

11. CMHC is not aware of the York Place of Hamilton Inc. project being used as collateral for Main Place of Hamilton Limited.

12. CMHC's solicitor was authorized to make the advances on the loan, subject to his establishing that "... there are no claims having priority over our mortgage". The solicitor was, therefore, responsible for ensuring that each advance was a first charge.

13. No.

14. The current estimate of $1.2 million, as the cost of completing York Place, is based on a report prepared by an engineering consultant retained by the Receiver appointed by the Supreme Court of Ontario.

15. The municipality carries a current assessed value on its assessment role of $960,139 for York Place.

16. No.

17. When foreclosure action on York Place was begun, 70 per cent of the first tower was occupied, and it was not possible for tenants to occupy the second tower since it was still under construction.

18. Yes.

19. No.

20. Mr. Morganti's financial relationship with York Place is as a mortgagee and as a guarantor, and his legal relationship with York Place is as an officer of York Place of Hamilton Inc.

21. The Abstract of Title discloses that Mr. Morganti holds two mortgages on York Place, one of which was registered on May 2, 1973 in a principal amount of $95,000 and the second registered on November 2, 1973 in a principal amount of $160,000.

22. No.

YORK PLACE—HAMILTON INC.

Question No. 1,169—**Mr. Clarke:**

1. Was a mortgage(s) granted by York Place of Hamilton Inc., to Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation against a parcel of land of approximately 2.89 acres in the block bounded by York, Queen, Greig, Barton and Oxford Streets being municipally known as 151 Queen Street South, in the City of Hamilton, Ontario and, if so (a) what were the dates and amounts of all advances made under the mortgage(s) (b) what other payments were made by CMHC that constituted a charge against the property (c) as of August 12, 1976, what was the total amount of interest accrued and unpaid and how was this amount calculated (d) was an increase of (i) $475,000 granted in the face value in 1973 (ii) $1,054,500 granted in January, 1975 and, if so, in each case, for what reason (e) were previous applications for increases in the mortgage amount rejected and, if so, for what reason?

2. In what state of completion are the buildings located on the parcel of land described in Part 1?

3. What is the estimated cost of completing the building, appurtenances and amenities on the said parcel of land?

Hon. André Ouellet (Minister of State for Urban Affairs): I am advised by Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation as follows: 1. Yes. (a) See answer to Question 812 answered this day. (b) CMHC paid $37,338.86 on April 15, 1976 to the Corporation of the City of Hamilton for arrears of Realty Taxes. (c) To and including August 12, 1976, accrued and unpaid interest amounted to $1,599,066. The interest has been calculated on the amount of each advance from the date of the advance to and including August 12, 1976, at 7½ per cent compounded semi-annually. (d) (i) Yes (ii) Yes; see answer Question 812 answered this day. (e) No.

2. As of November 4, 1976, Tower A was 100 per cent complete, and Tower B was approximately 88 per cent complete with the exception of certain amenities, underground parking and necessary repairs.

3. See answer to Question 812 answered this day.

SECRETARY OF STATE—USE OF PRIVATE EMPLOYMENT AGENCIES

Question No. 1,529—**Mr. McKenzie:**

1. Has the Department of the Secretary of State obtained (a) part-time (b) full-time employees from private employment agencies in (i) British Columbia

(ii) Alberta (iii) Saskatchewan (iv) Manitoba (v) Ontario (vi) Quebec (vii) New Brunswick (viii) Nova Scotia (ix) Prince Edward Island (x) Newfoundland and, if so, in each case, how many?

2. Are such employees paid from supplementary estimates and, if not, from what estimates are they paid?

3. By province, what was the (a) average hourly rate paid to employment agencies (b) average hourly rate paid to employees (c) total amount paid by the Department in (i) 1975 (ii) 1976?

Hon. John Roberts (Secretary of State): 1.

	1975/76	1976/77
(i) British Columbia	(a) 2	10
	(b) 0	0
(ii) Alberta	(a) 9	8
	(b) 0	0
(iii) Saskatchewan	(a) 10	10
	(b) 0	0
(iv) Manitoba	(a) 12	7
	(b) 0	0
(v) Ontario	(a) 12	7
	(a) and (b) Our records cannot provide information	Our records provide information from August 2, 1976
		(a) 173; (b) 19
(vi) Quebec	(a) 30	Unable to separate figures by fiscal year
	(b) 0	
(vii) New Brunswick	(a) 4	6
	(b) 0	0
(viii) Nova Scotia	(a) 7	14
	(b) 0	0
(ix) Prince Edward Island	(a) 0	0
	(b) 0	0
(x) Newfoundland	(a) 3	3
	(b) 0	0

2. Individuals employed in this manner are paid from funds provided by annual appropriation, normally Main Estimates.

3.

	(a) Average hr/rate Agencies		(b) Average hr/rate Employees	
	1975/76	1976/77	1975/76	1976/77
British Columbia	$5.44	$5.95	$3.67	$3.97
Alberta	6.23	5.77	*	*
Saskatchewan	5.55	5.87	*	*
Manitoba	5.30	5.75	*	*
Ontario	*	6.10 (approx.)	*	*
Quebec	*	5.20 (approx.)	*	$4.00 (approx.)
New Brunswick	$5.40	5.50	$4.00	4.45
Nova Scotia	5.80	6.25	4.00	4.45
Prince Edward Island	—	—	—	—
Newfoundland	6.00	7.00	4.00	4.45

*unavailable

(c) (i) Fiscal year 1975-76; Newfoundland, $1,100; Prince Edward Island, —; Nova Scotia, $3,455; New Brunswick; $2,100; Quebec, $44,158; Ontario (includes departmental HQ), $725,930; Manitoba $17,882; Saskatchewan, $4,782; Alberta, $18,006; British Columbia, $2,230; Total $819,643; (ii) Fiscal year 1976-77 (To January 31, 1977) Newfoundland, $1,486; Prince Edward Island, —; Nova Scotia, $7,665; New Brunswick, $2,889; Quebec, $3,529; Ontario (includes departmental HQ), $411,540; Manitoba, $3,486; Saskatchewan, $1,139; Alberta, $3,829; British Columbia, $1,897; Total, $437,460.

Order Paper Questions

CHANGE IN WORDING—NATIONAL ANTHEM OF CANADA

Question No. 1,898—**Mr. Herbert:**

1. Has the government received any representations concerning the legislation on the National Anthem of Canada in relation to the changing of the word "native" to "cherished" so that the phrase would be "our home and cherished land"?

2. What is the government's intention to ensure a quick and early passage of the bill?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): 1. To the best of our knowledge the government has received no representations to change the word "native" to "cherished" in Bill C-10 concerning the National Anthem of Canada.

2. The government invites assurances from the opposition parties that there would not be prolonged debate on this bill when it is called; up to now, no such assurances have been forthcoming.

PUBLIC SERVICE TRAINING CENTRE AT KEMPTVILLE, ONTARIO

Question No. 2,313—**Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton):**

Is it the intention of the government to close down the Public Service Training Centre at Kemptville, Ontario, and, if so, what plans are being made to absorb into the Public Service, in other areas, the thirty-three (33) employees who work there?

Hon. John Roberts (Secretary of State): I am informed by the Public Service Commission as follows: On December 2, 1976, the Public Service Commission advised the Department of Public Works that it did not intend to continue use of the Training Centre in Kemptville, Ontario after April 1, 1977. Only one employee was affected by this decision. She has since taken a position with the Public Service Commission in Ottawa. The Commission's course directors were assigned for the periods of the courses only; their permanent worksite was in Ottawa. The Commission also had contracts with the catering firm of Crawley McCracken and the Canadian Corps of Commissionaires for purposes of security. The catering firm generally employed up to seven people, and there were two or three men employed for the security work during two shifts daily and over the weekends.

REGULATION OF INTERPROVINCIAL TRADE AND COMMERCE

Question No. 2,337—**Mr. Stevens:**

As of December 31 (a) 1968 (b) 1976, how many federal employees were charged with policy-making, or interpretation of policies, regulating interprovincial trade and commerce?

Mr. Hugh Poulin (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): In so far as the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce is concerned: The Department does not regulate interprovincial trade and commerce as such and therefore does not have any employees charged with the development or interpretation of policies relating to the regulation of interprovincial trade and commerce.

Order Paper Questions

LAWYERS AND LAW FIRMS WHO PERFORMED SERVICES FOR CRTC

Question No. 2,363—**Mr. O'Sullivan:**

For each year since 1972, what is the name and address of each lawyer and law firm in the Constituency of (a) Hamilton—Wentworth (b) Hamilton West (c) Hamilton East (d) Hamilton Mountain (e) Halton—Wentworth (f) Halton (g) Lincoln (h) St. Catharines, who performed services for the Canadian Radio-television and Telecommunications Commission and, in each case, what was the total amount paid?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): I am informed by the Department of Justice and the Canadian Radio-television and Telecommunications Commission as follows: Nil.

PUBLIC SERVICE—INCREASE IN SALARIES TO DEPARTMENT HEADS

Question No. 2,541—**Mr. Robinson:**

What was the average increase in salaries given to department heads and deputies in the Public Service in each year 1970 to 1977?

Hon. Robert K. Andras (President of the Treasury Board): For the purpose of responding to the hon. member's question, it is understood that the information required is the amount of the increases in the salary ranges for Deputy Ministers and Assistant Deputy Ministers in each year 1970 to 1977. Table I following represents the increase in the mid-point of the Deputy Minister salary ranges, by dollars and by percentage in each year 1970 to 1977. Assistant Deputy Minister positions are classified at the Senior Executive or equivalent levels. Table II following represents the increase in the Senior Executive salary ranges, by dollars and by percentage in each year 1970 to 1977.

Table I

Department Heads

Effective date	$ increase	per cent increase
January 1, 1970	2,280	6.86
January 1, 1971	3,054	8.65
January 1, 1971	2,850	7.38
January 1, 1973	3,716	9.03
April 1, 1974	4,045	8.98
April 1, 1975	4,050	8.56
1976	No increase	
1977	A decision regarding the Fifth Report of the Advisory Group on Executive Compensation in the Public Service has not been made.	

Table II

Increases in the mid-point of the Senior Executive salary ranges, by dollars and by percentage for the years 1970 to 1977.

	SX-1		SX-2		SX-3		SX-4	
	$	%	$	%	$	%	$	%
1970	1,250	5.9	1,000	4.3	1,000	3.8	1,500	4.9
1971	1,250	5.6	1,750	7.1	2,250	8.3	2,500	7.8
1972	1,250	5.3	1,750	6.7	2,250	7.7	2,500	7.2
1973	1,750	7.0	2,250	8.0	2,750	8.7	2,750	7.4
1974	2,250	8.4	2,750	9.1	3,250	9.5	3,250	8.2
1975	3,000	10.3	3,500	10.6	4,000	10.7	4,500	10.5

Actual salaries have veen frozen since December 18, 1975. There have been no range changes in 1976 or 1977.

[Mr. Poulin.]

The effective date of salary range changes in the years 1970 to 1973 inclusive was January 1. In 1974 and 1975 the effective date was April 1.

APPROPRIATED AND BAND FUNDS MANAGED BY INDIAN BANDS

Question No. 2,751—**Mr. Smith (Churchill):**

1. What is the estimated amount of the appropriated and Band funds to be managed by Indian Bands this fiscal year and what will be the increase over 1976-77?

2. When a Band takes over a programme does the Department retain the man-years and are these man-years redistributed and, if so, what is the rationale for retaining the man-years rather than freeing the monies tied up with these positions for Band use?

Mr. B. Keith Penner (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): 1. In relation to appropriated funds managed by Bands, the 1977-78 Estimates reflect $165.7 million, the related expenditures for 1976-77 amounted to $143.7 million. The estimated increase over 1976-77 is $22.0 million. An additional amount of $9.1 million was expended in 1976-77 for F.L.I.P. operated by Bands. There is no available information for F.L.I.P. for 1977-78. Band Funds managed by Bands in 1976-77 amounted to $47.5 million. The 1977-78 information is not estimated or known at this time.

2. The decision to permit a band to administer a particular program that was formerly managed by the Department, is in many cases made on a band by band basis. That is, an individual analysis of the band's capability to manage the program is made. If some, but not all of the bands assume responsibility for a particular programme, the net effect on the overall workload of the department is marginal. It must also be noted that very often the type of work rather than the volume of work is the significant result of the change. In many situations while the day-to-day operations role is reduced, the departmental role vis-à-vis monitoring is increased. The resulting overall workload is not as a result significantly reduced. Over the past few years the Indian Affairs Program has reduced its total man years from 6,878 to 6,021 while at the same time expanding the number of employees in certain programs and reducing others.

● (1210)

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker: Shall the remaining questions be allowed to stand?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

AIR CANADA ACT, 1976

MEASURE RESPECTING REORGANIZATION OF AIR CANADA

The House proceeded to the consideration of Bill C-17, respecting the reorganization of Air Canada, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications.

Mr. Speaker: There are nine motions on the notice paper to amend Bill C-17. Motions 1, 2 and 3 stand in the name of the hon. member for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski), and I gather they could be grouped for debate. However, the Chair has some concern about the procedural regularity of motion No. 3, which would appear to be defective in that it goes beyond the scope of the clause which it seeks to amend, that is, clause 6 which deals with the capacities and activities of the corporation and, more particularly, in subclause (4) with the establishment of subsidiaries. Essentially, the proposition contained in subclause (4) is that the corporation shall not do certain things without the authorization of the governor in council. But motion No. 3 seeks to import a new proposition by adding the concept of public hearings and publication, which are not part of clause 6.

I would, of course, be prepared to hear argument on that point when we come to it. However, I want to advise hon. members also that clauses 4 to 9, inclusive, could be grouped for debate but would be voted upon separately if necessary. So there would be, essentially, two groups of votes and separate votes, if necessary, on each of the motions in the second group.

Mr. Mazankowski: That is certainly agreeable to members on this side of the House. Perhaps the government will be disposed to accept motion No. 1 and, if so, motion No. 3 might be answered in part. So we shall be able to deal with the thrust of motions Nos. 1 and 2 and perhaps, with the permission of hon. members, we might be able to broaden the debate sufficiently to include argument having to do with motion No. 3. However, I am optimistic that the government will have second thoughts about motion No. 1. Hopefully, they will accept it—and that would be satisfactory to us.

Mr. Speaker: For the moment, then, the House might launch into a discussion of motions Nos. 1 and 2 with the idea that some reference of an explanatory nature might be made to the substance of motion No. 3. But I shall not put the question on motion No. 3 at this time. After discussion has been concluded on motions Nos. 1 and 2, it might be necessary for the Chair to hear further argument and make a decision with respect to motion No. 3. For the moment, then, the discussion is on motions Nos. 1 and 2, both in the name of the hon. member for Vegreville, seconded by the hon. member for Edmonton Centre (Mr. Paproski).

Mr. Don Mazankowski (Vegreville) moved:

Motion No. 1.

Air Canada

That Bill C-17, respecting the reorganization of Air Canada, be amended in clause 6 by striking out line 25 at page 2 and substituting the following therefor:

"vehicles necessarily or incidental to movements by air freight into or within Canada, and in compliance with highway transport regulations in each province, and facilities for the transport—"

Motion No. 2.

That Bill C-17, respecting the reorganization of Air Canada, be amended in clause 6

(*a*) by striking out lines 14 to 17 at page 3;

(*b*) by striking out lines 18 to 21 at page 3 and substituting the following therefor:

"(2) For the purpose of carrying out the activities referred to in subsection (1), the corporation has the capacity, rights, powers, privileges, duties and obligations of a natural person."

and by renumbering subclause 4 as subclause 3.

He said: Mr. Speaker, as you correctly pointed out, the three motions which I have proposed, two of which we are now debating, are closely related, so we on this side welcome the idea of discussing the contents of the motions as one. The bill to reorganize Air Canada is one which we in our party have welcomed. The legislation serves to broaden the scope of the activities of the corporation.

Clause 6(1) outlines the capacities and the activities of the corporation. Clause 6(1)(i) is an umbrella or catch-all provision enabling the corporation to do such other things as are necessary or incidental to the carrying out of its activities. Then we go to clause 6(2) which gives the governor-in-counsel power to authorize the corporation to engage in or carry on activities not otherwise authorized by the act. So the powers which it is suggested should be delegated to the corporation and to the governor in council are extremely broad and discretionary. It is for this reason I have moved motion No. 1.

There is a great deal of concern with respect to the possibility of Air Canada engaging in trucking activities for hire beyond its primary purpose. The scope of the activities and capacities suggested in the bill has given rise to a great deal of concern among those engaged in the trucking industry, an industry which is essentially in private hands and which is represented by well over 13,000 individual business entrepreneurs. At a time when we are placing a great deal of emphasis on the needs of small business and trying to develop a policy which will maintain and foster the strenght of small business in this country, it is necessary to take every precaution to ensure that this important section of our economy is preserved and that nothing is done which will undermine the capacity of small business enterprises to survive, grow, and participate fully in the nation's economic life.

I believe the bill is weak in that it fails to provide sufficient protection to the trucking industry. We know that Air Canada has become a competitor with the for-hire trucking industry in the movement of goods of high value between metropolitan centres. Competition between plane and truck already exists on a trans-continental basis. I am told the service between Toronto and Vancouver is such that straight air cargo shipments do not arrive at their destination any quicker than those sent by the expedited trans continental trucking service now provided. It is anticipated that as progress is made there will be increased scope for intermodal competition between air-

plane and truck wherever quality of service implications and especially the guarantee of rapid delivery, are important to the shipper and the consignee.

● (1220)

The concern of the trucking industry is that the bill does not adequately protect and enhance the economic benefits to be gained from intermodal competition, and that by failing to do so Air Canada might be disposed or persuaded at some time to engage in surface transport such as for-hire trucking on the routes which are presently served by air freight. Certainly, it is air freight that is primarily the corporation's responsibility in the movement of freight. The fact that Air Canada has reorganized its corporate structure to give greater responsibility and autonomy to its freight division highlights the emphasis which Air Canada is placing on freight movement, and also, I might say, serves to highlight the concerns that the truckers have expressed.

The evidence presented in committee by the president of Air Canada indicated that he was optimistic about the future of air freight. He emphasized the buoyancy of the air freight division, and for that reason a separate and identifiable branch of the corporation is being established. The truckers believe that genuine air freight will come under increasing direct truck competition, and that because of the cost and service implications on some routes Air Canada may find itself under great pressure to try to do the same thing as the for-hire trucking industry so as to retain what they consider to be their fair share of freight volume and to protect their hold on that element of their business.

The assurances which the president of Air Canada has given, to the effect that genuine air freight will go to the truckers, are not well founded. They believe—and I tend to concur—that there will be a growing requirement in this country for express freight service on high valued goods. But that does not necessarily mean, given the experiences we have had over the last five years, that this service will be provided primarily by air. As I said earlier, we have clear examples of one trucking firm at least offering expedited service on a regular basis between Toronto and Vancouver and, in terms of time and cost, it is outperforming air freight. So with this kind of competition, and if the airline is determined to exploit the air freight sector, it could very well find itself using trucks on many intercity routes.

In my view, there is nothing in Bill C-17 which effectively prohibits or even limits the ability of Air Canada to engage in for-hire trucking, either in substitution for existing air freight service through trucks owned directly by the corporation or acquiring such entities from existing for-hire trucking companies. I submit that there is no valid reason for Crown corporations functioning in the rail or air mode to engage in for-hire trucking in competition with the primary function of the corporation.

To reiterate, the for-hire trucking industry has proved to be one mode where private enterprise has been successful in providing an adequate service and effective competition in practically all parts of the country. The trucking industry has done an excellent job in providing service to all parts of the country, despite some formidable obstacles, despite some difficulties in terms of variations of rules and regulations applied from province to province, despite climatic conditions and the realities of our geography.

The Minister of Transport (Mr. Lang) has stated that limitations and safeguards exist in clause 6(1)(b) and clause 6(4). Regardless of the present intent of the minister and his officials, or indeed the assurances of Air Canada management, the so-called safeguards contained in the act are vague and, I suggest, meaningless if one looks at the CNR experience. I want to deal with that for a moment, because I think it is totally relevant to the issue which we are now discussing. Since 1952, CNR has acquired or set up trucking subsidiaries which make it one of the largest for-hire truck undertakings in the country. Section 27 of the CNR act restricts CNR's ability to engage in motor vehicle operation to the extent that such investments have to be operated in conjunction with or in substitution for rail services. But if we look at the operations of the CNR trucking industry today, we find that CNR's network of for-hire trucking operation parallels their mainline trans-continental rail operations. So the spirit and thrust of the act do not really apply. In my view, that was obviously not the intent and spirit of section 27, so it has been circumvented—there can be no question about that—and I share the truckers' concern that the safeguards in the bill are no more substantial than those contained in the CNR act.

Section 31 of the CNR act states that CN may acquire any company or any business incidental to the working of a railway, or any business that, in the opinion of the board of directors, may be carried on in the interest of CNR, with the approval of the governor in council. There is enough latitude there for the CNR to engage in the trucking subsidiary, as it has done. When the for-hire trucking industry challenged CN's authority, they were rebuffed by the court. The Quebec court of appeal found, among other things, that governor in council approval of these expenditures, plus the CNR finance and security act, superseded any legislative limitation contemplated in section 27 of the CNR act. Furthermore, the fact that governor in council approval was given rendered provincial public hearings useless. If the governor in council considered it to be in the public interest to approve such an acquisition, the provincial boards simply followed suit and the hearing process became useless and provided no element of protection.

It is assumed that governor in council approval is always within the public interest and, therefore, the provincial regulatory bodies would assume the acquisition as a fait accompli. As I said before, regardless of the intent of the Minister of Transport and the president of Air Canada that such an experience would not occur again, these promises, I submit, are of a short-term nature. If that assurance is to be provided and if the minister is sincere—and I believe he is—I see no reason why that protection should not be enshrined in the legislation. We have a habit of moving ministers around, and

while this minister may place one interpretation on the act, another minister may take a different view. I think the minister has a tremendous amount of power in influencing his cabinet colleagues with regard to an acquition of that nature. The present wording of clause 6(1) is as follows:

The corporation may—

(b) buy, sell, lease, construct or otherwise acquire, dispose of and maintain and operate as necessary or incidental to the operation of the corporation's business, aircraft, hotels and other accommodation, surface vehicles and facilities for the transportation and housing of persons, goods and mail;—

I want to draw attention to the words "corporation's business". I think that under the existing act the definition of "corporation's business" is vague, misleading and open to interpretation. What we are really concerned about is that when we refer to air freight we know there is designated air freight which never sees the inside of an aeroplane. The concern here is that under the present loose wording of the act, Air Canada should very easily engage in the utilization of trucks on intercity routes presently served by air freight on the basis that it is incidental to the over-all operations of the corporation's business on a national basis.

● (1230)

The amendment which we have proposed would only serve to confirm the assurances the minister has given in this House and in committee that Air Canada's involvement in the trucking industry will be limited to that which is necessary or incidental to the operation of the corporation's business. I reiterate that the assurance which has been given by the minister should be enshrined and clearly stated in the legislation. Suspicions that if this amendment is rejected, Air Canada would encroach, are based upon statements made by Mr. Taylor to the effect that he sees a very bright future for the movement of air freight, but he is very careful to designate whether that freight will be moving by aircraft or by truck.

We have absolutely no objection to Air Canada's engaging in the movement of highly-valued freight and delivering it by truck as part and parcel of its air cargo service, but to allow Air Canada to engage in intercity trucking and for-hire operations is something to which I object. As a Crown corporation created by parliament to fulfil a particular purpose, to be in a position to opt out of that prime responsibility with facility when faced with competition, in a sense Air Canada is picking the taxpayers' pockets and buying up competition from another mode in order to engage in a business for which Air Canada was not, clearly, given a specific mandate by parliament.

When a Crown corporation determines that its economic well-being requires encroachment into an area outside the scope of its enabling legislation, the matter is first broached with Transport Canada officials who are responsible for air administration on a day to day basis, and support from this source, nine times out of ten, is tantamount to approval in principle in accordance with clause 6(4) which says, "The corporation shall not, without the authorization, by order, of the Government in Council." Then it goes on to outline the number of areas in which the corporation is governed in terms of the authority granted to it by order in council.

What bothers us further is what we will see developing in the transportation industry over the next decade. Rapidly rising costs may affect one mode to a greater extent than another, and where service characteristics are similar, such as they are between air and truck in many cases, the lower cost mode may become overwhelmingly attractive. If increases in fuel costs should have a greater impact on the air mode than on the trucking mode, possibly trucking will acquire a significantly greater cost advantage over air freight than at present. The tendency of a Crown corporation, like any company, is to move into new and more attractive fields rather than to wither away. The CN is a clear example of that. The difference is that a Crown corporation does not face the same financial constraints as private enterprise, regardless of any limitation to its mandate. In my view, Air Canada should not have the facility to involve the federal government further by way of direct investment in for-hire trucking in order to stay in the freight business. As a minimum, something more than the presently contemplated review procedure in clause 6(4) should be contained in this legislation. That is really the thrust of my second motion, failing the adoption of motion No. 1. As a minimum it seems logical that an effective review procedure should be inserted in the bill to provide sufficient notice for any intended acquisitions of existing trucking firms or the creation of new ones.

What is even more distressing to the largely private trucking industry are the implications of clause 6(2) when combined with the principal thrust of Bill C-33, the new National Transportation Act. Particularly, section 3(1) and section 3(2) of that act give the minister very broad discretionary powers to the point of almost dictating what mode of service shall be used to ship a given item to a given point. That kind of unorthodox power is frightening. For example, the minister can inquire into the relationship between the various modes of transport within, to and from Canada. The minister can undertake measures to achieve co-ordination in the operation, development, regulation and control of those various modes of transport. That is provided in section 3(3)(b). Section 3(1)(c) provides:

—and it is further declared that achievement of the objective of the transport policy for Canada requires the integration of services employing the most appropriate modes for each service and that it is the responsibility of governments to attend to the provision of the transportation system.

Those are very broad powers in terms of intermodal integration. Under the provisions of the National Transportation Act which are contemplated, the minister will be able to issue directions to the Canadian Transport Commission, which is the regulatory body, so we really have a nullification of the Canadian Transport Commission under the provisions of Bill C-33. To me, that is overkill in the strongest and strangest sense that I have ever seen in this House. If, in fact, the governor in council should approve a trucking acquisition, this would have the effect of section 27 of the National Transportation Act, which provides for a review procedure, being redundant, thus giving the affected truckers no avenue for an

adequate hearing. Surely, as a minimum, adequate provisions for review should be established in the event an acquisition takes place or a new enterprise is established.

Short of an outright prohibition against the purchase of shares or other interests in for-hire trucking undertakings, I believe governor in council sanctions should not be exercised unless or until interested parties have been given notice and have had the opportunity to comment to the Minister of Transport. The minister will turn around and say that this still has to be approved by provincial regulatory bodies. I say that before any government orders in council approve the acquisition of or the establishment of a for-hire trucking enterprise, adequate notice should be given to the industry, because to allow this to lay in the hands of provincial regulatory bodies is not sufficient, and there would not be sufficient time, in many cases, for the trucking industry adequately to prepare and study all the consequences and implications of a move such as that.

To my mind, inclusion of such a provision would not create a hardship since, pursuant to section 27 of the National Transportation Act and provincial highway transport board requirements dealing with mergers and acquisitions, Air Canada would have to give notice of acquisition for the purpose of allowing interested parties to object before the various regulatory tribunals. The difference is—and I repeat this—that governor in council approval is how the issue is usually resolved.

Past experience reveals that, pursuant to section 27 of the National Transportation Act, when orders in council are given it is assumed that approval becomes a *fait accompli*, and to a large extent the provincial boards abdicate their review responsibility. I would hope the minister would seriously consider motion No. 1. I know he will say to the House that there are sufficient assurances and guarantees to allay the fears I have been expressing.

● (1240)

I respectfully submit that the close examination I have given this legislation, and the examination that has been so thoroughly conducted by the Canadian Trucking Association, show that there is not sufficient protection in the bill to assure the truckers of a fair chance to engage in dialogue with the minister before any acquisition is made or a trucking enterprise is created under the aegis of Air Canada.

I should like now to deal briefly with motion No. 2 which has the effect of striking out the following:

> The governor in council may, by order, authorize the corporation to engage in or carry on any activities not otherwise authorized by this act.

I propose this simply because of the fears I have of Air Canada engaging in this extra-trucking activity. As I said earlier, its capacities and activities have been broadened extensively. Excessive powers have been granted over the activities and capacities as outlined in clause 6(1)(d) and (i), and we have further order in council powers authorized under clause 8.

[Mr. Mazankowski.]

The minister indicated in committee that he sees this particular provision being used only in extraordinary circumstances, so I certainly do not see any reason for leaving it in the act. I do not think Air Canada needs any more power, whether it is directly contained in the act or granted to it by order in council. If we are to go beyond the powers enshrined in this legislation, it is certainly a matter that should be referred to parliament. When you combine the thrust of this legislation with the thrust of the new National Transportation Act, it provides greater power to the government to dictate and manage the transportation industry of this country. We do not need this sort of ad hoc direction. We need some clearly defined policies and limitations, because we will soon be seeking huge investments in the transportation industry. What we need is continuity of policy and not the day-to-day intervention of the government.

I would hope that through the hearings on the National Transportation Act we will be able to define a realistic national transportation policy with minimal government intervention and will be able to allow the trucking enterprises to strike out on their own and do a job consistent with the delineation of a national transportation policy and with a minimum of ministerial interference. If we can do that, we will avoid the kind of ad hockery that is bound to come with a change of minister. I think it is fair to say that this minister has brought greater stability to the transportation industry than there was in the past. I commend him for that. We do not always agree with his policies, but I think we were successful in getting a clearer definition of the mandate and mission of Air Canada. I think our feelings generally correspond with the minister's feelings in that area.

I hope the minister will seriously reconsider motion No. 1, as I do not think it will hurt or impede the operations of Air Canada. If it were accepted, I would be happy to withdraw the other two motions standing in my name. There may be one or two speakers on our side who wish to engage in this debate, Mr. Speaker, so I will just call upon the minister to consider my motion seriously. It is an important motion, and would serve to dispel the fears of the trucking industry and create a better mood of confidence, stability and continuity which is what we really need at this time when we are engaged in a huge investment in the transportation infrastructure. It is something that will come about not only through the private sector but through the involvement of public funds.

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the objectives of the hon. member for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski) in bringing forward these amendments. We have discussed them in committee, but I know that one of his purposes—and I assure him that I share it—is to allay the fears of interested parties concerning what may happen with this bill. I believe that in committee I gave those assurances, but I will repeat them here. In putting the new structure of Air Canada before the House, we could have gone to the Canadian Business Corporation and given it all the powers of a natural person in relation to its activities. That would have been seen by some as giving the corporation and management of the

board the broad power to engage in activities that are the responsibility of ministers and of government.

We chose not to go that route, and therefore set out in detail the greater powers of the corporation. That leaves open the danger that certain powers might not be found to exist when the corporation wants to act, hence we included in the bill a clause which allows for expansion of those powers by approval of the governor in council and, therefore, the full authority, approval and responsibility of the government. We cited technical cases where that kind of additional power might be needed, or might have been needed in the past, to allow the corporation to get into computer operations, and those things that might arise in the future.

It is implicit in the bill that Air Canada is meant to operate essentially on a commercial basis and not to be able to rely on its position of being owned by the government, nor give it unfair advantage over its competitors in any way, even in the air mode where it will be competing directly. It certainly would not be extended to other modes in any unfair way. That should give some assurance to those who would be seriously concerned. It is not intended that the corporation expand to other modes of transportation at this point. Should that happen, it is a fact that in the case of trucking, obviously the industry would want to know that there are rules applicable to them and that others were applied to Air Canada. That is the essential thrust of the first motion of the hon. member. We resist it, as he knows, not because of its spirit but because the essential requirement of compliance with the highway transportation regulations in each province is already part of our fabric of law and administration. I would not want to see some apparently special treatment reserved in this particular case.

Under our general law in regard to trucking—even interprovincial and international trucking—we gave full authority on an administrative and legal basis to the provincial boards operating there before the constitutional position was determined, and we intend that should be the main basis of control and development in relation to trucking in the future.

● (1250)

While I understand the hon. member's concern and can appreciate why the hon. member for Vegreville reintroduced his motions, I urge the House not to accept them and to retain the bill in the form as reported by the committee.

Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North): Mr. Speaker, if one examines transcontinental operations of both the CNR and CPR, one will note that the railways for many years have found it more profitable to move a substantial proportion of the commodities they handle by truck rather than by rail. Therefore, I am not surprised at the concern of the hon. member for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski) that Air Canada may find it more profitable or convenient to transport by truck commodities it at one time transported by air. It may happen, and if it does it will illustrate the correctness of the position my party has taken for many years, that it is impossible to develop in this country an efficient transportation system which will meet the needs of all the people of Canada if you consider each mode of transportation in isolation from other modes.

If we are concerned about cost, we should not be concerned merely about the direct cost to customers but about the total cost which the customer and the community must meet. We must consider the total cost of airline service, which includes the cost of building airports, the cost of an air traffic control system, the cost of a weather report service, and so on. Similarly, when considering road transport we must consider the cost of building highways. We cannot deal with each mode of transport in isolation. This bill attempts to deal with the difficulties of Air Canada as if Air Canada is a transport entity unto itself. In the past we have dealt with the difficulties of Air Canada as though they are isolated, and with the problems of the railways and the bus companies as though they are isolated.

Almost every study we have commissioned in this country in recent years has concluded that we should not examine the operations of our airlines or railways, or bus companies, or even our private automobiles, in isolation but that, rather, we should consider the over-all effect of all modes of transport and bring forward policies which will enable us to use each of these modes of transport with the utmost efficiency and lowest over-all cost to the community. The intent of this bill is to let Air Canada do its job better. That is precisely what I don't like about it. The former minister of transport, Mr. Marchand, said it is difficult to consider the operations of Air Canada, of CNR or of CPR, or of trucking companies, in isolation. Back in 1975 he said:

> Transportation policy must therefore recognize the fact that there is a wide range of facilities and services, operating under different degrees of maturity and competition. It must enable each to be treated in an appropriate manner, and not, as is now the case, as exceptions to a policy which relies principally on competition.

In that speech he talked about the difference between providing service to the Quebec city-Niagara Falls corridor which has available to it the services of rail, trucks, ships, aircraft, and the private automobile, and providing service to western Canada where most commodities must be shipped by rail. One can compare service in the north, where a great proportion of commodities must be shipped by air. I suggest our transport policy does not yet recognize this as a fact. The former minister of transport, in a speech made in 1975, said transportation policy in Canada is "a mess". That comment accurately described our transport policy and was probably the most graphic comment that minister made while serving in this House.

We are supposedly operating under a new transport policy, but it is just the same old transportation policy under which we operated previously. The minister relies on competition, commercial viability, and his now famous concept of user-pay. It would take me days to illustrate the falseness of that concept and the impossibility of applying the used-pay principle, and it should be obvious to anyone who studies the subject that user-pay will not work. People could not live in some parts of this country if you applied the user-pay principle to them.

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

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Order, please. It being one o'clock, I do now leave the chair until two o'clock p.m.

At one o'clock the House took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 2 p.m.

Mr. Orlikow: Just before the lunch break I indicated the feeling of our party with regard to one of the major defects of this bill, and indeed every bill dealing with transportation brought in by this government. It attempts to—deal with one small phase of the total—transportation picture, in this case Air Canada.

As I indicated earlier today and on other occasions, all the evidence shows that we in Canada need to look at the total transportation picture. We must work out a comprehensive and coordinated transportation policy using all forms of transportation to their maximum efficiency in order to give the greatest social benefits and advantages to the people of Canada. This is why I am concerned about most of the amendments brought in by the hon. member for Vegreville on behalf of the official opposition. In committee I spoke out against one of the hon. member's amendments which the minister accepted. He revised the bill to include it. That is, that it should be written into the bill that Air Canada should have as one of its objectives the making of a profit.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Its main objective.

Mr. Orlikow: Its main objective should be to make a profit. I dealt with that aspect in committee. My colleague, the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles), intends to deal with it as well. It is a great mistake. Air Canada is our national air carrier. It is owned by the people of Canada. It must continue to service areas in which it cannot possibly make a profit. I think of the maritime provinces which have a relatively low population, some of the short hauls in western Canada which, thanks to the minister, have not been permitted to develop, northern Ontario and the Arctic. If that policy is followed, it will have a tremendously detrimental effect.

Because I am not likely to be here for the whole of the debate, I wish to mention one item in particular. In today's Montreal *Gazette* there is a story headed "Travel firm plans $209 B.C. return". This story indicates that yesterday the federal government opened the way for cheaper domestic air fares, possibly as low as $209 for a return trip Montreal to Vancouver. It states that the cost of a ticket from Toronto or Montreal to Vancouver will be cut in half. Travel agents are enthused. It is a step in the right direction, but I urge the minister to give thought to the real problem. One reason we have a deficit in foreign exchange is as a result of Canadians travelling outside of Canada. During the winter months, Canadians want to visit such places as Hawaii, Florida, Great Britain, Spain, Portugal, and so on. There is not much we can do about the weather. Tens of thousands of people are now travelling from Vancouver, Winnipeg, Toronto and Montreal to other countries. They are travelling to other countries, not because the price of a ticket from Montreal or Toronto to Vancouver is so high, though that is partly the reason, but because if one takes a trip to Hawaii, London, Amsterdam, the coast of Portugal, or Miami, Florida, one is able not just to buy a cheaper air ticket for the flight but a package which includes air fare, hotel and meals. This is virtually impossible in Canada, and such packages certainly are not advertised.

• (1410)

I had my office call some hotels in Vancouver this morning, and this is what I was told. The rate for two in a double room at the Georgia Hotel is $35 per night. At the Airport Hyatt it is $35 to $39 a night. At the Bayshore Inn it is $47 to $58 a night. At the Holiday Inn downtown it is $35 a night. I am not being critical of the hotels in Vancouver; if the people of Vancouver travel to Toronto or Ottawa they will pay even more. My wife came to Ottawa a couple of months ago. The Chateau was full, so she stayed at the Four Seasons, and speaking from memory it cost her somewhere between $45 to $50 single for one night. This is no way to encourage Canadians to travel in Canada, and neither does it encourage tourists to come to Canada from abroad.

If Air Canada really wants to expand its business, I suggest to the Minister of Transport that it not only offer charter fares but that it negotiate with major hotels in Canada in regard to reducing their rates at least for charter or group travellers. Then people in eastern Canada will be able to visit Calgary or Vancouver, and vice-versa, on a package tour basis which includes air travel, hotel accommodation and, hopefully, meals, similar to package tours to Hawaii, Miami, London, Portugal or Spain.

I urge the minister to use the provisions of this bill, which provides in clause 6(1) as follows:

> The corporation may, within and outside Canada, (a) establish and operate the business of an air carrier;
>
> (b) buy, sell, lease, construct or otherwise acquire, dispose of and maintain and operate as necessary or incidental to the operation of the corporation's business, aircraft, hotels and other accommodation—

I am not saying that Air Canada should go into the hotel business; that may not be necessary. But I do think they should use the powers they have to help develop the kind of travel in Canada which would, if successful, as I am sure it would be, save a great deal of foreign exchange which now escapes this country with so many people travelling outside Canada. Secondly, and more importantly, it would help people in one part of Canada to get to know people in another part. I urge the minister to do some of these things I have suggested and to make this legislation worth while and meaningful.

Mr. Arnold Malone (Battle River): Mr. Speaker, I want to take part in this debate because motions Nos. 1 and 2 which we are debating at the moment have as their intent the placing of limits on the growth of Crown corporations, causing them, in effect, to restrict their input into Canadian society. In recent years there has been growth in excess of 1,000 Crown corpora-

tions. It is not just the number of Crown corporations which makes the difference in terms of whether or not we are going to have a society left for free and enterprising people; it is also the scope with which various enterprises, Crown corporations, can extend themselves which is important.

One thing that is obvious in the writ of Bill C-17 is that it offers a broad-ranging scope to enable this Crown corporation, Canadian National, or Air Canada, to participate in a considerable amount of current enterprises being undertaken in Canada by the private sector. As the hon. member for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski) mentioned, the trucking industry of this country is very likely to face increasing competition. In response to the hon. member for Vegreville, the minister pointed out that he would give certain assurances, as minister, that there would be some competition in the trucking area under the regulations. However, I suggest we need much more than an assurance from a member of the cabinet or from the government of the day if the future of the industry is to be at all predictable. The industry affected by this legislation has to know what are the rules of the game, and these should be enshrined in the statute. Under this bill we simply do not know the rules of the game.

Last year, Air Canada lost $20 million in its operations. Let me compare that with Northwest Airlines of the United States, which has about the same capital input, approximately the same number of aircraft, and travels each year approximately the same number of air miles. While Air Canada lost $20 million, Northwest Airlines made a profit in the same period of over $100 million. On the other hand—and this is the difference between the two—Air Canada, a Crown-owned corporation, had almost double the staff of the privately-owned Northwest Airlines. That is an important piece of information to bear in mind when we have today a very efficient, free enterprise trucking industry throughout Canada. Under the provisions of this bill at the present time, CN, which generally trucks only from the railway to storehouses and back again, or between aeroplanes, shuttling back and forth, could very easily become a full-fledged trucking enterprise.

● (1420)

That situation is appalling and frightening to all Canadians. It would not be another Crown corporation, but it would engulf another enterprise. At the present time we have in excess of 1,000 Crown-owned enterprises operating in this country. We have to recognize that some of these corporations are expanding so as to engulf larger and larger proportions of what was previously private dollars.

At the present time, Canadian National Railways has its airline, Air Canada, its hotels, ships, recreation resorts, railways and shopping centres. It is becoming a very extensive operation on behalf of the public sector. Approximately 15 years ago, 28 per cent of the gross national product went for public spending in Canada. Today, something in the order of 42 per cent of our gross national product is going for public spending.

Almost all economists are in full agreement that the private sector creates wealth and, at best, the public sector redistributes wealth. When we take an analysis of what has happened during the past years, we realize more and more that the public sector is taking an increasing percentage of the gross national product. In the past decade and a half we have gone from 28 per cent to 42 per cent. If you put this on a pie-shaped graph and you expand your total GNP and the public "take" out of it, the obvious answer is that there is that much less left over for the private sector.

Thus, we get into situations whereby we have a problem with our balance of payments, with the creativity of wealth in the country and with unemployment. A portion of that is related to the type of bill we have at the present time which provides for the expansion of Crown corporations to operate more and more in areas which were traditionally part of the private sector. While there may have been a motive for the government to make an effort in terms of trying to assist Canadians in the exploration of oil and gas, the natural conclusion ought not to have been to develop Petro-Can as it was in the bill put before the House of Commons.

That act dealt with the exploration and search for hydrocarbon fuels. It also referred to service stations at street level where grease-jockeys jacked up cars and serviced them as a Crown corporations. While we have not moved to that phase, this bill is another example of the government moving into the private sector right down to street level. Do we want our cars to be serviced and looked after by the same people who run the Post Office? When we take a look at the Post Office, we see an institution which turned a profit for this country 15 years ago and lost $700 million this past year. As we take a look at Bill C-17, one of the reasons these two amendments have been placed before the House is to put some limitations on the extent to which Crown corporations can grow.

The trucking industry needs a forum for the airing of grievances, and it needs an assurance of predictability. A sensible private trucking industry cannot operate across this country if at the same time the government of Canada is involved in that business. Few people recognize that Canadian National is the biggest trucking corporation in Canada today. Regardless of the assurances by the minister, the trucking industry as a subsidiary of Air Canada can expand into direct competition with the last of our enterprising people.

A young person starts out by purchasing a truck in order to operate his own business. It is inexcusable of the government to leave a loophole in its legislation allowing for the largest trucking sector to expand in direct competition with the trucking industry. The Minister of Transport (Mr. Lang) gives assurances that if we do not have more than that, then it is a pretty weak case for people purchasing fleets of trucks in order to get into the industry. The objectives of these people are to service the country and expand their businesses. They have been given nothing but assurances by the minister that he will not do it, but the legislation allows for it.

In terms of growth, this legislation could place restrictions, and therefore this amendment must be debated. If the govern-

ment becomes involved in the trucking industry, then we have to look at all Crown corporations. We have to look at the Post Office and their $700 million loss over the past year. We have to take a look at Air Canada which lost $20 million and compare that to Northwest Airlines which made a profit of $100 million operating as a private industry. Both airlines had the same type of capital input, amount of planes and number of air miles travelled. Two years ago Air Canada lost $19 million in the most lucrative part of Canada—Toronto to Ottawa to Montreal. It is inconceivable that any company could lose so much in that lucrative area known as the golden triangle.

Part of the reason for these expensive losses on the part of Crown corporations is the bureaucratic overlayering which tends to take place in those corporations. One of the significant differences between Northwest Airlines and Air Canada has almost doubled the staff of Northwest Airlines. The same thing happens when you take a look at oil companies and railway systems. Recently I had some meetings with people from Canadian Pacific Railway, and I was told that the factor at the top management level is eight to one, heavier in CN rail than it is in CP rail.

There is a loophole in this bill. It is a direct threat to the private sector of the trucking industry, which concerns my constituents, my province and every part of Canada. Further, I notice the Minister of Transport said that Air Canada is supposed to operate on a businesslike basis and is supposed to operate according to guidelines—I assume from his intructions and from the instructions of management at Air Canada, to operate that airline on a businesslike basis. I appreciate that those are the words he is saying, but the fact of the matter is that when you compare Air Canada, with other major airlines of similar size, it consistently shows either a lower profit or a loss, while others are showing a profit.

● (1430)

I think we have to see, in the same light, the assurance he is giving to the truckers in this country, because while on one hand he is saying that this company is supposed to work on a businesslike basis, the fact is that it is not. Though he is trying to give us an assurance that it is not going to compete with the trucking industry as long as the legislation is in its present form, I am not convinced that the bureaucrats will not do it. If there is a market there, and in some way they start to lose in some other area of air transport, or any other section of that whole Crown corporation dealing with transport, if there looks to be a lucrative market in the trucking industry I think there will be pressure on the bureaucrats to go ahead and do it.

That, in effect, is what I am sure is going to be causing some pressure, and we must keep bearing in mind that even today, without Bill C-17 before us, Canadian National trucks are the biggest fleet of trucks in all of Canada. Certain restrictions and limitations ought to be put on the size and scope that that sector of business is going to become.

The bill would allow direct competition with the trucking industry, and that is a very unacceptable position. So I agree very much with motions Nos. 1 and 2—with No. 1. in particular—put forward by my hon. friend from Vegreville, an amendment which would limit CN trucking to incidental and associated transport related to air and rail travel. What it says in effect is that if you have a fleet of trucks associated with CN, that fleet has to be with associated fleet travel, so it is dealing with the freight that comes off a train and has to be hauled somewhere to centre town, or from centre town to the train and likewise to the aeroplane. But it ought to be limited to that and it ought not to have the prerogative of extending into direct trucking right across the country, to get into the private market, which, incidentally, is one of the situations we are in.

People can get into privately setting themselves up on a one-man family, small business, and grow into a large business even today with the growing opportunities in the trucking business at the present time. Certainly, in this very important summer that we have ahead of us, this very important decade that we have ahead of us, one of the things we are going to notice is an increase in truck travel because of the fact that the whole northern development is not going to be just pipelines, but whatever happens in our north as a result of next month's debate is, I am sure, going to lead to a whole expansion far beyond oil and gas in the north. I would hate to think that this development, somewhere down the road, is not going to be serviced by a private fleet of young, enterprising, trucking people who come out of school and want to grab a truck, go into business on their own and operate it efficiently within their own capacity, without some threat of government interference coming in there in direct competition.

In conclusion, then, I hope the minister will urge upon his colleagues that the approach to the intent, the spirit of this bill, is not really too different on either side of the House. What we are asking for in essence is a guarantee enshrined in the legislation, and if the minister were of the same spirit as we are on this side he would say we were giving the private trucking industry the confidence it deserves. It would then feel that its business was secured by legislation, not merely by a promise.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member, but his time has expired. The hon. member for Timiskaming (Mr. Peters).

Mr. Arnold Peters (Timiskaming): Mr. Speaker, these changes in Air Canada have been contemplated for a long time, and they give members an opportunity, unfortunately, at a late stage in the session to make some input into the direction in which we want Air Canada to go. Air Canada has, in effect, been an offspring, a subsidiary of the CNR and has been handled in a pseudo subsidiary capacity. During those years in which it has been under the Canadian National umbrella, the corporation has seen considerable growth from a small organization to a fairly large and competent international airline. But it is not without difficulties, and in this bill we appear to be putting in the same difficulties we established in

Canadian National and have paid little attention to the realm of competition in any of the fields in which it operates.

Canadians are a widely travelled people. They travel across the world by car, by sea or boat, particularly people from the province of the hon. member for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski) who go to Mexico and to Florida. You see a great many of them driving there. Canadians travel extensively, and this is causing a great deal of difficulty in relation to the balance of payments and the economy of our country. But in relation to travel, we have been interested in watching the relationship which has happened in Britain to their national airline and to competition. It is interesting that this competition is now causing a great deal of difficulty in the United States and it is causing some difficulty in Canada as well.

Laker aircraft has been granted permission to operate flights at greatly reduced rates between Europe and North America, and this will mean that travel will cost less than 50 per cent of the normal cost of air travel between North America and Britain. Obviously, this competition will have to be met in various ways, but it is interesting that in Canada, where there are a lot of enterprising entrepreneurs, Wardair in particular, should have said it can match the Laker deal and do it without cutting away all the frills. And it will be able to provide travellers with a seat on the aircraft; they will not have to stand up all the way to Europe. They will be able to get refreshments on that trip, rather than cross in total austerity as contemplated in the low-rate Laker package.

Canadians will be obliged to develop a totally new way of handling travel, or they will have to compete. I hope Air Canada will in some way learn how to compete. The amendment before us is an indication that the government has given no consideration to this type of competition. We are talking about fares which will take one from Ottawa, Toronto or Montreal to Europe cheaper than you can go across Canada.

● (1440)

The charge is made that we are losing a great deal of money, at least in Canada, particularly in the triangle of Montreal-Ottawa-Toronto, as the previous speaker has said. Every member here knows how this can be solved easily and simply and to the advantage of the travelling public. With the volume of traffic there is between Montreal and Toronto, no airline should be operating as if it had to provide a multicarrier flight to New Zealand. A computer is not needed, nor are other frills needed on that route.

I was very impressed with the entrepreneur who started the airline between Edmonton and Calgary. You line up, you buy your ticket as you would on a bus, and you catch the flight regularly. It is a half-hour trip. The plane is utilized totally, and the line is making money. The minister should remember that it is replacing a flight that was dropped by Air Canada because it did not make any money. They do not make the usual search that you have at airports. They do not operate from the two international airports that are a few miles out of the two cities, but rather they operate from the municipal airports right in the cities which are easily accessible to the travelling public.

They run that service efficiently, and they move a very large number of passengers. If you are standing in line and they take 100 passengers a flight and you are the one hundred and first, you would wait for the next flight and you would be the first one on it. You cannot wait more than one hour. It is my guess that when Air Canada ran that flight, one sometimes had to wait four or five hours to get on that flight. You could either wait at the airport or you could go back to the city and make several trips back and forth before you got a seat on the flight. Now it takes much less time.

The company which runs that airline competes very successfully with local ground transportation. My case is that they are making a lot of money. Two pilots fly each plane; they do not serve coffee, and there are no frills. But an efficient service is provided. Perhaps that is the way in which we should handle transportation between short distances. The efficiency per passenger of such of flight is 150 per cent better than if you were to fill up a DC-9 to fly between the two cities. The DC-9 has about the same capacity as the plane they fly on the air base where they use a Boeing 727. That type of operation should be considered seriously by the minister. It provides a good service.

There is a matter in which the Postmaster General (Mr. Blais), I and the hon. member for Nickel Belt (Mr. Rodriguez) are interested. It concerns a flight between Ottawa, North Bay and Sudbury. A jet service was to be provided by a third carrier, but there was opposition from Air Canada. They won, and they put on an early morning flight which nobody took. Then they provided another flight in the middle of the afternoon which, again, nobody took. Now they have discontinued the flight. A fourth level carrier is now operating that flight with DC-3s. I think the Postmaster General would agree with me that on a Friday afternoon you need a reservation on that flight to get a seat on the plane because it is often filled to capacity.

Mr. Blais: I fully agree with the hon. gentleman.

Mr. Peters: It seems to me that that service is provided at a time when many people use it, so it fills the purpose and the airline makes money. I suggest that one of our main aims should be to provide service. Any member here can tell you that service could be improved in the triangle area of Montreal, Ottawa, Toronto. There is not a member here who could not make suggestions about better service which could make Air Canada a heck of a lot more money.

Another point that I wish to make is that a return trip to Europe is cheaper than a single fare to Vancouver. Surely hon. members should be concerned about this because many of them fly to Vancouver regularly, perhaps once a week, and they are aware of the difference in cost. Surely the cost of domestic flights should be reduced.

I suggest that if we pass this bill without amendments, we will be duplicating what CNR has done, as has been said here before. We would not only be asking Air Canada to run an

airline; we would be giving them authority, as it is stated in the bill, to buy and operate aircraft, hotels and other accommodation, surface vehicles and facilities for the transportation and housing of persons, goods and mail. If the bill is passed, Air Canada will be authorized to buy condominiums at all the places to which they fly. They would want condominiums so their crews could stay there. We would be allowing them to buy trucks and other vehicles of transportation. The only thing I cannot see them operating is a railway, although they might even consider that. There is nothing in our transportation system which would surprise me very much. I would not even be surprised if Air Canada wanted to start a railway operation. What we want from them is an efficient airline.

I believe they should buy the kind of accommodation that is necessary. Hotels in Canada are a disaster. Accommodation in a hotel in Canada costs twice as much as comparable accommodation in the United States. Why is that so? Simply because in Canada they make no attempt to fill the hotel. Most of the time our major hotels are half full. From time to time there is a convention, and then they are filled. But generally speaking our hotels are only half filled, and therefore the price is doubled to cover the overhead. Therefore, we would like the airline to go into the hotel business to the same extent as other airlines, so they can make arrangements on behalf of customers and so their customers can make reservations at hotels for reasonably-priced accommodation. This may have to apply to meals as well. If it does not, there will be less and less travel in Canada, and more and more travel outside Canada.

● (1450)

Our forefathers did not set up Canada National Railways to make money. When Trans-Canada Air Lines was set up, it was set up with government financing, and with the backing of the general public, to provide a service. We have an immense country, and the only way to unite it was to provide a transportation facility to link it up. Today, when it costs $350 to go to Vancouver, most people would rather go to Florida or Mexico for half that price and have their holidays arranged by airlines through package tours. With the exception of Banff and several other ski tours in the winter, Air Canada does not have any package tours. We should be providing that kind of service to the Canadian people. We should be attempting to unite the people of this country, and there is no better way of doing that than by having people travel around the country.

A fantastic number of people in the province in Quebec could tell us more about every city in Florida, Mexico or in the continental United States, than about parts of Canada. I do not blame them, because all kinds of arrangements have been made to facilitate their travel to those areas. If you travel by car, your oil company will put together a package, arrange for hotels and provide all kinds of advice so that you can have a pleasurable trip. In Canada, nothing similar to that has been done for most areas. In my area the cost of accommodation, air fare, rail fare and all other costs which face tourists are so high that tourist activity is decreasing and many tourist operators are going out of business. I presume this is true in all the provinces.

Air Canada has a great reputation. It is probably the best airline I have ever used. The airline leaves much to be desired on the ground, however, and its tariff structure is a disaster. I do not think it is doing anything for the airline. It certainly does nothing for me, and I think it does nothing for the travelling public. Rather than getting vouchers to travel on Air Canada, I wish members of parliament had to make expenditures and be rebated. In that way we would know exactly what our travel costs and we would be much more concerned about problems than we are. It is not hard to get a $500 voucher to travel on Air Canada, but if we had to pay our fare and be rebated, we would wonder why it costs $500 to go to Vancouver and back.

Mr. Stewart (Cochrane): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I regret to interrupt the hon. member, because he is a good friend of mine. I have a great deal of respect for him, but the speech he is making should have been made at second reading. We discussed these things at length in committee. We worked hard there. We have motions Nos. 1 and 2 before us, and up to this point none of the remarks made by the hon. member have had any bearing on them. It seems to me that it is up to you, Mr. Speaker, to call the hon. member to order.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Hon. members will have noticed that in the past the Chair has been lenient. Sometimes hon. members give us a little tour and then come back to the subject before the House. Ground transportation is mentioned in motion No. 1. The hon. member for Cochrane (Mr. Stewart) indicated that this has been discussed at length, but when he rose I was just about to remind the hon. member for Timiskaming (Mr. Peters) that his time had expired. So perhaps there is no point of order to rule upon.

Mr. Robert C. Coates (Cumberland-Colchester North): Mr. Speaker, much of what the hon. member for Cochrane (Mr. Stewart) has said is accurate, but I believe the hon. member for Timiskaming (Mr. Peters) was trying to express the concern of hon. members from all parties in relation to what they hope Air Canada will provide in the way of service in the days ahead.

Coming from the maritimes, I am concerned because Air Canada is to a certain degree endeavouring to become involved in a field in which one Crown corporation is already involved to such an extent that it has caused great difficulties for the private sector. When we were endeavouring to secure the government's approval to bring trucking under the Maritime Freight Rates Act and to obtain subsidies so that there would be competition for the railways and, hopefully, through competition, more realistic freight rates, we discovered that the CNR, a Crown corporation, then moved into the trucking industry and dashed one of the hopes we had. We had hoped that competition would bring down truck rates and freight rates in general. I would be very concerned if Air Canada were to embark upon any venture which would result in the elimination of still more privately-owned trucking firms in favour of

government-owned firms, thus eliminating to an even greater degree the competition that is fast disappearing at this time.

Parliament must give very serious consideration to the amendments which are before us, so that the private enterprise sector is not interfered with in the area of transportation. I am upset about the degree of infiltration into the trucking industry by Crown-owned companies now, and I abhor the thought that they are going to move into the industry to an even greater degree in the days ahead. I am totally opposed to any concept which would allow that to happen in the future.

Air Canada has not instilled much confidence in the people of Canada in recent years as far as management is concerned. It has shown some multimillion dollar losses, so I hate to think of it branching into other areas.

● (1500)

The hon. member for Timiskaming may have been a little bit off the point of the amendment, but he was right on in regard to the arrangements in force at present for Canadians to move around the country at a reasonable price. It is cheaper to travel outside Canada.

We should try to determine how Air Canada can invest the money it has to best advantage in areas that would improve its service. When the bill was last before the House I brought to the attention of the minister the atrocious scheduling in Atlantic Canada. The hon. member for Central Nova (Mr. MacKay) and the hon. member for Annapolis Valley (Mr. Nowlan) also voiced the opinion that it was totally inadequate and must be improved. We had hoped for some action, and when the President of Air Canada announced plans for new and distinctive administrative regions encompassing all of Atlantic Canada by July 1 and that Mr. Linder, Vice President of the corporation, would head a new division, we looked forward to improvements. But we were disappointed to find there was no real difference in the schedule of flights between major centres in the Atlantic provinces and other major centres in Canada as of July 1 or even April 1. We live in hope that the fall schedule will re-establish the type of service we used to have; even though it was not the best in the world it was not as bad as that in force at present.

Tourism is down again this year, and unless the airlines assist with better service to move people into and out of the area it will be worse. Last year was devastation for the tourist industry, and the outlook is not good for this summer.

I do not know how we can convince Air Canada that it should produce at least a half decent system for the area without embarking upon new ventures that might add to the multimillion dollar deficit it already has.

I am concerned for the trucking industry inasmuch as Air Canada and the CNR in concert could do great damage to firms already in existence. The CNR often operates on a tariff basis that would eliminate private enterprise and then, when it has achieved that end, increases its rates. The CNR charges whatever it wants to, with little regard for whether those using its service can maintain their business or not. Tremendous cutbacks in employment are anticipated in Moncton and Nova Scotia and now we have an indication that Air Canada wants to get into the trucking industry, and possibly the hotel industry.

The hon. member for Timiskaming was correct when he said that the hotel business was a disaster for the tourist because our rates are so high compared with those in the United States. And even though our hotel industry is operating at 50 per cent capacity or less today, I do not see any indication of changes. Unless they bring their prices down they will not be able to persuade people to use them.

It is frightening to think of Air Canada going into the hotel business, using taxpayers' money, and in effect putting out of business hoteliers whose taxes go to maintain the airline which is reporting huge losses. I am concerned that Air Canada has not done more for Atlantic Canada. Both in committee and in this House a lot has been said about the atrocious service it provides to the Atlantic provinces. I view its involvement in the trucking industry with deep concern; we have already seen what the CNR has done to the trucking industry and to private enterprise in Altantic Canada.

● (1510)

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Before calling on the hon. member for Palliser (Mr. Schumacher) who, I believe, wants to contribute to this discussion, let me say I had indicated earlier in the day that the Chair has some concern, which I endeavoured to outline, about the procedural acceptability of motion No. 3.

In keeping with past practice I also circulated to some members of the House my notes in respect of the breakdown of motions which will be grouped for discussion. Those notes included in this instance my own notes about my procedural concern with respect to motion No. 3. I provided those notes to hon. members in order to give all hon. members the maximum opportunity to check the citations to which I had resorted in coming to today's preliminary conclusion, and I thought they would assist hon. members to prepare themselves for the discussion, if one were to take place, with respect to the procedural irregularity of motion No. 3. I understand hon. members have had the opportunity to review those citations and that no further discussion in respect of that motion is contemplated at present. I therefore repeat my earlier assessment of this motion. It appears to me to introduce a concept entirely foreign to the clause it seeks to amend. In my opinion, and for reasons I stated in a preliminary way this morning, it goes beyond the scope of the clause. Therefore, in line with citation 203(3) of Beauchesne's fourth edition, and Erskine May's nineteenth edition, page 521, I would conclude that the amendment goes beyond the scope of the clause it seeks to amend and is therefore procedurally out of order.

I said this morning that motions Nos. 4 to 9 inclusive could be grouped together. That was an erroneous statement on my part. I had intended to refer to the motions standing in the name of the hon. member for York-Simcoe (Mr. Stevens) and group them together. Those are motions Nos. 6, 7, 8 and 9. I

understand it is agreeable to discuss them together and, if necessary, to vote on them separately.

Motions Nos. 4 and 5 are separate from that group, and separate from each other. Motion No. 4 is in the name of the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles), and would be discussed and voted on separately. Essentially, motion No. 5 is a government amendment, designed to bring the French text of the bill in line with the English text and probably will not be the subject of much discussion or of a vote. In any case, it must be discussed and voted on separately if that is necessary. Therefore motion No. 4 will be discussed and voted on separately, as will motion No. 5. Motions Nos. 6 to 9 inclusive will be debated as a group, and voted on in a manner deemed necessary as the votes are called, if votes on those motions are necessary. If that is agreeable, perhaps I can call on the hon. member for Palliser to continue the debate on motions Nos. 1 and 2.

Mr. Stan Schumacher (Palliser): Mr. Speaker, I am concerned about the authority this bill would grant the governor in council to run the affairs of Air Canada. The bill would require Air Canada to report on its operations directly to the minister, and thus to parliament. That provision is desirable and we are thankful for it. But part of the price we must pay for the privilege is this: the organization will become the creature of the minister of transport, whoever he may be, from time to time.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Let's hope it will not be the hon. member for Crowfoot (Mr. Horner).

Mr. Schumacher: The present minister will not always be Minister of Transport (Mr. Lang). Politics being what it is, we can expect changes to be made from time to time, just as we can expect changes to be made in life. I think political considerations will influence the operations of Air Canada. That may be good or it may be bad. It depends how the influence is used.

I want to see this public corporation operate according to law, not according to the whims of an elected official, or of some faceless bureaucrat not accountable to parliament for his actions. At least if this bill passes we shall have the satisfaction of discussing Air Canada's operations from time to time, and hon. members will be able to voice their concern. I do not know how effective this exercise will be. I suppose the best thing about it is that because the subject will be discussed in this forum the public will be better informed. But I am greatly concerned, because the governor in council will have a great deal to say about the operations of the corporation.

Motions 1 and 2 are designed to protect the trucking industry and to make sure that in future there will not be any possibility of nationalizing our trucking industry by the back door, as it were. The industry, largely made up of small companies, by and large has proven efficient in carrying this country's freight. It has grown over the years and is the beneficiary of money spent largely by provincial jurisdiction, inasmuch as the trucking industry depends on this country's highway network, mostly under provincial jurisdiction.

[Mr. Speaker.]

Our trans-Canada highway system has been funded partly by the federal government, but the bulk of the country's roads still are the direct responsibility of the provinces. I point out that of all freight moved in Canada, the trucking industry moves 42 per cent. When I say all freight, I include freight moved by air, water and pipeline, and freight moved by truck. We move great volumes of commodities by way of pipeline, and one may say, too, that the trucking industry, composed of a large number of fairly small operators, has put up a creditable performance.

We should adopt the hon. member's motions, I suggest, because Canadian National Railways is becoming a big operator of trucks in an already large trucking industry. I understand that the Canadian National truck system now accounts for almost 5 per cent of that 42 per cent share of the total freight-haul market trucks have captured. The company has done this despite the provisions of the existing law which theoretically should limit Canadian National's ability to engage in trucking. I understand that the courts have interpreted parliament's approval of CNR's financing as having over-ridden the provisions of legislation which says the CNR must operate only as a railway.

● (1520)

As has been pointed out, one only has to look at the other activities of Canadian National, which is primarily a railway company. It has built the world's tallest free standing structure, acquired an interest in a fleet of ships, and has a large interest in the container operations to use with those ships. According to the television commercials of CN, it is certainly trying to emulate Canadian Pacific by getting into a very diversified operation.

What I object to in this situation is that the governor in council, in other words whoever may be Minister of Transport from time to time, will feel that he has a vested interest in making the operation of Air Canada look good. A political influence is now being introduced. The minister will take the position that he must have a good annual report to present to parliament so that the heat will be off him. He will therefore be very willing to stretch to the limit something the present Minister of Transport has undertaken to constrain, the present activities of Air Canada and functions of Air Canada.

I feel an adequate precedent has been established by what has happened to CN. The same need not happen with Air Canada. There is the matter of surface transportation, passenger traffic and baggage and, as the minister mentioned, mail is being authorized. That may be proper. There may be some controversy because I do not think it is generally accepted that Air Canada should have all the mail business. The tendency of the government will be to give Air Canada more and more of the mail business so that it will have a better profit and therefore better annual report.

There will be a natural bias against the private sector. This may be all right in some areas because the private sector has

not done that good a job. The trucking industry has proven to be a very efficient and competitive operation. Otherwise CN and CP would not be getting into it.

We should look to the past and try to learn from our mistakes. We should not protect a healthy and viable industry. It is not dominated by giants but made up of many small entrepreneurial firms.

The trucking industry can move high valued freight from central Canada to the west coast as quickly as air cargo. If the Parliament of Canada decides this industry should be nationalized, let us do it through the front door.

An hon. Member: Like Lougheed.

Mr. Schumacher: He did it very directly via the front door. He operated through the law. I do not think anyone can accuse him of operating illegally.

Mr. Rodriguez: And he did it with heritage funds.

Mr. Schumacher: I do not think the heritage fund had been adopted at that time. Of course I am not here to defend Premier Lougheed and the decision with regard to Pacific Western Airlines. I can point out, however, that we have a government that can be responsible for an airline. It has left the management pretty well unto itself in the day to day operation. At least it makes money. That is something this government cannot claim for this highly protective national airline.

An hon. Member: Did CP make any?

Mr. Schumacher: CP did not make any either. That was probably as a result of the policies of this federal government. It is greatly restricted by the amount of traffic it is allowed to handle, largely for the benefit of Air Canada.

I do not object to people operating in these areas as long as there is free and unrestricted competition. What is necessary is that the consumer benefit. We need a free and open market place.

The government wants the power to issue directives in writing to this company because it has a responsibility for it. Naturally it will do everything it can to make it look as though it is making a profit. it may do a good job writing an annual report, but in doing so it will deprive the whole economy of profit competition. We will end up with more and more of these functions being run by the government or through government agencies. I do not like it.

If the intention is to get into freight handling, why not say it? Why is the minister so afraid of taking it in? He agrees with the hon. member for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski). All he says is, "Trust me." Well, we might trust him and we might not.

If we do trust him, how are we to know what he says here today will bind any future minister or administration? I like to see things done by law, not policy. There is ample precedent for the necessity of this type of amendment. Let us learn from the past and keep Air Canada in the air business, not the trucking business.

Mr. John Rodriguez (Nickel Belt): Mr. Speaker, when I came into the chamber I did not intend to say anything with regard to the amendments being debated. But after listening to the gobbledygook on my right, I have been stimulated into making a few remarks. It was all I could do to sit and listen to them say how competition will solve the problem and that profit making is the new goddess which must be worshipped. They said we must look to the past and we must keep Air Canada in the air.

The hon. member for Palliser (Mr. Schumacher) talked about keeping Air Canada in the air, but he did not say anything about the extending tentacles of CP investment, CP Air, and the growth of that monolith, Canadian Pacific. They are not only in the air but on the ground in terms of rail freight, passenger business, steel mills, mining corporations and real estate. I suggest to the hon. member for Palliser that we look to the past so that we do not repeat our mistakes, thinking we can provide competition in terms of transportation in Canada and that competition will solve our transportation problems.

We in the NDP look on transportation in terms of service. According to all the articles I have read about railways, air lines and communications, since Canada covers a wide geographic area it is service to the people which should be uppermost in our minds. I have nothing against monopolies. It is just the matter of who owns them that concerns me. I am much more comfortable when a monopoly is owned by the public than when it is owned by a few people sitting in boardrooms in New York state or in the Senate.

• (1530)

Mr. Schumacher: What is the difference?

Mr. Rodriguez: My hon. friend does not know the difference. The difference is that when the people own the monopoly the people have control over it through their elected party.

Mr. Schumacher: Where is the control here?

Mr. Rodriguez: If the hon. member wants to talk about control that is a different matter. If Air Canada is to get into trucking while Canadian Pacific, using vertical integration, can handle the hotel business—

Mr. Schumacher: So does CN.

Mr. Rodriguez: Now just hold your horses.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Are there horses in this bill too? Have they horses on the payroll again?

Mr. Rodriguez: No, there are no horses in this bill. I am talking about competition. The population of Canada is so small that you cannot compete with a very small market. Airlines in the United States are competing with each other but they are losing money because there are too many airlines.

The two national airlines in Canada are competing for a very small market and both of them end up losing money.

It seems to me only reasonable that when an airline sets up a package tour, for example, it has to tie in with hotels to provide service to the travelling public. In the same way it is important that Air Canada have access to the trucking of air freight which it moves. It is extremely important that Air Canada be integrated so it can provide service to hotels and truck air freight.

What bothers me is that hotels which are owned by the people of Canada are being turned over to the Hilton chain to manage. It seems to me that this is not in the best interests of the Canadian public, particularly the travelling public. For example, right now the Hotel Vancouver is into a strike position. It is administered by the Hilton chain under contract to CN. We have never had a strike in 26 years among the workers at the Hotel Vancouver, but now that management has been turned over to the Hilton chain, lo and behold we have our first strike there. This is one concern we have when hotels are turned over to foreign outfits to administer.

I always get a charge out of the argument made by my colleagues to my right. They want no government interference in the market place, in the so-called private sector. However, when the private sector is having difficulty and needs support prices for its products, the bottom having fallen out of the market because of free market competition, it asks the government for a subsidy, a handout.

As my colleagues to my right know full well, one thing we do not have in this country is a free market. We have an administered market. Whether my friends like it or not, the giants in a particular sector set the trend. It strikes me that the free enterprise system does not want competition; it wants to control the market so it can take advantage of all the spin-off effects.

We have been invited to look at past history. We know that the taxpayers of this country built up CP by giving the company millions of acres of land. Now when taxpayers in various cities across the country, specifically in the city of Sudbury where CP is located in the downtown area, want the land back, CP tells them they will have to pay for it. As I say, the land was given to CP in the first place, in return for which they were to provide a service to the people of this country. We now have a perfect example of what happens when modes of transportation, operated by CP and CN, compete for the rail travelling public.

Competition is not the solution to the problems of rail transportation. We do not have a large enough travelling public to make both these giants profitable. We know their routes cover long distances and their upkeep costs are tremendous, but it is illogical to expect both corporations to make money when they parallel each other's routes across the country. Therefore it is only fair that the government's philosophy on transportation should be directed to providing service.

When the Canadian Transport Commission was considering an east-west route from Montreal to Ottawa, Sudbury, Thunder Bay and on to Winnipeg, two airlines, Nordair and Air Canada, applied for the route. Nordair put a great lobby on in this House with the members from northern Ontario.

Mr. Peters: Order!

Mr. Rodriguez: They held big cocktail parties, wine and cheese parties. They wined and dined—

Mr. Peters: Order!

Mr. Rodriguez: The hon. member for Timiskaming (Mr. Peters) can call order all he wants, but he was there and was part of it. He went down to the Carlton Towers hotel where members were wined and dined.

An hon. Member: Did you go too?

Mr. Rodriguez: No, I was not there. I refuse to participate in any of these lobbies.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): How about the teachers' federation? Do you go to their functions?

Mr. Rodriguez: No, I do not. I go to their cocktail parties but they are not after a franchise. But hon. members are casting aspersions. I do happen to be a fellow of the Ontario Teachers' Federation and, as such, I am a sort of honorary dignitary at the meetings of the federation.

Mr. Peters: You are one of the nabobs of the federation.

Mr. Rodriguez: Nordair laid on a splurge for members from Ontario, and I am glad to say that my colleague from Timiskaming attended. The next day they all got the big pitch. They wanted letters of support for the Nordair application before the CTC for the route from Montreal through Sudbury and on to Winnipeg. My support went to Air Canada.

• (1540)

Mr. Peters: Tell us what happened when they got it.

Mr. Rodriguez: Yes, Air Canada got it and they are servicing—

Mr. Peters: They got it, but they are not servicing it.

Mr. Rodriguez: I do not agree with that.

Mr. Peters: Be honest about it.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Order!

Mr. Rodriguez: I fly via Air Canada to Ottawa, and I arrive at 3.45 o'clock from Sudbury. It leaves Sudbury at 2.50. It is a very profitable route and is quite crowded. I argue in favour of Air Canada because it has to provide service on routes where no money is made. Therefore Air Canada has a right to have a route which is profitable.

The government ought to espouse that concept of transportation. It is not a question of making profit. It is a question of serving the people of this country with a particular airline,

railway, bus service, or whatever. In Ontario Grey Coach provided a bus service from Sudbury to Toronto. Grey Coach is owned by the people of Ontario through the CTC. Mr. Eddie Goodman, the flunky for Mr. Davis, made an appeal before the Ontario Transport Commission and surprisingly won for Greyhound, which is an American privately owned corporation. Thus Grey Coach has to pick up all the losing routes. The private sector in Toronto had Eddie Goodman in its back pocket.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. My point of order relates generally to transportation. I think the hon. member for Nickel Belt (Mr. Rodriguez) has strayed somewhat from the subject. For his edification I should like to indicate to him that in Ontario matters regarding highways are decided by a quasi-judicial tribunal which is as independent as the judiciary.

Mr. Rodriguez: I recognize I hit a tender spot of the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton (Mr. Baker), but the principle is there. Where a service is being provided, it seems to me government-owned transportation systems ought to take the good with the bad and not just take the bad. The amendments put forward by the Conservative party are with respect to Air Canada limiting itself to air and not becoming integrated with hotels and road transportation. If we look at the recent past, we see in a provincial jurisdiction where a publicly owned corporation was providing service on routes where it could make money, thus offsetting the cost to taxpayers of routes where it was not making money. Because of political machinations, we found the government shearing routes off to privately owned foreign corporations. It seems to me that these Tories and Grits are the same old gang.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Rodriguez: They can parade around all they want, but when they run into difficulties they come to the public trough and slurp it up just like any other corporation, public or private. Really, that is the crux of the matter. Are we going to provide service to the people of Canada with our transportation systems? Are we going to say to the public corporations that they have to take the out-of-the-way routes which cannot carry themselves and we will shear off the nice cushy ones? If the private sector runs into difficulty with the nice cushy ones, it can always come back to Santa Claus and have the public treasury opened up for it. You cannot suck and blow at the same time, but that is what the Tories and Grits do all the time.

Mr. Paproski: You are the only one who can do that in this House.

Mr. Rodriguez: The hon. member for Edmonton Centre (Mr. Paproski) has mastered that technique. Since I have come here, I have marvelled at his mastery of that technique.

Mr. Paproski: Not as well as the hon. member for Nickel Belt (Mr. Rodriguez).

Mr. Rodriguez: Our party has persistently maintained the position that we do not mind monopolies, as long as the people of Canada own them through their elected representatives.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Rodriguez: I would have enjoyed hearing the Conservatives stand up and argue that we should be breaking up the monopoly of CP Investments and that we should not have this conglomerate buying up land and becoming involved in various things, because it is destructive to free enterprise in this country. The minute one refers to breaking up the banks, the hon. member for York-Simcoe (Mr. Stevens) runs in and is their great defender. The hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert) defends banks any time there is an attempt to break up the monopolies of the banks.

As I indicated, it is sucking and blowing when it is said the people-owned transportation corporations ought not to integrate themselves, but on the other hand one turns a blind eye to the conglomerates and the monolithic private sectors such as CP Investments. One only has to look at the food industry to see how free enterprise can be destroyed. I should like to refer to one example—

An hon. Member: Tell us about that next week.

Mr. Rodriguez: In the city of Sudbury there is a bakery known as Ceccuti Bakery which employs 200 people. This firm has to close because the chains are loss leadering their own bread which is brought in from Toronto. The owner has to close up because he cannot compete. He is being squeezed out by the competitive pricing practices of supermarkets such as Dominion and Loblaw's which bring in their bread from southern Ontario and other places. That is another example of how free enterprise is being destroyed.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Order, please. I regret to interrupt the hon. member but his allotted time has expired.

Mr. Fred McCain (Carleton-Charlotte): Mr. Speaker, it behooves members of this House to read more than one philosophy. It behooves them to evaluate the philosophies they read and to choose from the options which are in print and which are in practice what may best work in a particular psychological and philosophical situation in the society in which we live.

Having taken a look at some of the experiences which the Government of Canada and its people have experienced, as a result of following some of the philosophies of the hon. member for Nickel Belt (Mr. Rodriguez), let me point out that it seems to be quite all right for a particular Crown corporation to lose $190 million. I have not heard the hon. member criticize that, but some taxpayer somewhere is going to pick up his portion of that $190 million.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): AECL.

Mr. McCain: Yes, AECL. The minister who was supposed to be in charge of that, the Minister of Energy, Mines and

Resources (Mr. Gillespie), might be used as an example of what happens when people take on business operations through their government. Once it was taken on there was no checkmate, no board of directors, no stockholders meetings, no stockholders notification, and no advice whatsoever. How many of those do we need? We have watched the government operate the Canadian National Railways. We have watched the government diversify in all ways which this act would have Air Canada diversify, and it has piled deficit upon deficit upon deficit. It has also curtailed service upon service. It has made its schedule impossible, as far as conveniencing the people of the Atlantic areas is concerned.

● (1550)

The hon. member may live in Nickel Belt and he may know all about that area, but I suggest he review the history and the services of Canadian National and then examine his own philosophy with great care and see whether it does in fact serve the people it was intended to serve. And the answer is, it does not.

An hon. Member: What is the CPR doing in New Brunswick?

Mr. McCain: All I can tell the hon. member is that many of us have shipped thousands of cars of materials, moved them tens and twenties of miles to get them to the CP for service which the CN could have provided and ought to have provided. The hon. member is putting forward a ridiculous argument.

An hon. Member: No weaknesses in the CP?

Mr. McCain: They have their weaknesses. The weaknesses are multitude. But they still have stockholders who have a voice.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. McCain: If we, as individuals in this House, were to have a voice in the operation of Air Canada or in the reorganization of Air Canada—

Some hon. Members: Agreed!

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. McCain: —and if its general management were subject to the criticism of this House, and if it would recognize the criticism which comes from members of the House, we would be singing a different tune. But this is not the case. This bill divorces the taxpayers from any ability to influence the corporation. He has not one word to say even through his elected representative. And that is reprehensible legislation.

Mr. Peters: The Liberals can muck up even a good program.

Mr. McCain: I have sat in the House long enough to know that no effective input into the policy or operations of Air Canada has been made by any committee of this House which has sat since October 30, 1972, and according to other members who have been here far longer than I have no one has ever been successful in making an input into Air Canada's operations despite all the notes and memoranda written to the president, to the chairman, or to branch management. Nothing happens.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. McCain: If the government would agree to say to the airline, "You will submit your budget to a committee of the House which will have an opportunity to study it and appraise its profitability and assess the service provided by your corporation," we would be talking about a different kettle of fish. But that is not the situation. We are being asked to approve a bill which puts more power in the hands of the minister, a bill which gives still more leeway to the executive, an executive which has proven itself incapable of running a service comparable with that available from other airlines.

I want to give you an example from personal experience of what I mean in terms of the basic procedures by which Crown corporations in general, and Air Canada in particular, operate. It was recently necessary for me to go to Washington. I was not able to make a connection via Air Canada because Air Canada does not bother connecting the Atlantic region continentally with any points except Montreal and Toronto. So I had to go to Presquile and use an American airline. What was my experience? We were grounded at Portland, Maine, by weather conditions, as can happen with any airline. There were two ticket officers at the airport there, side by side. I spoke with the agents of both companies, because of the urgency of my getting to the meeting in Washington. Those two men paged me jointly and separately and kept me posted every ten or 20 minutes until I knew exactly where I was going to be, and at what time, and could let the people at the other end know.

It was not six months ago that I had the misfortune to be out at the airport in the little city of Ottawa, at the disposal of Air Canada. With me was a father, a mother, a 13-month-old child, and a 3-month-old child. Do you know what that airline did at the airport, Mr. Speaker? They would not tell me what the weather was like out of doors. And they took those two little children, together with the father and mother, to Montreal in spite of the promise which was given to them at the airport, and dumped them off in Montreal where they sat for 18 hours on the benches at the airport there. I ask you to compare that kind of treatment which the service I received across the border.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Order. It being four o'clock the House will proceed to private members' business.

Mr. McCain: I wish to call it four o'clock, Mr. Speaker.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Order, please.

Mr. McCain: Mr. Speaker, I take it I have been recognized as calling it four o'clock.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): I have just recognized the parliamentary secretary on a point of order. Afterwards I will hear the hon. member.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' MOTIONS

[*English*]

Mr. Goodale: Mr. Speaker, in the normal course of events, earlier in the day we had made arrangements for the usual private members' business to be undertaken in this hour. Unfortunately, after we had begun our business today the hon. member who was in a position to proceed with an item in the private members' hour this afternoon, found he was not in a position to do so. This news came to us at a time when it was too late to arrange substitute business for this hour.

As hon. gentlemen across the way well know, private members' hour is one period which, unlike some others, is marked by a degree of co-operation and cordiality, and it is on this basis we are able to proceed on most days. It sometimes happens that a member is not in a position to proceed with the arranged item of business at the last minute and this leaves the House in some difficulty because of the late notice which is then given to other members about the kind of business we might take in that hour. That is the position in which we find ourselves today because of the late cancellation; we have not been able to find another item of business with which to proceed.

An hon. Member: Poor arrangements.

Mr. Goodale: Bearing in mind the point we have reached in the session it would seem to me to be a wise use of the time of the House if there were agreement to proceed with the hour remaining to us today by continuing consideration of the business which is presently before us, Bill C-17.

Some hon. Members: Oh!

Mr. Goodale: I hear some catcalls, an indication from the other side that hon. gentlemen may not be in the mood to do the country's business today. Nevertheless, I will at least request that we consider taking this hour which is available to us this afternoon and to devote to the continuation of the debate on Bill C-17.

● (1600)

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, speaking first to the question of private members' business as raised by my friend, I gather that the hon. member who sponsors the said motion, who is a member of the Liberal party, is not prepared to proceed with it. It is unfortunate, however, that the P.C. party was not asked whether we would be prepared to proceed with private members' business because we might well have been if we had been notified four, five or six minutes ago. In any event, private members' hour is an hour marked by co-operation, which means that government members co-operate to ensure that private members' business does not leave the House on second reading. That is the essence of the co-operation. Unfortunately, that is what is happening.

It is not too late to organize. I think perhaps we could go through the items on the order paper and find something which could be debated. The parliamentary secretary says he cannot do that under the circumstances. I happen to think that private members' hour should be respected. The parliamentary secretary and you, Mr. Speaker, I am sure, can tell from the comments from all sides of the House that there is no disposition to give up private members' hour simply because the government is not prepared to put forward a motion. Therefore, Sir, I must say, so that there be no doubt about it that I hide behind no one with respect to the matter and I say that consent is not forthcoming from this side, in the circumstances experienced in the House of Commons in the last couple of days.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I gather that the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton (Mr. Baker) has refused consent to giving up the private members' hour. That seems to leave us with the question as to whether there is something we could deal with, and I draw attention to notice of motion No. 27 in the name of the hon. member for Nickel Belt (Mr. Rodriguez). We would be prepared to deal with that motion in this hour.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): That would be agreeable to us, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Blais: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. There was some discussion as to whether we might not proceed with another motion.

Mr. Paproski: Quit the stalling.

Mr. Blais: An offer was made by the Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Goodale) to deal with Bill S-2. We attempted to obtain that consent because there are very few days left in which to deal with private members' business. In view of the fact that the hon. member suggested that we proceed with debate on that bill, let me say that we would be pleased to do so. Also, there has been some discussion that in the event we could not proceed with the item that had been suggested previously, the motion standing in the name of the hon. member for Laval (Mr. Roy), that the House adjourn at this point. Therefore, I in view of the inability to meet any requirement as to the business with which we are to proceed, all the best efforts having been made, I suggest that the House do now adjourn.

Some hon. Members: No!

Mr. Peters: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that there is no motion before the House, I suggest that, despite all the palaver of the parliamentary secretary, we proceed as usual and that you call out the notices of motions in the regular order, at

which time I would be prepared to indicate my preference if no other member indicates his.

Mr. Rodriguez: Mr. Speaker, I rise on the same point of order. Because of the bumbling of the Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Goodale) we are faced with this dilemma.

I have a notice of motion No. 27 on the order paper. We have not yet run out of business important to the people of Canada. The motion in my name asks the government to consider the establishment of a mining act for the protection of miners. If that is not of concern to the people of Canada, I do not know what is. How can the Postmaster General (Mr. Blais) suggest adjournment of the House when we have important business such as notice of motion No. 27 regarding the safety of workers? We can very well debate it. I think the government has bungled House of Commons business in the last three days miserably, and now it wants to adjourn the House. It is absolutely shameful for it to want to adjourn the House.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): And we will not let them.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): There has been a suggestion that we proceed to motion No. 27. Is that agreed?

Mr. Goodale: Mr. Speaker, we seem to have lost that note of cordiality which I referred to earlier which tends to be the hallmark of this hour. I think we should go through the normal process of calling out the items of business on the order paper. I do not think we have any other alternative at this stage but to follow the normal process.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Since we do not have unanimous consent to proceed to notice of motion No. 27, we will consider the motions one by one. The first notice of motion is No. 16 in the name of the hon. member for Scarborough West (Mr. Martin).

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): He is not here.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Is there agreement to debate the motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Blais: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I understand that the sponsor of the motion must be present in the House to move a motion. The hon. member for Scarborough West (Mr. Martin) is not here, so we cannot proceed with the motion, and I propose that it be struck.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): I rise on the same point of order. I would be prepared to move the motion in the name of the hon. member for Scarborough West (Mr. Martin) so that we could proceed with the debate on it. That is quite in order, and in accordance with the rules.

Mr. Blais: Not unless the mover of the motion consents.

[Mr. Peters.]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): The motion is stood at the request of the government.

• (1610)

Notice of motion No. 17 in the name of the hon. member for Hamilton West (Mr. Alexander). Is there unanimous consent to proceed with motion No. 17 in the absence of its mover?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: no.

Motion No. 17 stood at the request of the government.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Notice of motion No. 26 in the name of the hon. member for Winnipeg North (Mr. Orlikow).

Some hon. Members: Stand.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): The motion stands at the request of the government.

* * *

MERCHANT MARINE

SUGGESTION TO REVIVE

The House resumed, from Monday, December 6, 1976, consideration of the motion of Mr. Guay (Lévis):

That, in the opinion of this House, the government should consider the advisability of reviving the Canadian Merchant Marine and applying recommendations of the Darling Report.

Hon. J.-J. Blais (Postmaster General): Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to deal with this particular motion. There has been some debate on this motion, and the interest of the hon. member for Lévis (Mr. Guay) is a very serious and worthwhile one. As hon. members very well know, my riding is not adjacent to any of the oceans which surround the country. I am left at somewhat of a disadvantage. I therefore move:

That the debate on motion No. 3 be now adjourned.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to and debate adjourned.

* * *

PUBLIC SERVICE

TASK FORCE TO REVIEW PUBLIC SERVICE ACT

The House resumed, from Monday, December 13, 1976, consideration of the motion of Mr. Herbert:

That, in the opinion of this House, the government should consider the advisability of establishing a special task force to review the Public Service Employment Act and the role of the Commission in personnel management and employer-employee relations in the Public Service and that the review include an examination of the role assigned the Public Service Commission and its relation-

ship to the Treasury Board Secretariat and the Public Service Staff Relations Board; and

That the review entail a study of the relationship of the Public Service Commission and the departments and agencies; and consider the development of an audit system for perfomance accountability with respect to matters delegated to departments and agencies under the Public Service Employment Act.

Hon. J.-J. Blais (Postmaster General): Mr. Speaker, I chaired the joint parliamentary committee relating to the public service and staff relations within the public service. There was much deliberation. I feel it would not be useful at this time to proceed with this debate, so I move:

That the House do now adjourn.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

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

Some hon. Members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Call in the members.

The House divided on the motion (Mr. Blais) which was agreed to on the following division.

● (1620)

(Division No. 89)

YEAS

Messrs.

Abbott	Blouin	Douglas (Bruce-Grey)
Andras (Port Arthur)	Breau	Drury
Appolloni (Mrs.)	Cafik	Duclos
Basford	Campagnolo (Mrs.)	Dupras
Bégin (Miss)	Clermont	Fleming
Blais	Cullen	Fox
Blaker	Dawson	
	De Bané	
Gauthier (Ottawa-Vanier)	Lefebvre	Philbrook
Goodale	Loiselle (Chambly)	Railton
Goyer	Lumley	Raines
Holt (Mrs.)	MacFarlane	Savard
Hopkins	McIsaac	Sharp
Joyal	Milne	Smith (Saint-Jean)
Lajoie	Munro (Hamilton East)	Stanbury
Lalonde	Nicholson (Miss)	Stewart (Cochrane)
Lamontagne	Ouellet	Tessier
Lang	Pearsall	Watson
Langlois	Penner	Young—55.
Leblanc (Laurier)		

NAYS

Messrs.

Baker (Grenville-Carleton)	Johnston	Oberle
Clark (Rocky Mountain)	Kempling	Paproski
Diefenbaker	Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre)	Patterson
Fraser	Malone	Pigott (Mrs.)
Halliday	Marshall	Rodriguez
Hargrave	McCain	Saltsman
Huntington	Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich)	Schumacher
		Woolliams
		Yewchuk—23.

● (1640)

Mr. Speaker: I therefore declare the motion carried. The House stands adjourned pursuant to the Standing Order, and to this order just made by the House, until two o'clock on Monday afternoon.

* * *

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Speaker: For the convenience of hon. members, we might take a half minute to explore what the business will be on Monday. I do not know if that would warrant to be done by way of a point of order.

Mr. Blais: Mr. Speaker, I will be pleased to do that. On Monday we will be proceeding with Bill C-60 relating to redistribution in northern Ontario.

Mr. Woolliams: Mr. Speaker, when is Bill C-51 coming up for debate?

Mr. Blais: Thereafter, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: This House stands adjourned until Monday at 2 p.m.

At 4.50 p.m. the House adjourned, without question put, pursuant to Standing Order.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Monday, July 18, 1977

The House met at 2 p.m.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

INCOME TAX

SUGGESTION GOVERNMENT NOT PROCEED WITH PROPOSAL TO TAX BENEFITS OF LIFE INSURANCE POLICIES—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Gordon Ritchie (Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a matter of urgent necessity and of some considerable significance relating to the threatened implication of new taxes on the owners of life insurance policies, changes which may affect the tax status of millions of Canadians and of billions of dollars in policy benefits. In view of the fact that the proposal to tax policy savings gains at death amounts to reaching into the grave to tax the results of Canadian productivity and foresight, and in view of the fact that the proposals relating to the tax treatment of policy loans will deprive many average Canadians of a source of accessible and inexpensive financing for family and business needs, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Parry Sound-Muskoka (Mr. Darling):

That this House urge the government not to proceed with those sections of Bill C-56 dealing with the taxation of the life insurance policy owner and the tax treatment of policy loans and loan interest payments.

Mr. Speaker: Presentation of such a motion requires the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

* * *

LABOUR CONDITIONS

DATE OF ESTABLISHMENT OF CANADIAN CENTRE FOR OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Cyril Symes (Sault Ste. Marie): Mr. Speaker, I also rise under the provisions of Standing Order 43 to move a motion which I am sure all hon. members of the House will find agreeable. In view of a recent study which showed that foundry workers at Dominion Foundries and Steel Company have four and a half times the risk of lung cancer as workers in other parts of the plant, and in view of the health hazards in other industries and the lack of progress that is being made in cleaning up the work environment, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Yorkton-Melville (Mr. Nystrom):

That the federal government implement as soon as possible its long promised Canadian Centre for Occupational Safety and Health to help co-ordinate and implement measures to protect workers' health and safety.

Mr. Speaker: Presentation of such a motion for debate pursuant to Standing Order 43 requires the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

* * *

CRIMINAL CODE

SUGGESTED AMENDMENT TO ELIMINATE LOAN SHARKING—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Bill Clarke (Vancouver Quadra): Mr. Speaker, I too rise under the provisions of Standing Order 43 on a matter of urgent and pressing necessity. Since the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs (Mr. Abbott) has announced the withdrawal of that legislative mess known as Bill C-16, the borrowers and depositors protection act, which in fairness he inherited and could not correct even with some 75 proposed amendments, and since there therefore remains unsolved the serious loan sharking problem which continues to cause such concern to police and members of the Standing Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Northumberland-Durham (Mr. Lawrence):

That this House urge the Minister of Justice to introduce amendments to the Criminal Code which would be non-controversial and which would eliminate the practice of loan sharking.

Mr. Speaker: Order. Presentation of such a motion requires unanimous consent. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

* * *

HOUSE OF COMMONS

PROPOSED PRIZE FOR MINISTER OF SUPPLY AND SERVICES—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Ray Hnatyshyn (Saskatoon-Biggar): Mr. Speaker, I, too, rise under the provisions of Standing Order 43 on a matter of urgent and pressing necessity. My motion is prompted by the revelation of the Minister of Supply and Services (Mr. Goyer) that the abortive foray of the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) into July 2 broadcasting caused him to "be looked

Presence in Gallery

upon as a partisan, jaded politician", a very understandable and perceptive insight by the minister. In view of the minister's sentiments that it is unfortunate that politicians are held in such low esteem because it undermines their ability to provide leadership, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Prince George-Peace River (Mr. Oberle):

● (1410)

That this House recommends that the Minister of Supply and Services, in view of his outstanding achievements in the field of political buck passing, be awarded the J. Btlfzkf prize named after Al Capp's cartoon character who lived under the cloud of his own ineptitude.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

* * *

ELECTIONS

SUGGESTION HON. JEAN-LUC PEPIN NOT BE CANDIDATE IN NEXT ELECTION—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Howard Johnston (Okanagan-Kootenay): Mr. Speaker, I rise under the provisions of Standing Order 43 to raise a matter of urgent and pressing necessity arising out of concern for the integrity of the Order of Canada and more particularly for the tradition that it not be awarded to active politicians but be reserved in that field to honour those who, having made worthy contributions, have retired. In order that the House be reassured that the integrity of the order has not been breached, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Esquimalt-Saanich (Mr. Munro):

That the House call upon the Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin, newly appointed Companion of the Order to unequivocally state that he will not be a candidate for a Liberal nomination in any Ottawa constituency nor in any other federal constituency for the next federal election.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

An hon. Member: Who is politicking?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

* * *

HOUSE OF COMMONS

PRESENCE IN GALLERY OF DELEGATION FROM MALAYSIA

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Before commencing the oral question period, I know all hon. members will want to join me in calling attention to the presence in our gallery of a very distinguished parliamentary delegation visiting us from Malaysia, particularly from the state of Sabah, headed by their very distinguished minister of communications and works, the Hon. Guan Sing Lim.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

[Mr. Hnatyshyn.]

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[*English*]

INCOME TAX

SUGGESTED ABANDONMENT OF PROPOSAL TO TAX BENEFITS OF LIFE INSURANCE POLICIES—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Walter Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Finance. In his budget message the minister announced his intention of taxing what is called the savings portion of death benefits received from life insurance policies. In Bill C-56 which will implement these proposals the minister attempted to lessen their full impact by deeming that only the portion of a savings gain which exceeds $10,000 will be added to the income of certain beneficiaries. Considering that no modifications to tax thresholds can disguise the fact that this administration proposes to reverse the trend away from death duties and to reach into the grave to tax survivors at the worst possible time, will the minister tell the House whether he will now abandon this particularly repellent attempt to generate revenues through taxing the results of Canadians' productivity and foresight?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, perhaps I might correct the hon. gentleman. He would know if he examined the Income Tax Act that in cases where income has been deferred during the lifetime of a recipient where he has had the benefit of being exempt from income tax under those circumstances, the law provides that it shall be brought in and it shall be taxed upon the event of his death. This is the case with regard to the capital gains tax as well as a registered retirement savings plan which has not yet matured, and with regard to deferred income, for example, under Canada Savings Bonds.

Under those circumstances, it seemed to us fair that people who have chosen to save by way of life insurance policies, the savings portion, as opposed to other means of savings, should be treated in exactly the same way to the extent that the instrument is the same. On this basis it is fair to observe that this will bring the taxation of that benefit into roughly the same treatment as those of other kinds. I would remind the hon. gentleman that previously the tax had been imposed upon policyholders, but at the corporate level under part XII of the Income Tax Act. It is the replacement of that tax by another tax.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): The changes at the corporate level will require insurance companies to raise premiums, and the taxation by this government will cause hardship to widows and other beneficiaries. It is in effect a taxation reaching into the grave. The minister cannot have it two ways. Is the government considering the briefs which have been sent to it as a result of the fury this has generated in the insurance industry and the concern it has generated among the Canadian population generally, and is the government intending to change Bill C-56 over the summer? There is still some time, since the bill has been deferred.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Speaker, I repeat that this is to treat those who save by way of whole life policies in the same way as people who save by other instruments. It is to put all savers on the same basis. There will be a special benefit for policyholders who are entitled to modest amounts. I acknowledge that the life insurance industry has mounted a very extensive lobby. I think it is fair to point out to the House and to the country that it was the life insurance industry which asked to have part XII changed in order to put whole life policies on the same basis as other saving instruments.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, considering that very few countries in the world tax life insurance benefits, and considering that the Carter commission on taxation recommended against levying death duties—and that is all this is, another form of death duty—can the minister refer the House to any report or study which has recommended the imposition of such measures, and if he cannot, will the government reconsider the second question and consider abandoning what is a retrograde step in the field of death duty taxation, no matter what colour the minister tries to paint it?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman is wrong again. The measures do not tax the death benefits involved in a whole life policy. The death benefit is specifically exempt, and if the hon. member would examine the law, he would find that out. He would also find, however, that the savings that an individual has been able to enjoy tax free throughout his life are brought into taxation, just as all other kinds of savings are at the date of death. I again point out to the hon. gentleman that the part XII tax was brought in as a result of the Carter commission report which recommended that savings of this kind should be treated like savings of every other kind and that they should bear their portion of the taxation.

REASON FOR TREATING LOANS ON INSURANCE POLICIES AS DISTRIBUTION OF INCOME—POSSIBLE REFUNDING OF TAX WHEN LOAN REPAID

Mr. Stan Darling (Parry Sound-Muskoka): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Finance. I note that the minister proposes to treat the amount of a policy loan in excess of premiums paid as a distribution of income. In view of the fact that millions of Canadians borrow from policies for such purposes as sending children to college or meeting emergency expenditures, will the minister tell the House why he proposes to deprive Canadians of a source of inexpensive and easily accessible financing which is not subject to substantial tax penalties?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman might like to read the law or have someone interpret it for him.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Paproski: Your arrogance is showing.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Speaker, I say that to the hon. gentleman because I recognize that he is not a member of the bar and because this is a very difficult and complex measure. I say that in no demeaning sense. To the extent that the amount of an advance under a policy exceeds the aggregate premiums and also to the extent that the $1,000 exemption is now available, it will be taxable. We anticipate that in most cases this will not result in a tax liability.

Mr. Darling: Mr. Speaker, since the minister fails to see the similarity between borrowing on the security of, for example, the family home and borrowing on the security of a life insurance policy, can he tell the House whether he will consider refunding the tax assessed on policy loans once they are repaid?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Speaker, to the extent that there have been advances made on policies, any advances repaid on the policies will be added for the purpose of increasing the amount of aggregate premiums and therefore increasing the ultimate taxable exemption. The difference between an advance on a life insurance policy and any other kind of advance by way of loan is that there is an obligation to pay other kinds of loans back. That is not the case with respect to life insurance policies.

● (1420)

PROPOSAL TO TAX BENEFITS OF LIFE INSURANCE POLICIES—EFFECT ON SMALL BUSINESSES

Mr. Stan Darling (Parry Sound-Muskoka): Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Considering that many small businessmen now borrow on their insurance policies and deduct interest payments on those loans as a legitimate business expense, does the minister not realize that the cumulative effect of the two tax proposals relating to policy loans will be to force small businesses to make an attempt—not necessarily successful—to get financing from other financial institutions at much higher rates of interest? Has he consulted with his colleague the Minister of State (Small Business), to ascertain whether these tax changes are in the interest of the small business sector?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman might want to think about the mathematics of that. The small businessman would go to a banker to borrow at 12 per cent but he can get an advance on his policy at 6 per cent. In other words, the advance on the policy is a substantial benefit now and it seems to us it should be treated as an advance, which it is, and not a loan, which it is not.

* * *

ATOMIC ENERGY OF CANADA LIMITED

DATE MINISTER WAS AWARE OF LOSS

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of Energy,

Mines and Resources. A few days ago I asked the minister when he first learned that AECL had suffered a loss of $130 million on the sale of a nuclear reactor to Argentina. The minister said he only learned of it a couple of weeks ago. In view of the fact that he has frequently told the House that he reorganized the board of directors last November and at that time there were appointed to the board the deputy minister of energy, mines and resources, the deputy minister of finance and the deputy minister of industry, trade and commerce may I ask if his deputy minister, Mr. Gordon MacNabb, reported to him more than a couple of weeks ago that there was a loss of more than $130 million and what was more, a spread between income and expenditures of $290 million and why that was not reported to him more than a few days before the report was tabled?

Hon. Alastair Gillespie (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member would check the record he would see I indicated I had received precise advice on losses or more accurately, the provision for future losses because they are not losses that have yet been incurred this year to the AECL contract with Argentina a couple of weeks ago. It had been brought to my attention that there might be substantial losses with respect to the AECL operation perhaps a couple of weeks before that. It may well have come from the source to which the hon. member has just alluded. As to the precise loss with respect to that contract, my answer stands as it is on the record.

DATE MINISTER OF FINANCE WAS ADVISED OF LOSS

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, may I put a supplementary question to the Minister of Finance. I take it the purpose of appointing the deputy minister of the Department of Finance to the board of directors of AECL was for the purpose of keeping the Department of Finance informed as to the financial position of that Crown corporation. Was the minister advised anytime prior to the tabling of this annual report and financial statement that AECL faced a deficit of $290 million, $130 million of which was due to the sale of the reactor to Argentina?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I have already indicated to the House that I was advised there would be a substantial loss anticipated showing on the books of AECL for the period being covered.

An hon. Member: When?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): As I indicated, it was a matter of some weeks—I cannot be precise—before the tabling. That is the tabling now a week or ten days ago.

SUGGESTION DEPUTY MINISTERS NOT BE APPOINTED TO BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, may I put the final supplementary question to the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources. The purpose of putting busy deputy ministers on the boards of directors of Crown corporations ought to be to keep the government informed on what is going on, yet we find from the answer given today that the ministers were not aware of this until after the annual report was in preparation. Would it not be advisable, instead of putting pro forma representatives on the board of directors, to find people who could give time to this matter and report regularly to the government how they find the state of finances of the various Crown corporations to which they are appointed? Instead of putting deputy ministers on, who are already so busy with the work of their departments that they are unable to discharge adequately the responsibilities for which they were appointed, is it not time to change the method of dealing with this situation?

Hon. Alastair Gillespie (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, with all due respect, I think the hon. member is confusing the role of a director with that of an auditor of a corporation. In this instance the auditor of the corporation is also the Auditor General of Canada. The hon. member should recognize that it is the responsibility of directors to apprise shareholders of the size of a potential loss only when they are sure precisely how large that loss will be, and that is the purpose of the auditor. The auditor signed the statement on June 22; I believe it was submitted to the directors some days after that. Clearly, the directors would be out of order if they were to prejudge the statement of the auditor of the corporation, particularly when he is the Auditor General of Canada.

INFORMATION SUPPLIED MINISTER BY PRESIDENT OF CORPORATION

Miss Flora MacDonald (Kingston and the Islands): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a supplementary question to the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources? My question relates to the testimony the former president of AECL, Mr. Gray, gave before the public accounts committee on February 1, 1977. Telling the committee how well the government was kept informed, at luncheon meetings with deputies of the department or with the minister himself, he said:

I think that AECL and I, personally, did more to keep other government offices advised of what we were doing than any other government office.

When Mr. Gray left the office of president of the board, did that kind of transmittal of information cease and not continue with the new chairman, Mr. Ross Campbell, and the president, Dr. Foster? Is the minister saying he did not receive from the new officers the kind of ongoing information which had been supplied by the former president?

Hon. Alastair Gillespie (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, I am sure luncheons are a useful vehicle for transmitting information, but as far as I am concerned luncheons are not enough.

Miss MacDonald: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I am sure the minister, on occasion, has breakfast and dinner as well. Is the minister saying that the present officers of

AECL including the chairman, Ross Campbell, no longer informs him or his deputy on the continuing basis on which Mr. Gray had supplied this information formerly, whether at luncheon meetings or at any other kind of meetings?

Mr. Gillespie: No, Mr. Speaker, I have had the odd lunch with the director. I have had the odd lunch with Mr. Campbell and Mr. Foster, but I can tell the hon. lady that I have had many, many more formal meetings than luncheon meetings to discuss the affairs of the corporation. I do not just wait for formal meetings. I use the telephone a great deal. There is a good deal of discussion back and forth.

SALE OF REACTOR TO ARGENTINA—PERSON INFORMING MINISTER OF LOSS LEADER POLICY

Miss Flora MacDonald (Kingston and the Islands): A final supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Can the minister say who told him, and when, that it was the policy of AECL to sell a reactor as a loss leader to Argentina. Did Mr. Campbell convey that information to him?

Hon. Alastair Gillespie (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. lady is referring to a comment made by the chairman of the corporation when he said the corporation had sharpened its pencils, taken a major effort to secure a contract in the face of competition from foreign corporations and, in sharpening its pencils in order to get the business, might well have acknowledged it would not make a normal rate of return and that, indeed, there could be a small loss.

Miss MacDonald: Do you call a loss of $130 million small?

Mr. Gillespie: That is the interpretation I placed on Mr. Campbell's comment.

Mr. Paproski: Is $130 million one of your smaller losses?

● (1430)

LA PRADE HEAVY WATER PROJECT—REQUEST FOR ESTIMATE OF TOTAL COST—AMOUNT OF DEBIT ON FOREIGN SALES OF HEAVY WATER

Mr. Allan Lawrence (Northumberland-Durham): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources relating to AECL. I have given him written notice in the hope that I will get some specific answers from him. The AECL at the moment is building a heavy water plant known as La Prade, near Gentilly, Quebec. The annual report tabled by the minister a week ago last Thursday, which strangely enough had not been distributed to the public or the press, indicates that the 1974 total project authorization of $453 million is presently under review. Having had notice of my question, can the minister now tell me the current estimated total capital cost of the La Prade heavy water project in Quebec?

Hon. Alastair Gillespie (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, I have asked the corporation for the figures so that I might be able to provide an answer to the hon. member. It is quite true that he provided notice to my office with respect to this question. I think it important that he get a detailed answer. The corporation has indicated to me that they are not yet in a position to provide the kinds of figures he is seeking. I can give him an undertaking that as soon as they become available to me, I will transmit them to him.

Mr. Lawrence: Mr. Speaker, that is totally unacceptable to me and to every other member of this House. The question was asked not only to elicit information but also to get it on the record so that in case there is some type of coverup later in this House, the minister will be on the record. Certainly, information has reached some of us that the amount will be abhorrent. Can the minister tell us how much the Canadian debit is at the moment with respect to the sale of heavy water overseas? I understand that for this year alone there is a reserve amount of $30 million for a loss with regard to the overseas sale of heavy water. Having tabled the annual report, I am sure the minister will have these figures at his fingertips. Can the minister advise, and eventually I would like the answer in the House, the total loss on the overseas sale of heavy water?

Mr. Gillespie: Going back to the first part of the first question, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member must recognize there has been a very specific escalation in capital costs over the past three years in this country.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Gillespie: If the hon. member is familiar with the situation, he will know about the escalation in the costs of steel, refinery costs—

An hon. Member: Syncrude.

Mr. Gillespie: Even the Syncrude plant. It is for those reasons I want to get as accurate a figure as I can before providing the hon. member with that information.

As to the question about the obligations or the exposure of the corporation with respect of overseas sales of heavy water, if the hon. member will look at the annual report which has been tabled, he will see that $30 million has been provided for future losses of the corporation.

Mr. Lawrence: This year.

Mr. Gillespie: No, Mr. Speaker. The important point is that these are not losses that are being incurred this year. It is provision for future losses, which might take place over a period of five or more years.

Mr. Lawrence: I wonder if we could have assurance from the minister on two grounds. First, will the loss on the La Prade project be greater or lesser than the Argentinian project? Second, if it is greater, who will he have left to fire in AECL for that?

Mr. Gillespie: Mr. Speaker, there is no evidence at the moment that there will be a loss with respect to the La Prade

heavy water plant. There is evidence that there has been an escalation in costs as there have been with respect to all major capital costs in this country over the past three years.

* * *

HOUSING

DATE OF APPROVAL OF ST. LAWRENCE PROJECT IN TORONTO

Miss Aideen Nicholson (Trinity): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of State for Urban Affairs. In view of the July 31 deadline for CMHC approval of the St. Lawrence housing project in Toronto, if work is to commence on October 1, which will create 500 badly needed construction jobs, can the minister or his parliamentary secretary inform the House whether approval will be given before that date?

Mr. Jean-Robert Gauthier (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of State for Urban Affairs): Yes, Mr. Speaker. I am happy to advise the hon. member that last week the minister advised Mayor Crombie that he agreed in principle with the St. Lawrence project which, as the hon. member stated, will create many jobs.

Mr. Paproski: This isn't the late show. Just answer the question.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

* * *

ENERGY

POSSIBILITY OF GASOLINE RATIONING—GOVERNMENT POSITION—ALLEGED LACK OF EFFORT ON CONSERVATION

Mr. Dan McKenzie (Winnipeg South Centre): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources. The minister recently stated that gas rationing is a real possibility in the future and that his department has already prepared rationing legislation. Will the minister inform the House when he will be tabling that rationing legislation and can he give some indication as to when it will be necessary to begin rationing?

Hon. Alastair Gillespie (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, very shortly after the embargo in 1973, work was started to provide a contingency plan for Canada in the event we would not have supplies as a result of the embargo or for other reasons. That work proceeded. When the Emergency Supplies Allocation Board completed its work a year ago, the work was set aside. It has been completed and it can be put into force. It requires an act of this House to do so. I do not intend to table the bill at the present time. Quite clearly, I think it is prudent that we have legislation ready to go and more particulary the system ready to go for the allocation of scarce resources in the event it is needed. However, I hope it never will be.

Mr. McKenzie: As the International Energy Agency cited Canada for below average conservation efforts last year and as the minister has frittered away four years of opportunities during which this country could have made a good start toward self sufficiency, not self reliance, in the late eighties, is the government prepared to admit its responsibility where rationing is imminent?

Mr. Giilespie: Mr. Speaker, as I have already indicated to the hon. member, it is prudent to have a rationing system worked out which has been thoroughly discussed with the members of the industry so that if a rationing system becomes necessary, it can be implemented very quickly. It would be very helpful for the people of Canada and perhaps members on this side of the House if members opposite would take a more positive interest in some of these questions and put forward a few ideas. I cannot recall a time when the Conservative party has been as bankrupt of ideas in the energy field as it is right now.

Mr. McKenzie: I suggest that the minister read the committee meeting minutes as well as speeches made in this House by members of the opposition. We are not the government. They are the government. The IEA has stated that Canada ranks fifteenth out of the 18 member nations. How can the minister say he has an all-out effort with regard to exploration? When will he be giving us his new rules and regulations needed for frontier development?

Mr. Gillespie: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is misleading the House, I assume inadvertently, when he says that Canadian efforts with regard to conservation and the development of an energy policy lag so far behind. If he were to read the transcript, he would find that in almost every area Canada has moved ahead very substantially. The one area where Canada was criticized, and this is the area where the hon. member's party has had so much trouble making up its mind, was that we had continued to keep our price significantly below the world price. I have not heard the hon. member or his colleagues arguing that Canada should raise the price of its oil. Indeed, they have been absolutely silent with regard to this fundamental question on energy policy in this country.

* * *

● (1440)

PENSIONS

PROPOSED INCREASE IN VETERANS AND OLD AGE PENSIONS

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, my question relates to at least two departments of government and I had intended, therefore, to put it to the Prime Minister. In his absence I will address it to the Acting Prime Minister, which will probably be appropriate since the Acting Prime Minister today is the Minister of Finance. Now that the President of the Treasury Board has been able to announce the lifting of the freeze on the salaries of senior civil servants, although he has promised us that in 1977-78 no public ser-

vants will earn more than $62,500, may I ask the Acting Prime Minister whether the government will consider the serious needs of senior citizens and of war veterans and give the green light to the Minister of National Health and Welfare and the Minister of Veterans Affairs to increase the basic amounts of the pensions which come under their jurisdictions?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Acting Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the government has, of course, been continuing to give serious consideration to these matters but I regret I cannot give the green light to the hon. gentleman's request at this point.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): I really have two supplementaries to ask, Mr. Speaker, if I am allowed, but in case I am permitted only one I will direct it to the Minister of Veterans Affairs. Now that it is clear that money is available for some purposes, will the hon. gentleman go all out to win an increase in the basic disability pension and get rid of the wide gap which presently exists?

Hon. Daniel J. MacDonald (Minister of Veterans Affairs): I will do what I have done on previous occasions. I will put forward my best efforts.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Will the Minister of National Health and Welfare do the same?

Mr. Hnatyshyn: That is the most depressing answer we have had yet.

* * *

[*Translation*]

LABOUR RELATIONS

REASON FOR NEXT MEETING OF MINISTER WITH NATIONAL FEDERATION OF TRADE UNIONS

Mr. Pierre Bussières (Portneuf): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Labour. Today's newspapers report that the minister is going to meet the representatives of the Confederation of National Trade Unions. Can the minister give us an indication of the purpose of those meetings?

[*English*]

Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of Labour): Well, Mr. Speaker, there is a meeting planned for the next day or two with leaders of the CSN for discussions along the lines of those conducted with the CLC and the business community concerning the various options the government is considering with respect to a decontrol period. This is the meeting to which the hon. member may be referring.

ENERGY

DISCUSSIONS BETWEEN NEWFOUNDLAND AND QUEBEC ON DEVELOPMENT OF HYDRO PROJECTS IN LABRADOR—POSSIBLE FEDERAL PARTICIPATION

Mr. Jack Marshall (Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources and it relates to the meeting held between the premiers of Quebec and Newfoundland with regard to the development of alternative sources of hydro energy in Labrador. Has the hon. gentleman's department taken any part in these discussions or, if not, has any approach been made by either provincial government for federal participation or financial help?

Hon. Alastair Gillespie (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): There was no federal participation in these discussions nor did I receive a request from either of the provinces that there should be.

Mr. Marshall: Since there is a source of hydro power available on the Lower Churchill and having regard to the energy shortage, would the minister take the initiative by approaching the two premiers to ensure that this development goes ahead in the best interests of the country? He has already offered $340 million to Newfoundland in connection with the development of the Lower Churchill.

Mr. Gillespie: I took that initiative a long, long time ago. I am still waiting to receive from the government of Newfoundland updated information with respect to Gull Island. I am ready to sit down and discuss what I consider to be an asset of national importance, but I need that information, and it lies, right now, with the Newfoundland government.

* * *

IMMIGRATION

JAMES KENNEDY—REASON FOR DEPORTATION ORDER—POSSIBLE EXECUTION OF ORDER PRIOR TO HEARING OF APPEAL

Mr. Bill Clarke (Vancouver Quadra): A question for the Minister of Manpower and Immigration, Mr. Speaker. I recognize it is the minister's duty to carry out the provisions of the Immigration Act but I wish to raise with him today a matter which concerns human rights, one which I brought to his attention three weeks ago. The issue is not specifically James Peter Joseph Kennedy but the principle involved. This man has been held in maximum security in Vancouver, since May 27, nearly two months, now, on the suspicion that he is really someone else, an Irish terrorist, although no criminal charges have been laid in Canada and no public hearing has been held here, and no extradition proceedings have been commenced either against Kennedy or against the other man, McCann. I should like to ask for what reason the deportation order was issued and whether the appeal to the Federal Court, already lodged, will be heard before the order is executed?

Oral Questions

Hon. Bud Cullen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, I have been informed that a person known as James Kennedy was ordered deported on July 14, 1977 for being a person who had been convicted of crimes involving moral turpitude. Counsel for the person known as James Kennedy have commenced legal proceedings before the Federal Court. My officials are studying the implications of these proceedings as they relate to the execution of a deportation order.

Mr. Clarke: When will Mr. Kennedy be deported and to what country—or will he become another General Quang?

Mr. Cullen: No, I think one clunker is enough, Mr. Speaker. I understand that this gentleman would be deported to Northern Ireland and the time is to be determined following the investigations which our counsel are making into the implications of his filing an appeal notwithstanding that a deportation order is ready to be put into effect.

* * *

REGIONAL ECONOMIC EXPANSION

AGREEMENT WITH BRITISH COLUMBIA—POSIBILITY OF GUARANTEE WITH RESPECT TO SOCIO-ECONOMIC EFFECTS OF PIPELINE

Mr. F. Oberle (Prince George-Peace River): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion. It concerns the discussions held, and agreement signed, with the Province of British Columbia recently. I should like to ask the minister whether there was any reference in these discussions or in the agreement to the very special socio-economic implications to Northeast British Columbia which would accompany the construction of a pipeline. I should like to ask the government, specifically, whether it is the intention to require from the pipeline companies some kind of guarantee with respect to socio-economic effects both while the line is being constructed and afterward.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Marcel Lessard (Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): Mr. Speaker, obviously during our negotiations and discussions the possibility of building a pipeline was also considered, but we really could not, at that stage, look into the details of its social and economic implications, so that, in fact the agreements signed at that time do not concern that project as such. Naturally, when a decision has been announced and construction starts, the Department of Regional Economic Expansion, as well as the British Columbia department of economic development can pursue negotiations further with a view to seeing how those agreements can be of benefit to the regions concerned.

[*English*]

ENERGY

NORTHERN PIPELINE—POSSIBILITY OF GUARANTEE BY COMPANY TO BRITISH COLUMBIA WITH RESPECT TO SOCIO-ECONOMIC IMPACT

Mr. F. Oberle (Prince George-Peace River): A supplementary question to the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources. Since the National Energy Board has recommended that up to $200 million should be deposited to deal with the socio-economic impact on the Yukon Territory, is it the intention of the minister to require that companies which would be involved should meet a similar requirement with respect to areas of northeast British Columbia through which the pipeline would be passing, since those areas are just as sensitive in economic and in environmental terms as is the Yukon?

Hon. Alastair Gillespie (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): The whole question of the nature of the decision to be made will, of course, have to await the outcome of a debate in this House which I believe has been set for early in August. That is the time when all members can make their input. The government will then make its decision on the basis of that input and of other evidence before it, sometime in August. That is our plan. We shall also be ready to consider further representations if they are put forward on this question during that period.

* * *

POST OFFICE

SALE OF HOUSEHOLD DIRECTORIES TO COMMERCIAL INTERESTS—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Howard Johnston (Okanagan-Kootenay): Mr. Speaker, my question is addressed to the Acting Postmaster General. Can the hon. gentleman tell us whether the review of the Post Office practice of selling household directories to commercial interests has been completed and, if so, what decision has been made in this regard?

* * *

● (1450)

HISTORIC SITES AND MONUMENTS BOARD

FAILURE OF BOARD TO DESIGNATE HOME OF MR. DIEFENBAKER—REQUEST FOR REVIEW

Mr. Perrin Beatty (Wellington-Grey-Dufferin-Waterloo): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development. In view of the fact that millions of Canadians would like to see the government take appropriate action to honour a distinguished former prime minister, the right hon. member for Prince Albert, is the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development prepared to reconsider his unwillingness to intervene with the National Historic Sites and Monuments Board concerning their refusal to designate the home in Neustadt, Ontario, which was the birthplace of the

right hon. gentleman, as a national historic site as long as the right hon. gentleman is still alive? I ask this question in view of the fact that the home is in private hands and both the local council and the county council are very anxious to see this action taken.

Hon. Warren Allmand (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned before, the Historic Sites and Monuments Board is an independent commission which deals with these matters. It was set up in that way to make decisions in a non-partisan way. At the present time, its policy is not to recognize living politicians in that way; but I have asked them to review that policy, and I am awaiting that review.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: I hear they are buying Mr. Pepin's house.

* * *

CUSTOMS

LACK OF PERSONNEL TO GIVE CLEARANCE TO CHARTER FLIGHTS AT SYDNEY—GOVERNMENT ACTION

Mr. Robert Muir (Cape Breton-The Sydneys): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of National Revenue in charge of customs. I wish to thank the hon. lady for sending me a report on the subject matter of my question, although regrettably it is not encouraging. Several international charter flights have been prevented from landing at the Sydney airport, supposedly because of inadequate customs clearance facilities, according to certain bureaucrats in her department. Indeed one flight was forced, after landing at Sydney, to then fly to Halifax for customs clearance before returning to Sydney. Because this new regulation is creating great hardship and cost, not only to those who wish to visit Cape Breton island as tourists, but is hindering our tourist industry, would the minister be good enough to have this situation investigated further in order to have this problem corrected? I am informed that there are adequate facilities and manpower to take care of these charter flights?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Monique Bégin (Minister of National Revenue): Mr. Speaker, I can assure the hon. member that since I am responsible for a department providing services, I shall look further into the situation. I ask him to provide me personally with the details on the incident to which he referred. I should, however, like to take this opportunity to correct the impression he gave about the bureaucrats and existing facilities and so on. He knows full well that Parliament and the Canadian people have to keep some control over expenditures; we made arrangements for Sydney to accommodate certain chartered flights, but the airport is not classified as an international airport.

[*English*]

I wish him an international airport at Sydney one day, but we have not reached that point yet.

Mr. Muir: Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. lady for her answer; but in view of the fact that customs have been clearing international flights at this airport for many, many years, the magic number of 42 passengers comes up. Where was this decided? How was it decided that 42 passengers is the limit which can be cleared? In fact, a Concorde landed at that airport and they cleared some people there. Therefore, it would be in the interests of creating more jobs, which are badly needed on Cape Breton Island, if we could hire some more customs officials to clear some people there as they land.

Miss Bégin: Mr. Speaker, I will transmit this request to the Treasury Board.

* * *

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

SUGGESTED DENIAL OF BENEFITS TO THOSE WHO REFUSE TO TAKE JOBS

Mrs. Simma Holt (Vancouver-Kingsway): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Manpower and Immigration. In view of the fact that a new extended CARE hospital has officially opened at the medical science centre at the University of British Columbia, but two-thirds of it must remain closed to a long waiting group of elderly sick while 200 nurses receive unemployment insurance benefits, and since the reasons given for their refusal to take work violates UIC regulations, will the minister consider moving to discontinue benefits of those who refuse to take the jobs available?

Hon. Bud Cullen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, I believe the situation is that some benefits have been disallowed as a result of some nurses refusing to take these particular jobs. It strikes me this is a situation, given a surplus of nurses, where we can use the immortal words of Horace Greely: "Go west, young woman", as well as some young men who have taken up this respected profession.

* * *

LABOUR CONDITIONS

DATE OF ESTABLISHMENT OF CENTRE FOR OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH—PROVINCIAL PARTICIPATION

Mr. Cyril Symes (Sault Ste. Marie): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed the Minister of Labour. In view of the recent study which showed that foundry workers at Dominion Foundries and Steel Company have 4½ times the risk of lung cancer as workers in other parts of the plant, and in view of the health hazards in other industries as well and the lack of progress that is being made in cleaning up the work environment, I wonder if the minister can tell us when we can expect the establishment of the long promised Canadian centre for occupational safety and health to help co-ordinate and implement measures to protect workers' health and safety?

Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, I would hope by the end of this year, or at the very latest, the early part of next year. I should add that the interest of the hon. member is appreciated. By and large, discussions with the provinces have gone very well. They are desirous of participating with this agency, as are many in the business and labour communities.

Mr. Symes: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the minister can inform the House as to whether he has agreement from all provinces to participate in this centre? Because a lot of provincial jurisdiction will be involved, what kind of muscle will this centre have? Will it merely be an advisory kind of body?

Mr. Munro (Hamilton East): Mr. Speaker, as I indicated, it is not an invasion in any sense of the word on provincial jurisdiction. In a sense we have a responsibility to our own workers in federal jurisdiction. Because of substantial resources and expertise within the various government departments already devoted to this subject, we are proposing that they be brought together and co-ordinated through one institute which can marshall the resources, the research and the expertise necessary to stay on top of new and exotic noxious substances. They are always being introduced as new technology comes into place within the manufacturing industries and industry in general. In that sense, we are trying to stay contemporaneous with new developments in the work place and to protect the workers against harmful effects to which the hon. member has just referred.

To reiterate, there is no invasion on provincial jurisdiction. I have talked with ministers of some provinces and my officials have talked with them as well. The ministers to whom I have spoken have welcomed this initiative very much. If it has the participation of the provinces under the aegis of the federal government—business, labour and some type of tripartite apparatus—then their findings will have tremendous political momentum behind them for implementation and for acceptance within the general community.

* * *

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

SKAGIT VALLEY, BRITISH COLUMBIA—ACTION TO ENSURE NO FLOODING—POSSIBLE REVIEW OF AGREEMENT TO RAISE ROSS DAM

Mr. Donald W. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Acting Secretary of State for External Affairs. I am wondering if he can tell us what action the government is taking to ensure that the Skagit Valley in Canadian territory is not flooded, as a result of a decision by Seattle Light and Power to raise the Ross Dam in the State of Washington?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Acting Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I should be glad to make inquiries on this and communicate directly with the hon. gentleman.

[Mr. Symes.]

Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): Mr. Speaker, I should like to have the answer on the record. While the minister is inquiring, I wonder if he could inquire also as to whether the government can give the assurance that it supports the government of British Columbia in its efforts to have a second look at the International Joint Commission agreement under which the Ross Dam was to have been raised, as underlying this present dispute?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Speaker, I would be glad to make that inquiry as well.

* * *

ANTI-INFLATION PROGRAM

DATE OF STATEMENT ON DECONTROL

Mr. Sinclair Stevens (York-Simcoe): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Finance. As the minister has indicated on several occasions that he will be making a statement before the end of July with respect to the decontrol phase the government might be considering, could he indicate today more definitively when that statement will be made?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, tomorrow I will go to see my counterparts in the Atlantic provinces to discuss their approach to decontrol. On Wednesday I will see the government of Quebec, which will mean by that time that we will have consulted with all ten of the provinces. I anticipate bringing this matter before my colleagues in cabinet toward the end of the month. Naturally it will depend on the outcome of the cabinet decision, but I hope to be able to make it not later than the departure of cabinet for the summer at the end of the first week of August.

* * *

● (1500)

THE CANADIAN ECONOMY

INFLATION—FACTORS WHICH WILL SLOW RATE OF INCREASE

Mr. Sinclair Stevens (York-Simcoe): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question for the Minister of Finance. As prices are increasing at an annual rate of 10 per cent over the first six months of this year, can the minister tell the House what factors he expects will slow this very rapid inflation; and in general can he tell the House whether he still sees the "underlying trend to lower inflation" that he saw in his last budget?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): In general, Mr. Speaker, yes. The fact is, of course, that in the first six months of this year food prices increased because of the increase in the cost of imported food. We feel that those costs by now have been absorbed into the system, indeed that Canadian foodstuffs will be coming into the consumer market within the next few weeks and that we should see a reduction on that side. I would have to recognize, on the other hand, that

the further increase in petroleum and natural gas prices later in the year will be a countervailing factor.

* * *

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Privy Council the government's intentions regarding business for today?

Mr. Goodale: Mr. Speaker, it is our intention to begin this afternoon, as the first order of business, third reading of Bill C-51. As for items of business to be proceeded with thereafter, I should like to reserve the opportunity to consult with hon. gentlemen across the way, and I will be more specific about that later in the day.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I presume there is no difficulty in the government ranks in terms of votes today if we finish proceedings?

Mr. Goodale: That is correct presumption, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Cullen: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, my ever vigilant parliamentary secretary, the hon. member for Gamelin, has pointed out to me that in answer to a question from the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra I inadvertently said that a person known as Kennedy would be deported to Northern Ireland. That should, of course, be the Republic of Ireland.

Mr. Johnston: Mr. Speaker, it is rarely that I rise on a point of order arising out of the question period, but having given notice to the Postmaster General of my intention to ask a question, and knowing that on Friday afternoon things fell apart over there rather badly, but not realizing the decay had reached the point that it seems to have reached today—I am very happy to know that one parliamentary secretary is awake in the House—having checked the list, I see that there is a parliamentary secretary for the Postmaster General, the hon. member for Saint-Jean. My question was straightforward and simple. I understood that the Postmaster General, who I realize has to be away today, was prepared to answer it, and I cannot understand the complete and utter silence with which my question was met.

Mr. Smith (Saint-Jean): Mr. Speaker, I understood the question to be addressed to the acting minister; therefore, I did not rise at once. However, I missed my chance. The information that I have is that a decision has been taken, although I do not have a breakdown. I will gladly try to get an answer tomorrow for the hon. member.

Order Paper Questions

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, the following questions will be answered today: 1,404, 1,405, 1,645, 1,947 and 2,760.

[*Text*]

APEC'S FIFTH REVIEW (1971)

Question No. 1,404—**Mr. MacDonald (Egmont):**

1. Is (a) DREE (b) the Department of Finance (c) the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce aware that APEC's Fifth Review (1971) states that the richer provinces "continue and expand their own industrial incentives programs that lessen the effectiveness of the programs pursued in the poorer provinces"?

2. Do the Departments agree with this observation made by APEC and, if not, for what reason?

3. Have any of the Departments taken any initiative in response to this situation and, if so, with what results?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): In so far as the Department of Regional Economic Expansion is concerned: 1. Yes.

2. DREE has no evidence that incentive programs pursued by the wealthier provinces have had detrimental effects on its own activities in support of industrial development in the poorer provinces under the Regional Development Incentives Act.

3. See answer to part 2.

In so far as the Department of Finance is concerned: 1. Yes.

2. The department could agree with APEC's observation as a reasonable hypothesis, though not as a statement of demonstrated fact. As the same APEC review noted, evidence is lacking on the true impact of provincial development programs and on the actual effect of individual provincial programs on each other. The review recognized specifically that "quantitative and qualitative comparisons are difficult because of varying emphasis of activity for industrial development in the provinces, frequent changes in individual development in the provinces, frequent changes in individual provincial development programs, and the lack of data".

3. The department has not taken any initiative of the type mentioned.

In so far as the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce is concerned: 1. Yes.

2. The department has no evidence that incentive programs pursued by the wealthier provinces have had detrimental effects on its own activities in support of industrial development in the poorer provinces. Because departmental programs are largely in the form of grants and provincial programs

largely in the form of loans, assistance, in fact, is often complementary.

3. See answer to part 2.

PRODUCTION COSTS IN SECONDARY SECTORS

Question No. 1,405—**Mr. MacDonald (Egmont):**

1. Do (a) DREE (b) the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce accept the viewpoint that in general the costs of production in the secondary sector are higher in the Atlantic Region than in Ontario?

2. For the industries (a) food and beverages (b) wood products (c) paper and allied (d) primary metal (e) metal fabricating (f) machinery (g) chemical and allied (h) textiles and clothing (i) electrical products (j) transport equipment (k) furniture and fixtures (l) printing and publishing, which factors or costs of production (i) financing and financial services (ii) land (iii) buildings (iv) machinery and equipment (v) energy (vi) transport of inputs (vii) tariff on inputs (viii) material inputs (ix) wages to labour (x) management and other professional salaries and fees (xi) fringe benefits for employees (xii) profits (xiii) transport of product to market (xiv) marketing (xv) local taxes (xvi) provincial taxes (xvii) federal taxes, are significantly higher or lower than those in Ontario and by what percentage?

3. As an average over the past five years for the secondary sector for (a) Atlantic (b) Quebec (c) Ontario (d) West, what percentage of (i) financing (ii) material inputs (iii) machinery and equipment came from within the region?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): I am informed by the Departments of Industry, Trade and Commerce and Regional Economic Expansion as follows: 1. (a) and (b) See answer to part 2.

2. The answer to this question would vary from one firm to another depending on many factors, including type of product, specific location, markets, collective agreement provisions and corporate structure. To obtain the data requested would entail a detailed survey of all firms in the industries specified. The costs of such a survey, and the work that would have to be carried out by reporting firms, is considered to be prohibitive. Specific investigations are undertaken from time to time as may be necessary, particularly as part of the administration of the regional development incentives program.

3. The departments do not have the data required to answer this question.

LABRADOR LINERBOARD MILL LIMITED

Question No. 1,645—**Mr. Marshall:**

1. Has the Province of Newfoundland approached the government to assist in overcoming the problems in marketing being experienced by Labrador Linerboard Mill Limited in Stephenville, Newfoundland, through the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce, the Department of Regional Economic Expansion or the Department of External Affairs?

2. Has any approach been made to the Export Development Corporation or to CIDA, to help explore markets for linerboard produced at the Labrador Linerboard Mill by the Province of Newfoundland?

3. (a) What is the productive capacity of linerboard in Canada (b) what are the names of the mills producing linerboard (c) how much of it is sold to foreign and domestic markets and to which markets?

4. Is Canada able to meet the demand of foreign and domestic markets for linerboard?

5. Has there been any follow up by officials of the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce after meeting with the hon. member for Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe, expressing concern over the deterioration of the Labrador Linerboard Mill?

[Mr. Goodale.]

6. As a result of the tour of Trade Commissioners to Canada in December 1976 from seven European posts, what opportunities were elicited to and what information was given as to how Canadian businessmen could take advantage of opportunities in their countries?

7. Did the series of seminars include Eastern Canada to provide the resources available in that part of the country and, if not, for what reason?

8. (a) Who were the individual businessmen who met with the Trade Commissioners on December 7 and 8, 1976 (b) did any of them represent the fishing, mining or pulp and paper industry and, if not, for what reason?

9. Were interest free loans or grants provided to foreign countries through the Export Development Corporation or CIDA or loan specialists for the establishment of pulp and paper mills or logging industries and, if so (a) in what amount (b) for what reason (c) did the government consider the effect on the Canadian market potential of such loans?

10. What are the names of pulp and paper mills coming on stream in foreign countries on whom Canada now depends for pulp and paper markets?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): I am informed by the Departments of Industry, Trade and Commerce and External Affairs as follows: 1. The province of Newfoundland did approach the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce to assist in overcoming the problems being experienced by Labrador Linerboard Limited in marketing kraft linerboard to world markets. Officials have supplied data on kraft linerboard exports, world trading patterns and pricing and current trade enquiries received through trade commissioners on a continuing basis.

2. No.

3. (a) The potential production capacity of kraft linerboard in Canada is some 1.3 million short tons. (b) The name of mills producing kraft linerboard in Canada are: Labrador Linerboard Limited (Stephenville, Newfoundland); Minas Basis Pulp and Power Limited (Hansport, Nova Scotia); Consolidated Bathurst Limited (New Richmond, Quebec); Canadian International Paper Company (La Tuque, Quebec); Domtar Limited (Red Rock, Ontario); Crown Zellerbach (Elk Falls, British Columbia); MacMillan Bloedel Limited (Port Alberni, British Columbia); Eurocan Pulp and Paper Company Limited (Kitimat, British Columbia). (c) About 65 percent of Canadian kraft linerboard shipments (excluding recycled liner) is sold in the domestic market. During 1976 domestic shipments of kraft linerboard were some 70 percent of total mill shipments; the balance was exported. The approximate percentage distribution of domestic kraft linerboard shipments to the various regions of Canada is as follows: Atlantic provinces (5 percent; Quebec (25 percent); Ontario (50 percent); prairies/British Columbia (20 percent).

The major export market for Canadian kraft linerboard is western Europe which, during the 1973-75 period, accounted for 70-76 percent of total export shipments; this percentage increased to 83 percent in 1976. Central American/Caribbean area accounts for some 10 percent of total Canadian kraft linerboard export shipments. Exports to the United States, the world's largest exporter of linerboard, are minimal. The trading pattern of kraft linerboard exports from Canada to other world areas is inconsistent and fluctuates extensively between countries.

4. Canada has the potential production capacity of kraft linerboard to meet the demand of the domestic market and to increase exports.

5. In addition to the follow-up referred to in (1) above, a packaging paper and board mission from Italy (including a representative of Italian unbleached kraft linerboard converters) has been invited by the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce to visit Canada in April of this year. Arrangements are being made to meet Labrador Linerboard representatives in Newfoundland.

6. The purpose of the seminars was to inform the Canadian business community of market opportunities in eastern Europe by drawing upon the experince gained by the trade commissioners at their posts abroad and the various five-year development plans published by the countries to which they are accredited. Opportunities were identified for the supply of machinery and equipment required for large scale development projects in the forestry, mining and oil and gas sectors as well as for agricultural machinery and grain handling equipment, engineering and design services, electronic equipment, and special vehicles. In their presentations, the trade commissioners discussed methods of doing business in eastern European countries, the role of the foreign trade organizations, and how they could be of assistance to Canadian businessmen by establishing and maintaining contact with officials in the state agencies responsible for decisions regarding the purchase of foreign goods and services.

7. The seminars concentrated on areas of the country where manufacturing capabilities correspond to eastern European import requirements. The Atlantic provinces were not included owing to the limited number of firms located there whose products coincided with eastern European interests. Since the volume, value and composition of imports into eastern European countries are controlled by the state, import licenses are only authorized for goods and services which are not available from domestic or other eastern European sources and which have a direct relationship to the achievement of the goals established under the various economic development plans. However, trade commissioners are aware of those firms in the Atlantic provinces offering goods and services for which there is a demand in eastern Europe and will continue to keep in direct touch with these firms in order to assist them in their marketing efforts vis-à-vis eastern Europe. The department's regional offices in the Atlantic provinces are also on a constant lookout for additional firms manufacturing products which correspond to eastern European import requirements. Other seminars have recently been held in the Atlantic provinces from regions where the market potential is considered promising. On April 2, 1976, a group of trade commissioners from western Europe held a seminar in Halifax. Unfortunately a seminar scheduled for St. John's, Newfoundland had to be cancelled due to bad weather. Similarly, visiting trade commissioners from South East Asia held seminars in Saint John, Fredericton, and Halifax June 17 and 18, 1976.

8. (a) A total fo 194 interviews with individual businessmen were conducted on December 7 and 8. Since firms approaching the department for assistance do so on the basis of confidentiality, it would be inappropriate to publish their names. (b) No. According to our records no representatives of these industries made application for interviews on these dates. A representative of these industries did however attend the seminar on December 6.

9. (a) $3,449,000—loan (b) To establish a mechanized logging system in the Sinharaja Forest in Sri Lanka. (c) The Canadian export potential for wood products to Sri Lanka on commercial terms has been virtually non-existent, as Canada and Sri Lanka have had no significant trade relationship outside of the development assistance program. The objective of the mechanized logging project was to encourage substitution for imports of plywood for the manufacturing of tea chests which would increase the profits from sales of tea, Sri Lanka's most important export product.

10. For 1977 there are no new pulp and paper mills coming on stream in the United States, western Europe and Japan, which are the major markets for Canadian pulp and paper products. There are a number of additions to existing pulp and paper mills that will be increasing production capacity for the 1977/1978 period. According to trade sources, new pulp and paper mill projects have been announced in the United States, western Europe and Japan by: 1. Alabama River Pulp Company (Parsons and Whittemore Inc.—U.S.) 2. North Pacific Paper Company (Weyerhauser Company—U.S.) 3. Feldmuhle, Haindle and PWA (consortium between Feldmuhle AG, Haindl Papier GMBH and Papierwerke Waldhof—Aschaffenburg AG—Federal Republic of Germany).

SEWAGE TREATMENT PROJECTS, LAVAL, QUEBEC

Question No. 1,947—**Mr. Roy (Laval):**

1. During the fiscal year ending March 31 (a) 1974 (b) 1975 (c) 1976, were any projects undertaken in the City of Laval (sewers, aqueducts, rain-water drains) under the various financing and subsidization programmes of CMHC and, if so (i) what was the nature of these projects (ii) who obtained the funds or subsidies, and in what amount?

2. What programmes are planned for 1977-78?

Hon. André Ouellet (Minister of State for Urban Affairs): I am advised as follows by Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation. 1. The following loans were approved to the city of Laval under section 51 of the National Housing Act, in the period 1974-76, to assist in financing the construction of trunk sewers and sewage treatment plant:

	1974		1975		1976	
	Loans	$000	Loans	$000	Loans	$000
Sewer and pumping stations	2	909	—	—	—	—
Trunk sewers	3	170	—	—	2	8,210
Combined sewers	2	282	—	—	—	—
Storm sewers	—	—	—	—	1	154
Sewage treatment	—	—	—	—	1	94

2. CMHC has been advised that the city of Laval is planning the following works with the related estimated costs, for 1977-78: 1977, water supply project, $2,250,000; combined

sewers, $9,035,000; storm sewers, $2,264,000. 1978, water supply project, $549,000; combined sewers, $6,035,000; storm sewers, $250,000.

GOVERNMENT SUBSIDIZED INDUSTRIES

Question No. 2,760—**Mr. Marshall:**

1. What industries are being subsidized by the government as a result of economic failure and, in each case (a) what type of subsidy is being provided and for what reason was it granted (b) what is the annual amount?

2. What industries have been provided with support facilities, due to their lack of financing to provide the facilities themselves and, in each case, what are the actual facilities that were provided?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): I am informed by the Departments of Regional Economic Expansion and Industry, Trade and Commerce as follows: 1. The Department of Regional Economic Expansion does not subsidize industries as a result of economic failure. It does, however, provide incentives under the Regional Development Incentives program for the establishment, expansion or modernization of facilities which will make a significant contribution to economic expansion and social adjustment within designated regions. There are no industries being subsidized by the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce as a result of economic failure. The programs administered by the department are available only to companies with a financially viable prospect in order to strengthen the Canadian industrial base and to expand Canadian exports.

2. The following industries have been provided with financial assistance for support facilities which would not otherwise have been provided: (a) Book Publishing; In 1974, the department assisted the book publishing industry in creating an international annual trade fair in Montreal by providing display stands worth $500,000. (b) Textile, tanning, garment, footwear, and retail industries; The Canadian Colour and Fashion Trend Service was created in 1975 to gather information to enable Canadian manufacturers to anticipate consumers demand in both the domestic and international markets. (c) Footwear and Leather; In 1976, the Footwear and Leather Institute of Canada was created to assist the leather and footwear industries in acquiring highly specialized services in the areas of marketing, manufacturing, human resources and financial administration in order to improve the competitive capabilities of the manufacturers. The organizations listed in (b) and (c) above are administered by industry representatives. Since it is forecasted that these organizations will become self-sufficient, government involvement is temporary and limited to the formative years.

* * *

[*English*]

QUESTION PASSED AS ORDER FOR RETURN

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, if question No. 2,208 could be made an order for return, that return would be tabled immediately. Once again, the reason for answering in this way is the lengthy and detailed nature of the answer.

Mr. Speaker: Is that agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

[*Text*]

NATURAL GAS AND ELECTRICITY EXPORTS

Question No. 2,208—**Mr. Gauthier (Roberval):**

1. For each year 1970 to date, how much (a) oil (b) natural gas was exported and, in each case (i) to which country (ii) at what price?

2. For each year 1970 to date, how much (a) oil (b) natural gas was imported and, in each case (i) from which country (ii) at what price?

3. Do the provinces export electricity and, if so (a) which provinces (b) what was their production in each case (c) how much was exported (i) by province (ii) totally?

Return tabled.

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker: Shall the remaining questions be allowed to stand?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

CRIMINAL LAW AMENDMENT ACT, 1977

AMENDMENTS TO CRIMINAL CODE

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Justice) moved that Bill C-51, to amend the Criminal Code, the Customs Tariff, the Parole Act, the Penitentiary Act and the Prisons and Reformatories Act, be read the third time and do pass.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I had a long, detailed and definitive speech on the subject of this bill, but I think that it would be wise in the circumstances not to give it—

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Basford: —because I detect through the usual conversations that there is a great willingness to have this matter brought to a vote this afternoon, and I certainly appreciate that. We are, by way of third reading, coming to the end of a very long road in terms of discussion of this bill, gun control, wiretapping, changes to the Parole Act and other matters. It has been a road that has been marked, in the very best traditions of parliamentary democracy in a free society, with very vigorous debate, sometimes acrimonious debate, certainly a debate that brought out differences relating to the issues.

However, in the best traditions of parliamentary democracy, the time has come to end that debate, to take a vote and decide on the issues in the bill. In doing so, I want to pay tribute to the members of the justice and legal affairs committee who in

the last couple of months have dealt with four bills put forward in my name in addition to their work on the penitentiary sub-committee of that committee. All the members of that committee, chaired by the hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville (Mr. MacGuigan), including the official critics, especially the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams) and the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Leggatt), have worked hard. I want to thank the members of the committee, and particularly those two spokesmen, for their work on the committee and for their constructive willingness to allow parliament in the best possible way to make progress, while objecting strenuously to features of the bill and points of policy.

I want to express my thanks to all those organizations which during the course of Bill C-83 and this bill took the time to make representations to the committee. Many representations were also made to me and to other members of the House, many of whom, at great effort and sometimes at great cost to themselves, volunteered their knowledge and expertise both to me and my advisers. I include the Canadian Association of Chiefs of Police, the Canadian Wildlife Federation, Mr. Byrnart, Colonel Nicholson and other organizations who have taken an interest in this legislation.

Following upon comments in the media, while they are not generally the subject of plaudits from politicians in any quarter of this House, I should like to express my thanks to the many editorialists across the country who have taken a very deep interest in the matter of gun control and electronic surveillance, and who in that way made a contribution to this debate.

● (1510)

The sections of the bill relating to gun control deal with what I regard are the two essential purposes of the gun control legislation: to reduce the incidence of murders, accidents and suicides caused by guns, by a system of screening those purchasing guns and by a system of increasing the standard of care relating to the sale, disposition, storage and use of guns, without at the same time unduly interfering with what in this country is often the necessity of carrying a gun, for example, by the native people or the northern people who use guns as a way of life, and by people who use guns in a responsible and competent way as part of a sport or recreation. The two objectives must be to endeavour to reduce the number of incidents involving guns, without affecting the position of those in our society who require guns.

I will mention one riding only because it is one in which I have done some hunting, namely, the riding of Comox-Alberni. The hon. member representing the riding has taken a deep interest in both Bill C-83 and this bill and recognized at an early date that the measures have to meet two criteria; first, that they be effective in reducing gun incidents and, second, that they do not interfere with responsible sporting and food gathering activities. That is a riding that I know well as having within it many fine sportsmen and people who come to the area from other parts of Canada or from the United States for purposes of hunting. The hon. member recognized those two fundamental principles of gun control and has been very helpful to me and to the government in advancing the proposals to this date.

There are a number of things that have to be done in the future. Obviously, one is that the bill must be dealt with in the other place. Secondly, as I undertook to the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs, we will establish the national advisory committee on firearms safety, made up of the chief provincial licensing officers, in order to provide consistency and co-ordination in the provincial application of the law, but also consisting of those interested in gun sports who have knowledge and expertise to contribute. I hope the committee will be established very quickly in order that the regulations which have to be dealt with under the legislation can be dealt with by the national advisory committee to ensure that they are sound. I would point to the provision of the bill which allows provincial attorneys general to either operate the acquisition certificate system themselves or to attach the requirements to their gun safety or hunting programs.

I hope that in future the wildlife groups and the gun clubs can be active, with the support of the government of Canada—both my department and that of the Solicitor General (Mr. Fox)—in working with the provincial attorneys general to encourage the further development of competence programs so that competence may be attached as a precondition to the issuance of a federal acquisition certificate. That is an objective which the Canadian Wildlife Federation and many others have worked for very hard. I hope that with the passage of Bill C-51 we will have provided a statutory mechanism which will encourage the program in the provinces so that we will know at some time in the future that people with guns do not have criminal records involving violence, and that they are competent in the handling of guns and have passed a course in gun safety training.

We will be organizing at some time in the future an amnesty or recall program which is designed, not to take guns away from those who still want them but to recall unwanted guns. This has been tried on an experimental basis in a few communities in this and other countries, with some success.

With regard to proclamation, it would be my hope that, subject to the bill being dealt with by the Senate—I think I should make this clear to the House—the prohibition and the new offence sections, in which the committee took a great interest, could be proclaimed shortly after passage of the legislation. However, the acquisition certificate system obviously will take some time to establish. To do it too quickly would cause problems in administration, in public information, and confusion among hunters and dealers. Therefore, it is my objective to declare the prohibition and new offence sections as quickly as possible and to work toward the implementation of the acquisition certificate program in mid-1978 after extensive consultations are held with the provinces.

I could go on and give a long description of those sections of the bill relating to electronic surveillance, and to other aspects of the bill, but I think the House has debated this bill and its

predecessor at great length. Extensive hearings have been held, both on this bill and its predecessor, by the committee on justice and legal affairs, and I think the issues are clearly understood. However, I say to the House, and to members of the media who have taken an active interest in those aspects relating to electronic surveillance, that extensive amendments to the bill were made in the committee on justice and legal affairs in seeking a proper balance which must exist between the civil rights of people and the right of society to protect itself. That was the objective of the committee, and I think, with respect, the committee has met those two objectives.

Because of the amendments made in committee, we have an improved law relating to electronic surveillance which has a number of safeguards built into it and which, at the same time, provides additional measures to law enforcement authorities to deal more effectively than in the past with organized crime. Electronic surveillance has been a controversial issue every time it has been dealt with by the House, and that is how it should be. When the legislation was first passed in 1974, the government undertook that upon passage they would monitor its operation for the next year to assess the implications of new legislation. I think I should reiterate the same pledge today. If this legislation is passed and these changes are made, there is need for me to establish a committee made up not only of provincial authorities, either police or Crown officers, but involving, also, eminent citizens from non-governmental sectors to assess and monitor the operation of the law and to make recommendations to the Solicitor General and to me on how the law operates and what, if any, changes should be made in the future. We want to monitor the operation of these changes from the point of view of their effectiveness in combating crime and their effectiveness in protecting the human rights and civil liberties of Canadian citizens.

● (1520)

I have cut down my remarks very measurably because I think there is a willingness in the House to deal with this issue this afternoon. This bill and this whole subject has been a matter of intense examination and discussion in this House, and I think there is a willingness, which I certainly share, to acknowledge that we have come to the end of this long debate and that we should deal with this question by way of a vote this afternoon.

Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Calgary North): Mr. Speaker, we have come to the end of a very lengthy debate on these amendments to the Criminal Code. As I said with regard to Bill C-83, and as I said at second reading of Bill C-51, I cannot comprehend why the minister insists on linking together various distinct matters even though they fall under the Criminal Code.

Before referring to two or three particular matters, I would like to review what is in this bill. The bill deals with firearms control, commonly called gun control. It deals with electronic surveillance; in other words, wiretapping or, more clearly, invasion of privacy. Under this bill the authorities will be able to wiretap our telephones, bug our offices and bug our homes and our cars. This legislation also deals with dangerous offenders and offenders formerly known as habitual offenders. It deals with people repeatedly convicted of such things as sex offences, which include rape or indecent assault of young girls. I discussed this at second reading and I also raised it several times when I was asking questions of the Solicitor General (Mr. Fox) and the Minister of Justice (Mr. Basford). This legislation deals with custody and release of inmates under the Parole Act. With the exception of one amendment we have no difficulty accepting it. This legislation also deals with the Prisons and Reformatories Act, and after the report of the special subcommittee I am sure far more extensive changes will take place.

As I said at second reading, joining these parcels of legislation together is, in my opinion and in my party's opinion, totally irresponsible, reprehensible and devious. It is being done deliberately. This is an incompatible form of marginal, unrelated amendments designed not only to frustrate us at second reading but also at committee stage, report stage and third reading. Having dealt with the five matters which I say should have been severed, I would like to point out that at second reading we opposed this bill. We moved a motion to have the bill severed so that we could deal separately with those sections dealing with gun control, wiretapping and the other matters I have outlined. The most serious parts of the bill are those parts dealing with gun control and with privacy. The other matters are not so contentious.

A few days ago, after a tragic incident which took place in Ottawa, the Minister of Justice and other members of the government suggested that we in the opposition had delayed this bill. I think it is up to me to put on the record just what we have been doing since Bill C-51 was introduced. We spent two short days at second reading stage. We spent that little time on a bill dealing with five separate and distinct matters. We spent only eight days in committee. I stood against the group in committee which suggested we should hear two groups of witnesses, one group on gun control and the other on the invasion of privacy. To be fair to the minister, I should point out that actually there were three groups. There was one on gun control which was nicknamed CASAL because it was supposed to be a group embracing all the various organizations representing people interested in guns either as collectors or as sportsmen.

In spite of that, I have in my office, I would say without exaggerating, more than 5,000 letters complaining about this bill. We sat only eight days in the committee. All witnesses were shut off. Basically, closure took place in fact, if not in law. After hearing witnesses there was a clause by clause study. There were 73 amendments moved in the committee of which some 37 were either moved by myself, members of my party or by the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Leggatt).

Amendments with regard to wiretapping were moved by the hon. member for New Westminster and myself. The hon. member and I were in full accord; we worked out amendments together. However, with reference to gun control there was

some difference of opinion. There were 73 amendments moved, and of the 37 which were moved by myself or by other hon. members in the opposition, only four were accepted—and those were very innocuous amendments which really did very little.

The minister says that the gun control part of this bill is a panacea for crime. The minister says the murder of police officers which is taking place across the nation would not be happening if this legislation were in effect. That statement is false and misleading. I doubt whether anybody has an accurate figure as to the number of long guns there are in Canada. Someone in the committee estimated there are 11 million, someone else estimated there are 6 million. I am not here to say whether there are 11 million or 6 million, but I do say that there are millions of long guns owned by people in Canada and many of them have been owned for many years. Some people inherit long guns from their grandfathers. I have a shotgun which I inherited from my grandfather who settled in western Canada before the turn of the century.

I want to make it clear that whether there are 11 million or 6 million long guns in Canada, none of them is included in this bill in any way at the present time. Under Bill C-83 there would have to have been certain documentation in reference to owners of long guns, but that is not so under this bill. I emphasize this because with all those guns in our society "A" can sell "B" a gun—many guns have no serial numbers—and no one has any way of telling who is buying what or who is stealing what. When they say that this bill will stop murder, shootings, robbery with violence, they are misleading the people of Canada. Make no mistake about that.

● (1530)

I am now convinced—I was not so convinced when Bill C-83 came in—after reading a lot of mail and listening to the evidence, that murder committed by firearms will continue. I know long guns are not covered by this bill. I must say, however, that of the last three murders in Calgary at least one was committed by means of a restricted and prohibited weapon. We must recognize that gangsters who want to rob corner stores or hold-up banks will get firearms as long as they have criminal intentions. In the case of the Brink's truck robbery in Montreal, the parts for the machine-gun that was used were brought in from the United States and the gun was built by the robbers.

For the minister or other members of parliament to go across this nation in an election—and there may be one—telling the people that they gave them gun control, is not the answer, because there is nothing in this bill, except one thing which I will deal with in a moment, to stop murder, robbery with violence and the use of firearms. If a crackpot or an alcoholic suddenly decided he did not like his neighbour or a member of his family, and he went to the hardware store to get a gun, he would need a certificate. Once he got the certificate, however, for five years or more he could buy any number of guns—a whole arsenal.

When it is claimed this bill would stop crime, I must say I have reservations about that. I hope the minister is as fair in future speeches on the hustings as he was this afternoon, rather than being unfair as he was the other night at the scene of probably the most tragic incident that has occurred in this city for many years. Let us be honest and let us be fair. Let us not play politics with murder and the killing of police officers. The House knows where I stand personally on such matters. Where it is premeditated murder, not only of police officers, and where there is a conviction on direct evidence, then I say some penalty other than the one we use today should be imposed. We had a free vote on that matter, however, and I will not get into it today.

I want to deal now with the method used by this government to produce legislation that is a matter of substance, not an administrative act. I realize we have orders in council to appoint George to this job and Nellie to that job, or to set up tribunals.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): George and Nellie both being Grits.

Mr. Woolliams: When I talk about substantive law, and we are legislating amendments to the Criminal Code, that law should be brought before parliament for scrutiny. In committee, 73 amendments were offered to the bill during eight days of meetings when at times we sat ten hours or more. We sometimes hear that members of parliament are not working, but we know that if they are busy on committees, they are working. That goes for members from both sides of the House. I moved an amendment which read in part as follows:

> Every order in council, regulation or form made under this act shall be laid before parliament within fifteen days after the order in council regulation or form, as the case may be, is made or if parliament is not then in session, within fifteen days after the commencement of the next ensuing session—

I do not say it has to be debated then. Through their representatives, the Canadian people would be able to analyse what kind of law is being legislated by some body or some cabinet minister that may not exist at the present time. According to statements made by the Minister without Portfolio from Alberta (Mr. Horner) I understand there is going to be a cabinet shuffle. He leaves the impression that he is going to get a big job, and if that is so perhaps he will be making the regulations and not the Minister of Justice or the Solicitor General. I put forward that amendment honestly, fairly and, I believe, concisely, believing as I do that that is no way to conduct the affairs of parliament and that it is against the democratic process.

Where offences are created in the bill by order in council or otherwise, the onus is placed upon the accused. Under our system of jurisprudence, which is the same in every Commonwealth nation that has adopted the system of the mother country, the onus is always on the Crown. The Crown must prove its case beyond a reasonable doubt. In this legislation the reverse is the case. I have said it is more like the Napoleonic code than the system of criminal justice that has been the rule in Canada since confederation.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to move on to something that excites me even more, in terms of misrepresentation. I presented three motions on electronic surveillance. In that regard I am talking about the invasion of privacy of the individual. I do not want to repeat what I said about the medical clinic or law firm, except to say that in order to catch one person by telephone, all the conversations of perhaps 35 doctors and their patients can be listened to for two or three months and everything can go in as evidence. That is total invasion of privacy. The same thing may take place in reference to lawyers. I should like to refer to a well-known authority in this connection, Mr. Speaker. In "Phipson on Evidence", ninth edition, at page 203, appears the following:

A client (whether party or stranger) cannot be compelled, and a legal adviser (whether barrister, solicitor, the clerk or intermediate agent of either, or an interpreter, Du Barré v. Livette, 1 Peake 108) will not be allowed without the express consent of his client, to disclose oral or documentary communications passing between them in professional confidence. This rule applies to the case where the legal adviser is provided under the Legal Aid and Advice Act, 1949—

The rule is established for the protection of the client, not of the lawyer; and is founded on the impossibility of conducting legal business without professional assistance, and on the necessity, in order to render that assistance effectual, of securing full and unreserved intercourse between the two—

Why is that rule there, Mr. Speaker? It must always be remembered that when the state lays a charge against an accused—whether it is murder, manslaughter or whatever—the state can gather evidence through its police officers who have the authority to do so and who have the technical know-how, the fingerprinting equipment, ballistic experts, and so on. Money is no object. The little fellow whose guilt has to be proved beyond a reasonable doubt, however, only has a lawyer interrogating police officers, trying to make sure that the facts going before the jury are the type that would permit the jury to find him not guilty. That is the purpose of that rule on privileged communications. It is for the protection of the people, not the lawyers and doctors. When they change the law and say it is not permissible unless a judge rules it within his discretion, that does away with that protection.

Under the common law we had far more protection than in the legislation that is suggested by the minister, which is supposed to change the common law to give more protection to the citizens of this country. Surely the minister could have accepted some of our amendments. Now he leaves it to the discretion of the judge.

● (1540)

With what kind of evidence will our judges deal? The judge will have discretion with respect to evidence which flows from the conversation itself and with respect to evidence not derived from the wiretap. But the entire question of the wiretap is to come under the discretion of the judge. The judge is bound by the decision of the Supreme Court of Canada, the highest court of the land, which has said that if the matter is relevant to the issue, it is admissible. My amendment would have made not admissible evidence obtained from an illegal wiretap. Personally, I believe evidence derived from, or as a result of a wiretap, should not be admissible. Only in this way can we protect the due process of law. Now you know why we fought so strenuously against the changes the minister proposes.

[Mr. Woolliams.]

I said the other day the rule of law is our only protection. There is no doubt that arbitrary power is today resented and feared to an even greater extent than in the late nineteenth century in the democratic states of the western world. The rule of law presupposes the absence of arbitrary power and so gives the assurance that the individual can ascertain with reasonable certainty what legal powers are available to government if there is a proposal to affect his private rights. A person who takes the trouble to consult his lawyer ought to be able to ascertain the legal consequences of his own acts and what are the powers of others to interfere with these acts.

The reason lawyers are apt to be critical of powers of delegated legislation and of the exercise by bodies other than the regular courts of judicial decision is in the uncertainty which these powers are alleged to produce. It is true enough that on many matters the law as administered in the ordinary courts is difficult to ascertain with any assurance. But in public law this uncertainty is accentuated by the bulk and detail of statutory instruments which are enacted by the departmental ministers as well as by the impossibility of predicting how, in the event of a dispute, discretion will be exercised, whether the last word rests with a tribunal or with a minister.

We heard today that the Minister of Finance (Mr. Macdonald) is to change retroactively the law applying to life insurance policies. Many of our little wage earners buy life insurance policies. Some of the money goes toward risk, the rest toward savings. If the policyholder needs a second or third mortgage for a house, because he may have one or two more children than he anticipated having, he borrows against the policy. Now the Liberal government has said that any money the policy earns becomes taxable immediately on the policyholder's getting a loan. We oppose that kind of law, just as we oppose the kind of law this bill will become, if passed in its present form. I was shocked at the Minister of Finance's arrogance in making his statement. He said, "We tax corporations. Now we shall tax the little people as well." The party opposite always tries to make out it is the friend of the little man. Look at what it has done.

The rule of law, Mr. Speaker, is based upon the liberty of the individual and has as its object the harmonizing of the opposite notions of individual liberty and public order. The notion of justice maintains a balance between these notions. There is an important difference between the rule of law as the supremacy of law over the government, and the concept of the rule of law as the supremacy of law in society generally. The first concept is the only feature common to the western nations, connoting as it does the protection of the individual against arbitrary government. But it is fundamental that there must exist some technique for forcing the government to submit to the law. If such a technique does not exist, the government itself becomes the means whereby the law is achieved.

If we allow evidence obtained from illegal wiretaps to be admissible in court, the entire administration of justice will fall into disrespect. We tried to make this point to the minister, but he refused to accept our views. He would not listen. As I say, it

is fundamental that there must exist some technique for forcing the government to submit to the law. If such a technique does not exist, the government itself becomes the means whereby the law is achieved. This is the antithesis of the rule of law. The government is, of course, a large bureaucratic organization, make no mistake; and the more it moves away from the pure doctrine of representative government into the murky area of the corporate state, the more bureaucratic it is likely to become. It is evident, if one views what has happened with respect to our large Crown Corporations, that parliament has lost control of those corporations which in themselves are large bureaucratic organizations.

Setting up a large bureaucratic organization to administer the Criminal Code by order in council is not good enough; and passing a law for allowing the police to wiretap illegally and bug people's homes and offices, and for allowing such illegally obtained evidence to be admissible, is also not good enough.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Woolliams: The mischief that has arisen to the public from inconsiderate alteration of our laws is too obvious to be called into question. The common law has fared like other venerable edifices of antiquity which rash and inexperienced workmen have ventured to new-dress and refine with all the rage of modern improvement. Hence, frequently its symmetry has been destroyed, its proportions distorted, and its majestic simplicity exchanged for specious embellishments and fantastic novelties such as wiretapping.

We intend to vote against this bill on third reading. We voted against it on second reading. The minister refused to accept our amendments, save two, innocuous in character. I proposed 73 amendments in committee, only to see the minister refuse all but two innocuous ones, as I have said. I shall move no more amendments, but leave it to the highest jury in the land, the Canadian people. They shall know the nature of this legislation which the minister clutches to his chest. They shall know the kinds of gun controls this government proposes and how the minister proposes to snoop, against all the dictates of conscience, into the lives of citizens. That is to be the law of this land, and the people shall know it.

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that we should deal with a bill as important as Bill C-51 at the end of this session, for the bill will have far-reaching implications for the Canadian people. One wonders why we debate legislation of this sort on July 18. Two things always happen when the hot weather arrives. Something goes wrong with the air-conditioning, a coincidence which does not escape most people, and the government brings forward for consideration at the tail end of the session legislation it has found difficult to get through the House. We are told it intends to proceed with the immigration bill which the committee reported last Thursday evening, I believe. That the government should play games with the House of Commons and the people of Canada is bad. I point out that when the Solicitor General (Mr. Fox) appeared on a CTV program last Saturday night, he said it is difficult to get legislation through the House of Commons at the moment. He wants an election to clear the air. With the stench that is around that department right now, a change of air would not hurt.

● (1550)

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): However, as far as getting legislation through, an election will not solve that problem. Whatever members are here from whatever party, they will want very closely to examine this piece of legislation. Two things concern us in the NDP about this legislation. The first is that we should be considering it in the dying days of the session, when the press and some members have gone home. Those who have not gone home are anxious to get home. They are quite justified in wanting to get home to see their wives and families. This is not the time to be dealing with legislation as important as this.

The second reason we are concerned about this legislation is that it has been framed in such a manner as to put the members of this House in an impossible position. This is a bill in which there are four or five distinct pieces of legislation. The only thing they have in common is that they deal with the Criminal Code. The bill deals with control over the kind of people who can purchase guns, obtain parole, who are classed as dangerous sexual offenders, and it also deals with electronic surveillance. There are members who will agree with some of the clauses in the bill, but not with others. That is why we have repeatedly asked that the bill be broken up.

We in this party have supported the minister in previous years and this year with respect to legislation which would restrict the kind of person who would be able to purchase a long gun. We think it is essential that people able to purchase deadly weapons should at least be able to convince the authorities that they do not have a criminal record, that they are not psychotic, that they are of an age and have had sufficient training to be able to handle dangerous weapons.

The Government has put before us this legislation with respect to gun control. It is a greatly watered-down version of what we had before. I do not think for a moment that it will prevent crimes being performed, or a lot of deaths resulting from the improper use of firearms. All this legislation will do is restrict the purchase of guns after it is passed. It will not do anything with regard to registering the millions of guns already around. However, half a loaf is better than none. I believe this legislation is a first step. It is a very cautious milk and water step. That is what we would expect from this government. They have never been noted for taking a strong stand and saying "Here we stand. We cannot do other". They take one step forward and two steps back. They have done that again with this legislation.

This is weak legislation in terms of gun control. However, it is better than nothing. It will give us a chance to ensure that guns sold in the future will not be sold to people who should not have them. We will develop techniques for registration in the years ahead, in the hope that this legislation will be strengthened even further. We are in favour of legislation controlling the sale of long guns. However, in order to express, in the third reading of this bill, our support for the bill, the

minister puts us in the position that we have to vote for electronic surveillance—and that we are not prepared to do.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): The whole question of wiretapping has been blown out of all proportions. We are told by some attorneys general and heads of police that electronic surveillance is absolutely necessary to deal with crime. I am sure many members saw a report by the New York *Times* service referring to a pamphlet put out by Herman Schwartz, the former New York State commissioner of corrections, entitled, "Taps, bugs and fooling the people". Mr. Schwartz says that electronics surveillance is a rending of the fabric of trust in a society without which free speech and association is not possible. He went on to state that since 1968, there have been 5,495 legal taps or bugs, and that they listened to 3.6 million conversations between 282,429 people. He points out that it cost in the neighbourhood of $11,000 per bug. He summed up by saying that the overwhelming majority of the targets were small-time gamblers and minor drug pushers. That was all they got for invading the privacy of 3.6 million homes or individuals in that area.

When legislation was introduced in 1974 to make it illegal for any citizen in Canada to indulge in wiretapping or electronic surveillance, we supported it. We did so because the government said at that time it would not allow the police to break the law. It said the police could not bug telephones, any more than any other citizen, unless they got authorization from the courts in the same way that they must get authorization for breaking and entering private property. The legislation before us gives the police the power to break the law. Under this legislation, an unlawful act is not illegal if it is committed by the police. The police cannot only bug an individual's home or place of business, but they can do it without authorization. They will not be punished in the same way as a private citizen.

The final iniquity is that they may use the fruits of their break-in as evidence in court. Does anyone think that a police officer will bother going to court to get authority to wiretap if he knows that he will not be punished for wiretapping illegally, and that if he gets anything worthwhile as a result of his fishing expedition, he can present it in court as evidence? In the television broadcast to which I referred a few moments ago, the Solicitor General, in one of his more unctuous moments, said the following:

—anyone who is a member of the national police force and who commits an illegal act can expect to be treated in the same way as an ordinary citizen—

That is absolute bunk.

Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): There is a stronger word.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): I know another word beginning with "b", but I do not want to use it. The fact is that the police will not be treated as ordinary citizens. How many policemen have been charged and convicted of eavesdropping or wiretapping without an authorization?

[Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands).]

• (1600)

An hon. Member: None.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Under this legislation they will further incentives to commit illegal acts because they will be told that the results of their electronic surveillance can be produced in court. We are being given a good example of this at the moment. The judicial inquiry which has been going on in Edmonton is a case in point. One member of the RCMP has appeared before the inquiry and said that another RCMP person told him they had bugged the rooms of three Edmonton policemen while they were in the city of Winnipeg. On June 9, my hon. friend from New Westminster (Mr. Leggatt) asked the Solicitor General about this incident, as reported at page 6465 of *Hansard*. What was the minister's reply? The minister said:

The deputy commissioner of the RCMP was delegated by the commissioner of the force to investigate the matter fully and as a result of his investigation it was found that no acts of bugging in connection with the investigation which the hon. member mentioned have occurred.

What did we find before the commission headed by Mr. Justice James Laycraft? Here is one paragraph:

The inquiry also heard assistant commissioner Peter Wright, head of the RCMP in Alberta, testify that Ross Paisley, Alberta's deputy attorney general, told him the bugging was a fact and not an allegation and that assistant commissioner George Paquette in charge of the RCMP in Manitoba at the time gave his approval at the time this incident occurred.

So the Solicitor General tells the House that the deputy commissioner had investigated the matter and found there was no wiretapping of these Edmonton policemen, yet here is the assistant commissioner in charge of the RCMP in Alberta saying he was told by the deputy attorney general of Alberta that assistant commissioner Paquette in Manitoba authorized the wiretapping of these three Edmonton men. Thus, it is clear that not only the bugging of the public by the police but the bugging of policemen by each other can go on under the existing legislation. I ask the House, then, to stop and think what will happen under this legislation now before us, under which the police, instead of being blamed and open to charges of having committed an illegal act, are allowed to use whatever evidence they collect in a court of law.

I say to the government that it is placing us in an impossible position. It is asking us to accept an erosion of civil liberties, an encroachment upon the rights of a free people, if we want to vote for the other clauses in Bill C-51. But this we do not intend to do. We intend to protest as strongly as we can against this invasion of the rights of Canadians. In the final analysis, we are talking about the whole question of the use of power. I think it was Lord Bryce who said that all power corrupts, and that absolute power corrupts absolutely.

An hon. Member: Lord Atkin.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Lord Atkin. That statement is true. The more power possessed by any individual or group of individuals, the greater is the danger that the power will be abused, the greater the danger that they will become so involved in the particular case they

are espousing, or a particular objective they are pursuing, that they will destroy the rights and privileges of others. One of the roles which parliament has performed for centuries at Westminster and for the last 110 years in this country is to see to it that too much power is never concentrated in the hands of any person or groups of persons and that no institution, even a police force, is allowed to become a state within a state, possessing powers which will allow it to sweep aside the rights of other people. That is what this battle is all about.

The government brings in a measure of this kind in the dying days of the session, though we ought to have an opportunity to debate it at much greater length. But there is no need to exhaust hon. members. The government is aware of the position we take. The country, too, knows our position. I want those interested to know that as far as the NDP is concerned we would vote for the other part of the legislation provided for in Bill C-51. But we shall not vote for a bill which contains provisions approving not only electronic surveillance but the right of the police to commit criminal acts and, going even further, allows them to use in court the evidence which they have secured by this method. I therefore move, seconded by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles):

That the motion be amended by deleting all the words after "that" and by substituting the following words:

"Bill C-51 be not now read the third time but that it be referred back to the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs for the purpose of reconsidering clauses 8, 9, 10, 11 and 12 thereof.

● (1610)

[*Translation*]

Mr. C. A. Gauthier (Roberval): Mr. Speaker, I was hoping this afternoon to speak on Bill C-51 generally, but as this amendment has just been moved, I merely wish to say a few words in its support since it is asking that the bill should not be read for the third time, but that it be referred to the committee for a more thorough consideration and I would add to elucidate its contents.

We are told in the House that since this government is in power, we only see those omnibus bills designed to make us take poison coated with chocolate. It is always the same thing with those omnibus bills and this is why we will never accept them, despite the fact that they have been introduced for many years. Afterwards, during the election campaign we are told that we have voted for or against it. There are fine provisions in an omnibus bill, but there are also some bad ones. There are some things that we cannot accept, but by refusing the omnibus bill to oppose the bad provisions, we oppose the good ones as well. The government knows that very well, rather, the officials know it very well, because they are the ones who prepare this kind of bills. Someone said a little while ago that after ten years in power any government is corrupt, I say that after ten years in the administration, an official is just as corrupt as the government. That is why bills like this one are prepared by only one official, and he is doing it for fifteen or twenty years, he is the only one able to put out such a sordid thing. Only officials can do a thing like that.

It is not the minister who has been in charge of this portfolio for only one or two years who understands all these tricks, but his high ranking officials. We are being administered and directed by these technocrats, with the consequences that we know today. The government relies on these technocrats, because they are helping it gain power. A party should not seek and hold power with means such as these, with all sorts of hypocrisies; it should tell the truth to the public, because the public wants it.

The government would like us to swallow the wiretapping issue; as a matter of fact, it should have introduced not one, but four different bills, so we could deal with the gun issue separately from the wiretapping issue. By the way, I am always surprised to read subclauses such as this allowing the wiretapping procedure. Yet, the Prime Minister himself claimed during his first term in office that he was the champion of human rights. Incidentally, he said—when we were talking about homosexuals—that we had no business in the bedrooms of the nation. But what kind of authorization is he going to give to the police? That of searching everywhere, of wiretapping everywhere, to know what is going on, and not always in accordance with the law, Mr. Speaker, as we have seen in recent weeks. The RCMP admitted that it did not always have a legal warrant. We must not forget that wiretapping is a very delicate matter.

In the light of what we are being told these days I don't think I can trust anyone anymore. The RCMP has always been considered as one of the most honest police forces. But when we see what is going on these days, we cannot help wondering where Canada is heading, when a government such as this is giving all sorts of permission because it is in power. If such is the price of power, Mr. Speaker, I would rather not have it. Our laws should at least provide for more morality, integrity and sincerity:

I think this is a complete reshaping of justice, and not another intrusion in the life of honest people, on a plea of trying to denounce, to find a criminal. But there are other means to find criminals, Mr. Speaker, if the police really wants to do so. But on the pretext of finding a criminal, we search into the life of honest people, to know what happens in their homes, in the small community where they live.

This is what we have to prevent, this is what we think about when we see pieces of legislation as permissive as this one. I always see intrusions here in my province, in the province of Quebec, where the provincial government refuses authority; they do not want to pay for the federal police any more. However it goes there, it stays there and it is paid to go there. But do not forget that we should endeavour to prevent the police from playing politics, and we have virtually evidence it does so. We have been fighting for two years. We have reached the point where we can no longer call a taxation office or another agency without getting the federal police on the phone. If you ask who is speaking, the answer is: "The federal police". What are they doing there? We should wonder about this. Nowadays it has become impossible, even for a member of parliament, to have a discussion with any of the leaders of this country without him being attended by a federal police-

man. I say "No!". Things have to be made clear, we will have to select our bills. When we are dealing with such a matter, a matter that has been dealt with in committee, this government should take the reports of this committee and study them.

We were talking a moment ago about these remarkable committees and the job they are doing. However, notwithstanding piles and piles of reports, not a word has been changed. In fact, 39 motions have been proposed in this House and all of them have been rejected. Government officials have told the minister: "That is what you should do. It is going to be this way, Okay!" So what is the use of working in a committee. I am not going to work there any more. It is hard and it is ridiculous. Look at what happened last week. If any average citizen had seen that, he would have thought that we are worse than children.

Mr. Speaker, I say that we should absolutely oblige this government to introduce real legislation instead of omnibus bills, legislation about precise matters we will be able to discuss thoroughly and especially, instead of listening to technocrats, they should read and consider the reports of the committees hearings. I think from there we will be able to work seriously, instead of referring the case from Caiaphas to Pilate, as it is the case now, so that we do not know who is responsible for whom and for what.

Mr. Speaker, I think that if we do not do that, if we go on proposing such mixture to the people, they are not going to consider us as serious legislators. As for me, I cannot vote for this bill in its present form. There are some good things in there, but, in its present form, I cannot swallow the whole thing. That is what I wanted to say to support the motion of the hon. member from the New Democratic Party.

● (1620)

[*English*]

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, I intend only to make a few brief remarks. I join with the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands (Mr. Douglas) in expressing my protest at the way this bill has been introduced. To me it is an abuse of parliament to bring in a bill which has two parts, one having no connection with the other, and to ask the House to vote on them in a kind of package. What are we supposed to do? I had always understood that we voted according to our conscience, but in one part of this so-called package there is one measure we would like to vote for, however weak the gun control aspect of the bill may be. I should like to support it as a gesture, to indicate that there must be some stop put to the use of guns for violent purposes, that the picture must change.

I have tried to support the right to privacy of individuals in society, but I have no intention whatever of voting for a bill which includes these offensive provisions in regard to wiretapping. In the article quoted by the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands which I think was printed in the *Globe and Mail* a few days ago, Tom Wicker quotes one of the greatest judges in the history of this continent, Mr. Justice Holmes. He described wiretapping and bugging as "a dirty business". Mr. Wicker, who is a distinguished journalist, comments "and so it has proved".

[Mr. Gauthier (Roberval).]

I am not going into this aspect of the bill in detail. If it were effective, if the minister had brought in any evidence to demonstrate the effectiveness of this method of apprehending criminals, we might have to take a different view. But no such evidence exists. In fact, nearly all the evidence is precisely to the contrary. Therefore, we are invading the right to privacy of individuals for no good purpose whatever. I suppose the reason for bringing forward this legislation is to please the police. I regard the police, as I imagine every member does, as being a very important element of our society, with a very important task to perform. But one task the police do not perform is the making of the laws of this country. I regard the subservience of the minister to the point of view of the police as something that is highly unsatisfactory and wrong.

I have had occasion in the last few weeks to wonder why the party opposite calls itself the Liberal party of Canada. I cannot think of anything less liberal than the way they have approached some of these matters. I was on the immigration committee where they put in a platoon system, and people who had not even heard the evidence voted down nearly all the constructive suggestions which were made. Personally, I would be ashamed if I were minister of justice in a so-called Liberal cabinet and I brought in this regressive, backward piece of legislation dealing with wiretapping which, as I say, infringes basic human rights.

I have said what I wanted to say, Mr. Speaker. I hope I have said it clearly and that at some stage or other the minister will start paying attention to the decencies of parliamentary life.

Mr. John Rodriguez (Nickel Belt): Mr. Speaker, I just want to say a few words on the amendment moved by the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands (Mr. Douglas) to refer back to committee those clauses dealing with wiretapping. Every single day brings new insights into the whole question of wiretapping and the broadening of such powers which we are permitting in this bill. Personally, if I had my preference I would outlaw wiretapping and bugging by anyone, including the police and the law enforcement agencies.

I think the minister should be aware of the latest disturbing news, which is that Securicom of Canada Limited, a company which is an expert on debugging and specializes in locating bugs in rooms and on telephones, has been in communication with and offered a position to J. Gordon Liddy, a convicted criminal in the United States. I do not know how he will get by the Manpower department. The department will probably give this chap a work permit, with one million Canadians out of work, and he will be engaged in this very surreptitious business of working for Securicom detecting bugs and other listening devices.

Mr. Paproski: There are a lot of bugs in the Prime Minister's office.

Mr. Rodriguez: The hon. member says—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Order. I would ask the hon. member for Nickel Belt (Mr. Rodriguez) to get back to the point under discussion, which is the amendment.

Mr. Rodriguez: That is right, Mr. Speaker, and the amendment says that the particular sections of the bill dealing with wiretapping ought to be sent back to the committee. I point out to the House that this is a wise proposal because we ought to examine evidence which is coming in every day. The latest evidence is that a firm specializing in debugging telephones and rooms will be a magnet to some of the most unsavoury characters ever to come out of the sewers across the world, who will, in effect, be deployed on debugging each other. I just ask you to imagine, Mr. Speaker, this whole concept of counterbugging. In terms of trying to put the boots to organized crime in this country, this is a most stupid approach. Surely the criminal element will be the hiring companies like Securicom just as much as private citizens. For as many bugging devices that the law enforcement agencies come up with, there will be as many counter operations to circumvent the law and to defeat the whole purpose and thrust of this legislation.

In other words, it comes back to the question of who ends up being deprived of the right to privacy. It will be the private citizen in his communications with other private citizens, his lawyer, his doctor, his psychiatrist, his member of parliament, and so on. Therefore, I think the hon. member has made a wise proposal to refer these particular clauses back to the committee. If this were done, we could examine all of the latest evidence coming forward almost every day on the whole question of the use of bugging devices and wiretaps so that we can bust organized crime.

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

Some hon. Members: Question.

● (1630)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): All those in favour of the amendment will please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

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

Some hon. Members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Call in the members.

The House divided on the amendment (Mr. Douglas, Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands) which was negatived on the following division:

● (1640)

(*Division No. 90*)

YEAS

Messrs.

Baker (Grenville-Carleton)
Beatty
Benjamin
Brewin
Caouette (Villeneuve)
Coates
Darling
Dick
Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands)
Ellis
Epp
Firth
Fraser
Gauthier (Roberval)
Grafftey
Hargrave
Hnatyshyn
Hogan
Huntington
Jarvis
Johnston
Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre)
Knowles (Norfolk-Haldimand)
Lambert (Edmonton West)
Lawrence
MacDonald (Egmont)
MacDonald (Miss) (Kingston and the Islands)
Marshall
McKenzie
McKinley
Muir
Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich)
Neil
Nystrom
Oberle
Paproski
Peters
Pigott (Mrs.)
Ritchie
Rodriguez
Schumacher
Stanfield
Symes
Whiteway
Woolliams—45.

NAYS

Messrs.

Allmand
Anderson
Andras (Port Arthur)
Baker (Gander-Twillingate)
Basford
Béchard
Bégin (Miss)
Blaker
Boulanger
Breau
Buchanan
Bussières
Caccia
Cafik
Campagnolo (Mrs.)
Campbell (LaSalle-Émard-Côte Saint-Paul)
Caron
Clermont
Collenette
Comtois
Corbin
Cullen
Cyr
Dawson
Demers
Douglas (Bruce-Grey)
Drury
Duclos
Duquet
Ethier
Faulkner
Flynn
Foster
Francis
Gauthier (Ottawa-Vanier)
Gillespie
Goodale
Goyer
Guay (St. Boniface)
Harquail
Herbert
Holt (Mrs.)
Hopkins
Horner
Kaplan
Lalonde
Lamontagne
Landers
Laniel
Lapointe
Leblanc (Laurier)
Lessard
Loiselle (Chambly)
Lumley
MacDonald (Cardigan)
Macdonald (Rosedale)
MacFarlane
Maine
Marchand
McIsaac
Milne
Munro (Hamilton East)
Nicholson (Miss)
O'Connell
Olivier
Ouellet
Pearsall
Pelletier
Penner
Philbrook
Portelance
Poulin
Prud'homme
Railton
Raines
Roy (Laval)
Savard
Sharp
Smith (Saint-Jean)
Stanbury
Stewart (Cochrane)
Trudel
Turner
Watson
Whelan
Young—86.

● (1700)

Mr. Speaker: I therefore declare the amendment lost.

Criminal Code

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[*Translation*]

QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED

Mr. Speaker: It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 40, to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: the hon. member for Medicine Hat (Mr. Hargrave)—Agriculture; the hon. member for Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe (Mr. Marshall)—Transport; the hon. member for Vancouver South (Mr. Fraser)—Labour conditions.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

• (1710)

[*Translation*]

CRIMINAL LAW AMENDMENT ACT, 1977

AMENDMENTS TO CRIMINAL CODE

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Basford that Bill C-51, to amend the Criminal Code, the Customs Tariff, the Parole Act, the Penitentiary Act and the Prisons and Reformatories Act, be read the third time and do pass.

Mr. Armand Caouette (Villeneuve): Mr. Speaker, Bill C-51 now before us entitled Criminal Law Amendment Act, 1977, may not be the most intelligent one introduced by the government but it could go through history as the bill with the longest title and the most mixed provisions. As far as I am concerned it is a hotchpotch not to say a rotten bill. Here is its title: "An Act to amend the Criminal Code, the Customs Tariff, the Parole Act, the Penitentiary Act and the Prisons and Reformatories Act."

Mr. Speaker, we are dealing here with an omnibus bill, that is, a bill which includes amendments to a number of acts in various areas and which are connected only by the will of the minister who sponsored this bill. The minister could have included as well amendments on tomato growing, which the House would not have found particularly surprising. I have heard with interest the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Leggatt) suggest that the bill introduced by the minister should be divided into several bills, so that following the debate on this bill, hon. members should not be called upon to vote at the same time on provisions of which they approve and on provisions of which they disapprove.

Yet, this is exactly what is going to happen following the decision the Chair has rendered on the basis of established precedents. I understand quite well why the government will not introduce distinct bills for each and every amendment it wishes to adopt in respect of existing legislation. It has chosen this quite legitimate approach and refuses to introduce useless bills, because it wants to spare the House's time and resources.

Mr. Speaker, I feel, however, that the government should demonstrate judgment and good sense and avoid placing hon. members in a difficult situation. I know the Chair had no other choice but to accept the legislation as put forward by the minister since it is bound by precedents. However, I think the Minister of Justice could have remembered his experience with Bill C-83, when several members had protested against the fact that the bill included all kinds of things, and I think he has missed a good chance of showing members on both sides of the House his honesty and his willingness to co-operate with all the elected representatives of the people.

Anyhow, Mr. Speaker, this legislation the consideration of which we are about to conclude is nothing but the bastard offspring of Bill C-83 about which so much ink had been spilt and which had given rise to such an amount of criticism everywhere across the nation and especially with hunting and fishing organizations, and groups like the Wildlife Federation. Last year, I had the opportunity of working in close cooperation with those organizations. I was very proud when the government gave up trying to have the bill passed during the last session. For me, as well as for all those concerned by individual freedom, the death of Bill C-83 was a great victory. The hunters of northwestern Quebec who represent a major part of my constituents welcomed with relief the government's decision not to pass that bill, particularly not to force its passage.

Mr. Speaker, I probably have the greatest number of hunters among my constituents than any other member. I thus consider myself as the spokesman of all hunters and all nature lovers when I speak on this matter. My constituency, Mr. Speaker, is an immense territory full of game of all kinds and my fellow citizens take advantage of this unique chance to live close to nature. This exceptional geographical position is known by thousands of tourists who come to our area during the hunting season. So I know what I am talking about when I point out the concerns of hunters and nature lovers about Bill C-51. Obviously, the minister cannot say as much. He looked clearly astonished, during the sittings of the committee on Bill C-83, on hearing the specific and logical representations of the groups which appeared as witnesses against those elements of the bill that clearly interfere with the rights of the citizens. Mr. Speaker, I said at the time, and it still applies today, that the minister knows so little about the concerns of those who live in rural areas, close to the woods, that he probably would have a hard time telling the difference between a fir tree and a telephone pole.

Mr. Speaker, on this the last reading of Bill C-51, I shall dwell strictly on that part of it that deals with the control of firearms, as other hon. members have spoken and will speak about the other aspects of the bill. I shall use up my time to convey to the minister the concerns and worries of hunters and ordinary citizens in my riding as well as the rest of Canada. In his speech on May 11 last, the Minister of Justice (Mr. Basford) averred as follows, and I quote:

As a result of the introduction of Bill C-83 and all the discussion which flowed from it we have been successful, in Bill C-51, in marrying the public objective with the need to protect the rights of certain people who, for responsible and legitimate purposes, use long guns in this country.

Mr. Speaker, I would not want to hurt his feelings and make him cry in the House of Commons, but I do believe it is my duty to tell the minister that once again he is completely mistaken if he imagines that Bill C-51, as it now stands, protects the public while also protecting the right of the individual to use guns for legitimate purposes.

Now, Mr. Speaker, those who claim that the public will be better protected once this bill is passed are naive to a very considerable extent. Criminals will never be placed by this bill in a position which will prevent them from finding firearms. Criminals use the firearms they bought in the underworld and which cannot be traced nor identified by dealers. These firearms have been stolen and disguised especially for crime.

It is as ridiculous to claim that these criminals will be affected by this legislation as to believe that criminals are so stupid that they would have their firearms registered at the registration office and obtain a certificate before committing their crimes. In fact, we must recognize that criminals will not be affected by this piece of legislation. As in that past, they will obtain their firearms on the sly, that is on the black market which the government will never be in a position to control with the provisions of the bill which is now before us. So much for the protection of citizens!

As for the protection of the rights of individuals who possess and legitimately use firearms for serious purposes such as hunting or target shooting, the bill is not only useless and unefficient but plainly dangerous. Indeed, it will be left to officials to decide whether or not citizens will be allowed to possess or to use firearms. For instance, subclause 104(3) provides that decisions of the firearm officer are presumed to be valid, that they are supposed to represent the truth whether or not this officer has made an inquiry, that his conclusion be right or not, and that the citizen is presumed to be guilty. Mr. Speaker, that provision is completely contrary to what our judicial system stands for, namely that a citizen is presumed innocent unless proven guilty. In the case of Bill C-51, the firearm officer enjoys a presumption which compels ordinary citizen to bear the burden of the evidence, even if this decision is excessive and has been taken without prior inquiry or checking. That is a frightful aspect of the bill, Mr. Speaker. Canadians are not ready to accept this kind of dictatorship; they are used to be given the benefit of presumptive innocence and they are entitled to the extension of that presumption in all areas. Mr. Speaker, any legislative measure imposing the burden of the proof on the ordinary citizen is unacceptable. For that matter, if he wants to put Canadian citizens in the position of having to prove everything, the minister could just as well ask them to dip their hands in boiling oil to prove that they are innocent and protected by God. Was it not the way it was done in those days when people had to prove their innocence? This is a basic principle and the minister should amend the bill accordingly.

● (1720)

I would like to give a few more examples of very questionable points. One reads in the following clauses, and I quote:

The accused, the citizen is presumed not to have had a permit, and it is up to him to prove it before the court, that is he is still presumed guilty.

It is forbidden to sell, exchange, give, lend, give up or deliver a firearm without the person receiving it showing his or her permit between individuals and the person selling, giving or lending has the onus of proving that the person to whom he gave, sold or lent had the permit.

Those are, Mr. Speaker, further cases where the onus is unfairly placed on the shoulders of the citizen. Here are, Mr. Speaker, a few more examples of clauses interfering with the rights of citizens.

Permits and registrations issued by bureaucrats may be withdrawn at any time.

The recognition of the validity of hunting permits (competency cards in the handling of firearms) under clause 105 (p. 130) is a purely discretionary prerogative of the governor in council.

Those are clauses, Mr. Speaker, and I will have an opportunity to quote others later, that take acquired rights away from Canadian citizens. Having a permit to own a firearm is no longer a right. It becomes a privilege. And that privilege will be administered by almighty public servants who will hide behind the authority of the cabinet to prevent law-abiding citizens from using their acquired rights.

Mr. Speaker, I have here an article by Jean Pagé, published in the *Montreal-Matin* of May 12 last. He writes the following about Bill C-51, and I quote:

Seizures without warrants, without crimes, without trials, and confiscation without compensation are the first legislative step toward dictatorship. Presuming decisions by bureaucrats imposing the onus on citizens to be right is the second step toward dictatorship.

And what benefits will Canadians get for the loss of their rights and freedoms?

Mr. Speaker, gun control is not an effective way to check crime. Take Switzerland for example. In that country, all adult citizens are required to own a gun under the law. Everybody must have one. Yet, the crime rate for aggravated theft and murder is quite low in that country. Far from controlling firearms, Switzerland requires its citizens to own guns and rifles.

On the other hand, in England where gun control laws have been very strict for more than 50 years, a study conducted by Inspector Colin Greenwood of the British police has shown that gun control had no effect at all in reducing the number of crimes committed with firearms. Indeed according to those figures, violent crime has greatly increased since 1963 in England in spite of gun control. There again, Mr. Speaker, it is clear that gun control will not reduce the number of violent crimes. We have proof of that. Some countries without gun control have very low crime rates, while others with controls are faced with soaring crime rates. If Canadians cannot even expect a decrease in the crime rate in exchange for this loss of freedom, what will they get? Nothing more, Mr. Speaker. The minister thinks that firearms are responsible for crimes and murders.

Instead of controlling guns and their possession, he should be dealing with criminals through measures that would deter them from illegal actions. But the minister in his wisdom prefers to deal once again with firearms through Bill C-51, as he did with Bill C-83. Presumably, the Minister of Justice will some day introduce legislation putting guns in prison while criminals will go free. As far as I am concerned, the government is proposing to deal with material objects, putting the blame on them for inhuman acts by criminals and vile assassins.

Guns do not kill by themselves. Whoever saw revolvers walking down the street? They do not have the gift of motion. Punishing them for the acts committed by those who want to break the law is utterly ridiculous. But once more this year the Minister of Justice is proposing to do just that.

As I said, Mr. Speaker, gun control will victimize honest citizens, hunters and sportsmen that will have to submit to controls, while criminals will be able to do exactly as they wish, going on breaking the laws we pass in this House.

Mr. Speaker, over the weekend I had the opportunity to meet people who keep ammunition in their stores not for their own protection but for the use of hunter tourists, as I said the other week, to help them out. Of course, those hunters do not buy ammunition only, but a number of items they need for their survival in the bush.

And the minister or rather the government objected to an amendment to the bill put toward by a member of the Progressive Conservative party, asking for the withdrawal of the provision requiring the purchase of a permit to sell ammunition and even some items used for hunting purposes. The government, here again, has failed to listen to the legitimate requests of the small dealer and the small businessman who will have to pay even if it is not being done at the provincial level. A permit is sold under the provincial government authority.

I do not know whether the federal government is jealous of the revenue derived from this sale by the provincial government, but as I said, they feel obliged to interfere in an area which is not under their jurisdiction but which is specifically under the provincial jurisdiction, to sell another permit to the small businessman who to serve our tourists and hunters, will have to give up the sale of ammunition needed by some hunters, if they want to avoid paying more than they get from this sale. I think it would be appropriate for the government, even though the amendment is passed, to withdraw this bill immediately so that it can be considered even more carefully. Unfortunately, government members are looking forward to going home like many honourable members, and they introduced once more this legislation in a hurry, so that it can be passed as soon as possible.

● (1730)

[*English*]

Mr. Robert C. Coates (Cumberland-Colchester North): Mr. Speaker, I have not participated to any extent in this debate up to this time. One of the reasons for my sitting back was the fact that the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams) gave this party tremendous leadership in the area of Bill C-51.

[Mr. Caouette (Villeneuve).]

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Coates: The hon. member for Calgary North was very willing to co-operate with the government in every possible way to produce a more realistic proposal which, if he had been listened to, would have seen this House give unanimous consent to the passage of the legislation. As it is now, without the many amendments which were put forward by the hon. member for Calgary North, we find ourselves in a position where we have bad legislation which I cannot support. I am sure most members cannot support it if they take the time to think about it, both in regard to gun control and wiretapping.

Even at this late date the Minister of Justice (Mr. Basford) is not wise enough to accept the good advice which has been given both in committee and in this House by the hon. member for Calgary North, the effect of which would produce legislation that would be acceptable to all Canadian people. What we have is a bad bill that the government has been unwilling to move on. Unfortunately other things have come into this debate which are most unpalatable to me and to most of the members of this House.

The only other time I spoke in regard to this bill in the House was when I rose because of some reprehensible remarks made by the Minister of Justice outside this Chamber in relation to the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Towers), the hon. member for Moose Jaw (Mr. Neil), the hon. member for Kootenay West (Mr. Brisco), the hon. member for Palliser (Mr. Schumacher), and the hon. member for Dauphin (Mr. Ritchie). These remarks were completely unparliamentary, as far as I was concerned, and should have been removed from the record by the Minister of Justice. He still has an opportunity to do that at this late date. He reflected on the good reputations of those individual members of parliament.

The remarks of the Minister of Justice should not stand in relation to these particular members, as they were endeavouring to give the best wisdom they had in relation to this legislation. In regard to those five individual members of parliament the record will show, upon examination, that they voted for the retention of capital punishment, which is the greatest possible deterrent available to government to enforce law and order in this country. It should continue to be a deterrent for all time to come.

If the government is interested in trying to bring some sanity into an insane situation, as far as enforcing laws upon the people of this nation is concerned, it will have to bring in another amendment to the Criminal Code placing on the statute books the retention of capital punishment for capital murder. That would do more than all the regulations associated with gun control implemented at any time.

Legal wiretapping from this moment forward will become a total joke. With this legislation, police officers are told that they can illegally wiretap and then introduce the evidence they secure into a particular trial. Why would any police officer want to bother going through the formality of getting author-

ity to wiretap if he knows it can be done illegally and can be introduced in a trial for the purpose of producing a conviction?

My party is opposed to the wiretapping aspects of this legislation. The hon. member for Calgary North has put on the record how cosmetic wiretapping is. Out of 1,062 attempts, evidence which assisted in finding a person guilty of a specific crime was only secured on 13 occasions. When one considers that, he realizes just how little value wiretapping has in the first place. When you think of the encroachment on individual rights and liberties associated with this legislation in its present form, one can well understand why members of parliament have stood up and indicated their concern relating to those sections of this particular piece of legislation which are associated with wiretapping.

Apparently the Solicitor General (Mr. Fox) has found time to go on television and tell the Canadian public that we should have an election. One has to remember that he is the man who is in charge of the police forces in this country. He sits as a member of a majority government which has been in office for only three years. Yet, he says the government cannot run the country, that the government cannot get legislation through the House of Commons. All I can say is that if the Solicitor General admits to the Canadian people that the Liberals cannot run the country with a majority government, then how many members do they need on the government side before they can run the country as efficiently as the Solicitor General would like?

• (1740)

The Solicitor General cannot run his own department. He cannot produce legislation associated with a report on penitentiaries produced by a sub-committee which was agreed on unanimously and which detailed how badly penitentiaries were being operated at the present time. Apparently the Solicitor General cannot control the RCM Police and has to have a special inquiry into their operations. Yet this same member goes on television and tells the people the government cannot run the country, after three years of majority government.

We have been saying that the Liberals cannot run the country for quite some time. I am very pleased that the Solicitor General has taken time out of his busy schedule, and away from all the inquiries revolving around him, to tell the Canadian public that the government of today cannot operate in a parliament where it has the majority of the seats. Apparently he is hoping by some magical formula that the Canadian people are going to eliminate the opposition altogether. I imagine that is the only way he feels the government can function properly. But the Canadian people are not going to provide the government with the power to eliminate opposition so that the government can operate by edict.

I feel very badly about the fact that a majority is giving the government the power it now has in Bill C-51. To a far greater degree than in the past the government is going to regulate the lives of Canadians by interfering more and more with their rights. A general election will solve nothing. The government already has a majority mandate from the Canadian people, and rather than running around, getting on television, and saying we should have a general election, hon. members opposite should go back to their offices and get their work done. If they did the people of this country would have some confidence in the way hon. members opposite operate the government.

I see the Minister of Justice in his seat. I ask him once again as a House of Commons man to eliminate once and for all any smear that he might have inadvertently left on the reputations of the hon. members for Red Deer, Palliser, Moose Jaw, Kootenay West, and Dauphin (Mr. Ritchie) resulting from the injudicious remarks he made outside the House about the contributions of those members in the House. I think it is terribly unfair that a member of this House says outside the House anything about what another member said in the Chamber. As conscientious members of parliament they were speaking in a debate in the House and endeavouring to indicate what were their concerns about a piece of legislation that is troubling a great many Canadians both inside and outside this Chamber. I hope that when I sit down the minister will be willing to do what I suggest. His remarks were something injected into this debate which was not required and added nothing. All members of this party were terribly upset at his injudicious comments, and we hope that the minister will clear the record once and for all.

Mr. Arnold Peters (Timiskaming): Mr. Speaker, unfortunately time is moving on and for that reason I feel reluctant to say what I would normally say in a third reading speech. I think this legislation is very bad. That is pretty well the opinion of the chiefs of police as well; they indicated they were very sad that the minister has not done for them what they wanted him to do. They referred to the fact that the Carter administration in the United States is in favour of electronic surveillance and that the minister should do what they want. I presume that that means to allow unlimited surveillance. This is probably what the police will carry on anyway. They have never been too law-abiding in their enforcement of the law on others.

I am wondering whether they are really saying that they believe that the Carter administration in the United States is going to allow the police to use all kinds of wiretapping equipment without the benefit of court protection and then allow the use of that illegally obtained evidence to be used in court. I would doubt very much, knowing the reputations of the United States courts, that they would allow illegally obtained wiretap evidence to be used in them.

I suppose it is like people eavesdropping on everybody else. With the old party line telephones, if there was nothing else to do the housewife could always take the receiver off the hook and entertain herself while doing the ironing, the darning, the cooking or whatever. That was a great way to understand what everybody else was doing, and there were no secrets. It was a very open form of communication and whoever wanted to listen could, and often did so. I think it would have been a very brave rural resident who would go to church on Sunday morning and say "Did you hear the gossip on the telephone the

other day when I heard Mrs. Jones talking about Mr. Smith?" Perhaps that would not have been done because people did not want others to know they were listening in, even though almost everybody did it.

The only way bugging can be effective is if people are unaware their conversations are being overheard. The police are foolish if they think otherwise or that it will help them very much. It will help them catch the small penny criminals, but so far as organized crime is concerned the government is barking up the wrong tree if it thinks this kind of surveillance will stop organized crime. It will only catch the little old lady trying, as somebody said, to sneak some underwear across the border; it will not do much to prevent organized crime. That surely is not really the main purpose of the police.

● (1750)

Police would like the elimination of firearms in the hands of the public. One of the police chiefs speaking on a radio program last night said that he wished there were no guns in the hands of individual citizens in Canada. I think that if you controlled all guns, that would be effective, but this is Utopian and it will not happen. There would be not much point in trying to achieve it. Perhaps that would be suitable in Canada, but people in Canada treat guns differently than they do in the United States.

In the United States there has always been a great deal of confusion about the right to use guns to protect one's property, under their constitution. We never had such problems. Very early in our history we established military law. The militia controlled the laws in the early history of Canada, in both French and English Canada. The militia acted as policemen in the colonies until we developed a police force. Our police force was not the same as in England or in France. It was a relatively mobile police force and some of its aims, among others, were to put down revolutions and to protect the properties of merchants. The police took part in the war of the English and French fur traders. Later the mounted police was formed. That was its background, so we in Canada have not developed the same attitude toward guns as they have in the United States. It has usually been a necessity here to carry a gun. On many occasions Canadians have been called upon to pick up guns in the defence of their country. Canadians have used guns as tools of their trade.

Listening to the program "Cross Country Check-up" last night I heard some interesting comments. One was from the Northwest Territories. A caller said that guns there were not treated with particular respect and care, but at the same time they were not misused. He said that there was no difference between the way a gun and a butcher's knife were approached. Children are taught early on in their lives that they must not pick up a butcher's knife because they might cut themselves, or a gun because it is dangerous. No particular care is taken of either a butcher's knife or a gun, but neither are they misused. Many murders that were committed in that area did not involve the use of a gun, although a gun was easily accessible to those involved in the crimes.

The police want to outlaw guns. In the bill preceding this one the minister indicated that he wished to outlaw guns. "Get them all out of the way, and there will be no problem", he seemed to say. Many of those who called in on "Cross Country Check-up", said, "We do not have guns over theah and therefore we do not want guns over heah". My tendency would be to say, "If you want to go over there, we will help to get you over there, because we like it here and we want to stay here". Much of it is that British nonsense, and the kind of people who go with that.

They fight their social wars here because over there they were not allowed to join the hunt club. Over here you can join the hunt club and chase foxes if you want, or you can shoot foxes at your own leisure—you do not need to belong to a social club or come from the right side of the tracks. There was a caller from Manotick who said, "We don't like these guns around, they are dangerous". That is a lot of nonsense. If they do not like them, they can go home and take their arguments with them.

There are many people in this country who are prejudiced either for or against guns. We all agree that the use of guns should be controlled to some degree, and one of the ways to control them is to improve ways of storing them. The way in which guns are stored in many parts of the country is atrocious.

We are worried about the one extra gun which one fellow used in the incident which took place in Ottawa the other day and which, they say, he would not have bought when on parole had the legislation been in effect. But no one said how he used other guns before that incident. They are talking only about the control of the gun he used this time. What shocks me about the police is that they seem to have known when and where he bought the gun, they knew all about it. Obviously they did not need this kind of legislation. Why did they let him buy it? Why did they not send a better trained policeman with a warrant to pick him up? In my opinion they are not really doing anything to prevent people from misusing guns, but they are really doing a number of things that are detrimental.

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

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It being six o'clock, I do now leave the chair until 8 p.m. tonight.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

AFTER RECESS

[*English*]

The House resumed at 8 p.m.

Mr. Peters: Mr. Speaker, before the recess I was talking about the fact that the police chiefs of Canada are not particularly happy with the minister because they do not believe the wiretap legislation he is proposing is sufficient. They are also quite upset about the watering down of the bill with regard to gun legislation. In their brief the police chiefs

talk about the unnecessary and impractical procedural burden which will be put on a firearms officer when he has to issue certificates of acquisition. They add something—which I presume is interesting to lawyers, but it is surprising to me—and it is this sentence:

It is the applicant who wishes to avail himself of a privilege—

That is, to buy a gun.

—and therefore the onus should be on him to provide the information necessary on the further grounds that he is also in a better position to provide that specific information.

It is proposed that the following question be asked: "Do you wish to say anything further which would incriminate you, because if we find out about something afterwards, you will face a more serious offence?" The police wish to go that further step so that the person who applies for a certificate, which the police chiefs call a privilege, could face other charges if the information he gives turns out to be inaccurate.

The brief of the police chiefs also says:

We further feel that any certificate renewal should be made only where there has been a revocation, and that the five year review of existing certificates should therefore be dropped.

The police chiefs think that anything else would be too expensive, would involve too much of the time of the police, and would be limiting.

An hon. Member: You are saying that.

Mr. Peters: No, I am paraphrasing what the police chiefs said. They were the ones who said that the five year review of existing certificates should be dropped, and that unless people do something wrong or there is some reason to revoke a certificate, people should not have to reapply after five years.

This is not the kind of legislation which will remove guns from people. On the other hand I do not think it will do anything to make it easier for the police to control the use of guns. There is considerable confusion as to what are prohibited guns, what are restricted guns, and what category the remainder fall under.

It has been argued that this legislation will control revolvers, but it will not affect them at all. They are already controlled. There are many revolvers on the market, and many are being used in hold-ups and in other criminal offences. Revolvers have always been very closely regulated. Machine guns would be banned under this legislation, but they have been banned under the Criminal Code for a long time. Machine guns have not been legalized, and there is nothing in this legislation which changes that. The only change affects automatic and semi-automatic weapons.

We are asking many people to support a bureaucracy in its efforts to do something which really will not accomplish anything. It is unfortunate that young members of parliament and young members of the public do not remember the fiasco of a number of years ago when there were $2 radio licences. People were supposed to pay $2 to licence each radio. They were supposed to do it voluntarily, and there were all kinds of inspectors who went around the country counting radios. That did not work, and the system was discarded.

Recently in Ontario the same thing was tried with regard to fishing licences. That was nuisance legislation. It was not designed to make just enough money to pay for itself. It did not keep people from fishing. It was established to produce revenue and to allow some control. There were better methods, and they are now being used. It seems to me this will be true of this legislation also.

● (2010)

If a person wants to buy a gun he will still need to have a certificate, and if he wants to sell that gun he will also need a certificate. In this way all new acquisitions will be recorded. This will not affect the more than 10 million long guns that are in circulation today, however, and I believe may lead to confusion in any attempt to control hand guns and other weapons used illegally by criminals.

This legislation is not going to satisfy anybody, but it will create a great deal of confusion for the police forces in the country and give them more work to do. Statistics accumulated and put in the hands of the police could be used against ordinary people.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that the firearms provision and the wiretapping provision in this bill should not be passed.

Mr. Bert Hargrave (Medicine Hat): Mr. Speaker, my remarks will be very brief but I believe they will reflect the view of my constituency on this very important bill that we are tackling for the second time in this session. My constituency mail on Bill C-51 now before us was a great deal lighter than the mail I received on the earlier peace and security legislation, Bill C-83, although the tone of the mail was similar. Most letters came from rural people, farmers, hunting and sports associations and their members. There was very little comment on the wiretapping provisions of Bill C-51 and I think this is because the public at large do not understand the implications, so most of them did not comment on it. This impression is confirmed through conversations with many constituents.

Predictably most of the comments I received fully supported my stand on Bill C-83, the bill that died on the order paper, and almost all were critical of the firearms acquisition certificate, and were unanimously critical of the $10 fee.

A significant number of people pointed out that the priorities of the bill were wrong in view of the evidence on the misuse of alcohol and drugs in our society today. Many pointed to the statistic that 72 per cent of all violent crimes are related to the misuse of alcohol and drugs and felt that this matter should be receiving the attention of the House, not gun control as presented in the bill. I must say I thoroughly agree with that view.

My correspondence suggested that competency courses of instructions in the handling of firearms would be more applicable than this form of gun legislation. I agree with that as well. The underlying theme of all correspondence, however, in regard to the gun control feature of the bill, was that even with

the substantial work done in committee on both Bill C-83 and Bill C-51, and in spite of the improvements resulting from the various amendments, this new bill will not do what all of us want, that is, take firearms out of the hands of criminals.

I received only about 50 letters on this bill, a small number in comparison to the number received on the earlier bill. About half of that 50 were from my constituents and the other half from all over western Canada.

I should like to put my personal views on record regarding the wiretapping provisions of the bill. There is no question that today our society is very disturbed and concerned about the frightening evidence of organized and unorganized crime in Canada. How far should we go in our efforts to combat this upsurge in crime?

I am equally concerned about the civil rights aspects, the invasion of our private rights in our homes. Recent high level break-ins—official or otherwise—pinpoint the need for a very high level assessment of our criminal laws as well as the political direction and responsibility of our police and security forces. We are not going to get this protection from the wiretapping provisions of this bill.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, a very appropriate letter appeared in this morning's *Globe and Mail* on the subject of gun control, written by a former member of this House. It is a short letter, under the heading "Gun control" and reads as follows:

Gun control

Justice Minister Ronald Basford is quoted (Officer Slain, Six Wounded in Ottawa—July 12), as indicating that the slaying of an Ottawa policeman should "get Parliament and the Opposition moving to pass a bill we have been trying to get through for 18 months."

On Feb. 5, 1973, as an opposition member in the 29th Parliament, I asked the then Minister of Justice, (Otto Lang) if, in view of the shooting down of a third Toronto policeman, he would consider implementing the suggestions made by the Policemen's Association, regarding the ownership and registration of firearms in Canada.

He answered: "The problem is that regulations in relation to firearms most certainly interfere with the ordinary activities of a lot of law-abiding citizens, whereas in no way are they certain to interfere with the activities of criminals."

Mr. Basford was a member of the Government who supported that policy and made no protest. That was four years ago.

Reg Stackhouse

Toronto

It seems appropriate to conclude by pointing out the utter futility of the package concept in preparing legislation of this type. If the five parts of this bill had been split into at least two bills we could have been finished with both gun control and wiretapping long ago.

I cannot support this package bill, Mr. Speaker, mainly because of the government's proposals on gun control and wiretapping.

Mr. J. R. Ellis (Hastings): Mr. Speaker, I will be very brief but I want to go on record as saying I intend to support my party and oppose this bill. Had the bill been split it could have been passed two years ago and this legislation would not now be before us.

[Mr. Hargrave.]

It seems to me that in some of the speeches there has been a tendency to malign the police forces of this country. Some wild charges have been made about what the police will do with wiretaps—that they will use illegal wiretaps and engage in nefarious schemes, skullduggery, and other things that are objectionable. I disagree with such accusations, Mr. Speaker. I have probably had no more than the average number of encounters with the Ontario Provincial Police who service a number of municipalities in my riding. I may get the odd speeding ticket, and that is the sum of my encounters with them. Much the same applies to the RCMP. We see the RCMP on ceremonial occasions and know of some of the work they do. I have a personal relationship with a senior officer of the force who grew up next door to me. He is a sterling character; I know his family, and hope some of the accusations levelled against the RCMP will be cleared up during the forthcoming inquiry.

● (2020)

I resent some of the things some hon. members have said about our police forces. Let me say that in the small area I represent our police forces are not villains. They are the protectors of our people. I sat four years on the board of police commissioners of the city of Belleville and I can tell you that Chief Doug Crosbie heads one of the finest police forces in all Canada. I am not ashamed to say I had a hand in hiring him, but I do not single him out particularly, because chiefs before him were also good. Let me also mention Carl Beattie, chief of the police force in Deseronto. When they have a barbeque at the Lion's Club, or when there is work to do at the arena, to get ready for the kids on Saturday morning, Carl is one of the boys; but everyone in the village knows that on Saturday night, when Carl Beattie is on duty, you had better not drive down the main street of Deseronto faster than you should, or carry a mickey in your hip pocket, because Carl will put you in the clink as quick as a wink.

The same is true of Charlie Fletcher in Picton. I have an Indian reserve in my riding, one of the few with its own police force. When there is a problem in Shannonville, or on the Tyendwaga reserve, Tom Maracle comes up and talks to the people. If it is an Indian problem he straightens it out.

Those kind of people protect people in my part of the country. Mr. Speaker, I submit many hon. members who have spoken recently, barring the hon. member who spoke before me and dealt with a specific part of the bill, have come dangerously close to imputing serious crimes to police forces in Canada. I object. In my opinion these small police forces will not engage in undue wiretapping. I guarantee it. Small communities never have enough money for equipment and men. They do not have enough men for wiretapping, or for the sort of wiretapping they might like to do. The municipal police budgets are never large enough to enable the police forces to do the job they want to do. Those forces are equipped with the best equipment it is possible to obtain for them in the circumstances. They try to buy equipment as good as they can afford, and keep their training methods up to date. But they make a

major decision when they decide to upgrade their radios or buy a new radar unit.

Personally I am not worried about wiretaps. Like most members of parliament I probably spend more time on the telephone than the average Canadian. Perhaps I use the telephone more than some other members do. If any people want to listen to my telephone conversations, they are welcome to try. Go ahead. I have nothing to hide. I am not the least bit worried about somebody tapping my telephone. I merely want the record to show that there is support in this House—I know I speak for many members—for those forces which protect Canadians. Our police forces are not a bunch of villains.

[*Translation*]

Mr. C. A. Gauthier (Roberval): Mr. Speaker, I am happy to rise under your chairmanship; this is the first time I have had this opportunity. I have something to add although I have spoken this afternoon on the amendment of the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands (Mr. Douglas) about wiretapping. Everybody will realize that this legislation which is over 80-pages long, despite all the points dealt with, as I said this afternoon, is an omnibus bill dealing with the Customs Tariff, the Parole Act, the Penitentiary Act and the Prisons and Reformatories Act, wiretapping, gun control, etc. We find that the gun control section covers 44 pages of the bill, and that is why I said this afternoon that this was the most important question in the legislation, and that it would have been absolutely necessary to have a bill dealing specifically with gun control. What sort of a control? To what extent?

We are in favour of some control, and we have already had controls since World War II on ordinary and automatic weapons, but mainly since the sixties; and I should add that controls on automatic weapons are a lot stricter now, because I remember that when I had one day to have my revolver registered, I realized that the laws had become a lot more severe. We do not object to that, but we are saying that this legislation goes too far or is not precise enough, so that it frightens almost everybody. That is why I should like to convey to the House the reaction of the people in my constituency of Roberval who see in this bill not only a protection for law abiding citizens, as the minister claimed, but also in my opinion a legislation which favours the criminal to the detriment of the honest citizen. I am thinking about the farmers, the sportsmen and the businessmen of my constituency. Mr. Speaker, when I spoke on Bill C-83, I even proposed not only to grant permits but free permits. With all the money involved in this bill, it is simply another Loto Canada set up by the federal government and permits should be granted to those who require them, such as all farmers.

● (2030)

The bill specifies Indians and Inuits. I agree, but there are also other groups. I cannot imagine a farmer unable to have a permit for one or two guns, or sportsmen, and I added also businessmen. Nowadays, Mr. Speaker, if someone really wants protection, he must in a way look after himself. There is the civil defence, protection in general, of course, but I think it is essential that responsible citizens have the right to protect themselves. If a businessman does not have the right to keep a gun in his home to protect himself against bandits, that is terrible. Can you imagine, Mr. Speaker, the situation if every bank manager, every bank teller could be armed? There would no longer be any bank robbers or at least far fewer of them would dare go into a bank with five, ten or 20 tellers. Then, they would start to be scared. But if there is a law that in fact disarms all those people, all the honest people, that forces them to hand over their weapons, who will then be favoured? Mr. Speaker, this bill will not disarm a single bandit. They will continue to keep their guns, and all the equipment they use to commit their crimes. In some stores, some banks, when robbers come face to face with a weapon, they do not show up a second time.

According to police reports, the law is not strong enough for us to abolish capital punishment. We started with doing just that; and now, we are asked to disarm all the honest people, under the pretext that crime will thereby be reduced. It is impossible to do so by proceeding in this way. The minister says he heard witness after witness. Yes, indeed, there were many in committee. I shall take a couple at random, for instance, from the report of the Canadian Police Association, and another, which I have here, from the report signed by Mr. McCann, advisor to the government or even from the report on arms control; those people are not extremists. They do not deny the government the right to exercise some control. I quote from that brief:

> As responsible owners, we feel that arms control should endeavour to prevent criminals and the mentally ill from owning such weapons while responsible citizens should be allowed to enjoy their favorite sport without undue restrictions.

I consider it undue restriction to have all those people.

In the first place, the department is going to set up a committee to enact regulations, to impose taxes because people are more concerned over regulations than the act itself. And following that bill, which already contains 44 pages on firearms alone, I anticipate another volume on regulations they want to impose on each and everyone. And you will notice, Mr. Speaker, that the bill emphasizes the punitive rather than the educational aspect. And that is the kind of avenue the government always follows. For instance, if a farmer forgot to register an old gun handed down from one generation to another, the officials will have the right to seize it because he did not report it.

We know how those things happen because there are confiscations every day in our area even with the present regulations because some hunter kills game that he is not allowed to kill, his gun or his rifle is confiscated or he is quietly on his way home after six o'clock and was unfortunate enough to leave his gun on the back seat, the gun is seized, a $200 to $250 gun that he will never see again. He is given a fine, and his rifle is taken away. People come to my office asking: Is it possible to get at least our rifle back after paying the fine? No. What do they do with it? We do not know, and nobody can tell us. But I think that thousands and thousands of rifles are being trafficked, I believe, by some public servants who take a wicked

pleasure in seizing every time they can the rifles and guns of people who need them.

I am afraid that this bill which is excessively permissive will further strip honest people of a firearm to which they are attached, a firearm they want and would then have the right to keep in their possession in their homes. That is why, as I said this afternoon, I repeat that bills like this should be selected and graded so we would have time to discuss and vote with the necessary amendments to strengthen that bill, and when it would come back to the House, I think it would be easier to pass. What did happen? It was buried in an omnibus bill and the witnesses were indeed listened to but without giving it more attention to bring in the amendments they were proposing about firearms. That is why I say that we cannot support Bill C-51, not because it is entirely bad, no, but because it is an omnibus bill and we cannot afford to get everyone into the same boat.

For example, is the registration of firearms going to cost $10 or $15? We do not know. The regulations will determine that and the regulations are not written by members of parliament but will again be written by public servants who will determine the amount of money they need to pay to have the right to own a firearm. But will those permits be renewable every year now? Every five years? Every ten years? That is another thing, we do not know yet, Mr. Speaker. I think there are many obscure issues in this bill and it is impossible at present for us to give our support to that part of the bill. I say that this bill operates to the detriment of honest citizens. We also find the following statements in the A. McCann report which I realize has been tabled in committee. I quote:

> Estimates to the effect that 7 to 10 millions firearms are owned by Canadian citizens certainly prove that a lot of people 2 to 3 millions perhaps are interested enough in firearms to buy and maintain them. Only a few of these weapons are meant for illegal use. Although firearms owners are entirely in favour of effective controls, it seems unreasonable to subject a great number of citizens to such impracticable regulations. As for revolvers, controls on this type of firearms have existed in Canada since before the Second World War. These controls have been tightened in the sixties and since then their possession has become so difficult that it borders on prohibition.

And on that point they are right for I have made the experience myself. In spite of that, these controls did not result in a decrease of gun usage for criminal activities.

This is what I want to emphasize, Mr. Speaker. Even with all those precautions, another report says that the crime rate has increased and that criminals are more active than ever. It is not by refusing everyone a permit that we can decrease the incidence of criminal acts.

> A comparison of the crime rates in countries with strict gun control has proven its use, unless other appropriate factors be considered as well. For every country, the comparisons emphasize the importance of history, population, family life and mutual respect. In the case of criminals, there is a premeditated intent to violate the law. If this includes the use of a firearm, violation of another law by the criminal is therefore completely unimportant. The criminal will always be able to obtain the weapons he needs from illegal sources. This is why we cannot believe that any control or prohibition can have a concrete effect on the criminal use of firearms.

The next paragraph talks about mental patients. I believe mostly in some control at the level of weapon sales, but this control that we shall have will be another federal tax on illegal sales. Instead of using the police for imposing a legal control, the government wants another licence traffic. And everyone knows what this traffic is like in politics. Everyone knows that this is the source of the whole problem. There will again be people who will not be entitled to hold permits but who will still get them because of political patronage. This will again come into play. If there was a legal commission to issue permits without any fee involved, there would be much less political influence. And this is always what I fear in such cases.

Well, Mr. Speaker, if the federal government requires a permit for firearms trading, this is quite well for the trade. However, we do not want some regulations to deprive once again some honest citizens. This is what we fear in our areas especially according to the reports which I received at my office. All those who came to my office are afraid, but I think their fears will soon be justified if this goes on, because the minister mentioned that only the Indians, the Inuit and those who earn their living by hunting would have free permits, but they are not alone.

There are other Canadians who do not hunt for a living but who like that sport and who also have the right to own a gun either for their own pleasure or for their personal needs, such as farmers, tradesmen, businessmen and those who have great financial responsibilities. Mr. Speaker, I understand that this bill, regardless of what we might say, is going to be passed anyway, but I simply wanted explain why I was opposed to it, once again not because the whole bill is bad, but because of that famous omnibus bill that I have never swallowed and will never swallow.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is the House ready for the question?

● (2040)

[*English*]

Some hon. Members: Question.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The question is on the motion in the name of the Minister of Justice (Mr. Basford). All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

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

Some hon. Members: Nay.

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

Mr. Basford: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, there have been discussions through the usual channels as to when a division on this motion might be taken and it has been agreed through the usual channels, I believe, that it be taken at the close of the question period tomorrow.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): That is the gist of the discussions, and it is quite agreeable to us on this side.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gauthier (Roberval): I think that is strange. A short while ago, the minister came to my office and told me that there would be a vote tonight. I find it rather strange being told that there has been an understanding. I have not heard about that, and the minister came to my office a short while ago and told me that there was going to be a vote. This is why I am in favour of this vote tonight.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I will point out to the hon. member for Roberval (Mr. Gauthier) that he has a choice open to him. The House needs unanimous consent so that the vote may be deferred till tomorrow, after the oral question period, and as the Chair is not privy to these negotiations between party House leaders and since any member has the right to dissent, the unanimous consent of the House must be obtained before the House may make an order for the vote to be scheduled for tomorrow.

[*English*]

Mr. Basford: May I say to the hon. member for Roberval (Mr. Gauthier) that I did discuss this matter with him this afternoon before he made his speech and I thought I made it clear there would not be a division tonight—that the yeas and nays would be called but that the division would be taken tomorrow. That is the agreement I have been seeking to obtain all day—that after the debate had been concluded we would do the actual voting tomorrow. I apologize if I did not make this clear. I thought I had.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gauthier (Roberval): Mr. Speaker, I think there was a misunderstanding, because when the minister came to talk to me, I did understand that he asked me if I was going to speak tonight. I said I would but that I would allow time for the taking of the vote tonight. Then he said to me: "Very well." I told him that immediately after I finished speaking, the vote could be held. I do not see what difference it makes whether the vote is taken tonight or tomorrow. I had understood correctly and I was indeed under the impression when I talked to him that the vote would be taken tonight, so I made arrangements accordingly.

[*English*]

Mr. MacEachen: Thank you.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: There not being unanimous consent—

Some hon. Members: Oh!

Mr. Basford: With respect, Mr. Speaker, I believe the hon. member for Roberval indicated to me, when I explained that I thought the vote would be taken tomorrow, that it was immaterial to him whether it was taken tonight or tomorrow. I thought I had informed the hon. member earlier that it would be taken by agreement tomorrow. I know he was ready to have a vote this evening but other groups in the House preferred to defer the voting until tomorrow. I would ask him, in line with our conversation, to agree to that course.

Mr. Epp: You Liberals blew it!

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gauthier (Roberval): Mr. Speaker, I am sorry. I never said tonight or tomorrow. I said tonight when I spoke, because I had my reasons for wanting the vote to be taken tonight. That is why I did not want it postponed until tomorrow, because tomorrow there will be other business to be considered and we do not have enough members tonight to discuss the legislation that will be called after the vote. That is my reason for being honest with him.

Mr. Blaker: Do you agree that we adjourn until tomorrow?

Mr. Gauthier (Roberval): Do I agree to adjourn until tomorrow? That is precisely the point. I am being asked if I agree to adjourn until tomorrow, and I cannot agree because we do not have enough members to proceed with the next legislation that will be called.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. If I understand correctly the hon. member for Roberval, since his party is not ready to proceed with the legislation to be called after the division, if it were not taken tonight but deferred until tomorrow, he would prefer the vote to be taken tonight, so that there will not be much time left, but enough to proceed with another bill and not necessarily to dispose of it.

● (2050)

[*English*]

There seems to be a misunderstanding. The hon. member for Roberval (Mr. Gauthier) insists that his party is not ready to proceed with other legislation, if the vote is postponed at this time, and unless there is some agreement by his party after the question being postponed, we would not proceed with other legislation. He is not ready to give unanimous consent. Unless someone finds an argument to get that consent, I will have to call in the members.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gauthier (Roberval): Mr. Speaker, if the vote is taken tomorrow, I do not mind, but let us call it ten o'clock immediately, so that we will not consider other bills after that.

Mr. Lessard (Lac-Saint-Jean): I rise on a point of order. I should like to point out to the hon. member for Roberval, the constituency next to mine, that there appears to be a clear case of misunderstanding between the hon. member for Roberval and the Minister of Justice (Mr. Basford). I should like to add that the hon. member apparently fears that there will not be enough time or opportunity to debate the next bill, which is Bill C-60, the purpose of which is to create a constituency in northern Ontario. The hon. member for Villeneuve (Mr. Caouette) is certainly ready to deal with this question. If my hon. colleague from Roberval would agree to have the vote postponed until three o'clock or 3.15 tomorrow afternoon, Bill

C-60 might be called immediately and give the hon. member for Villeneuve, NDP members, and probably others, and perhaps some also from this side the opportunity to make their views known. Anyway, it is already 8.55 p.m.

There is hardly an hour of debate left before the end of the sitting this evening. This would allow the hon. member for Villeneuve (Mr. Caouette) and other members to state their views on Bill C-60. Then the discussion on Bill C-60 could take place at some other time as determined by the Chair, or the House leader in consultation with the leaders of the other parties. I suggest to the hon. member for Roberval (Mr. Gauthier) that he consider the matter and allow the debate to be deferred until tomorrow at 3.15 p.m.

Mr. Gauthier (Roberval): Mr. Speaker, I made a distinction which I explained to everyone, and the members of the New Democratic Party were aware of the fact. I said that if Bill C-51 was discussed after supper, there would necessarily be a vote, because we would not be ready to deal with Bill C-60. In other words, they want to slip Bill C-60 between two others, but it will not be done just like that. This is the reason why I say that the vote should take place this evening. The minister should tell us why a vote cannot be taken this evening. We are all here and we are ready to vote. We are waiting for it.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Since there is no unanimous consent, I must call in the members.

● (2100)

[*English*]

The House divided on the motion (Mr. Basford) which was agreed to on the following division:

● (2110)

(*Division No. 91*)

YEAS

Messrs.

Allmand
Anderson
Andras
(Port Arthur)
Appolloni (Mrs.)
Baker
(Gander-Twillingate)
Basford
Béchard
Blaker
Boulanger
Breau
Buchanan
Bussières
Caccia
Caron
Clermont
Collenette
Comtois
Corbin
Corriveau
Cullen
Cyr
Dawson
Demers
Douglas
(Bruce-Grey)
Drury
Duclos
Dupont
Duquet
Faulkner
Flynn
Foster
Francis
Gauthier
(Ottawa-Vanier)
Gendron
Gillespie
Goodale
Goyer
Guay
(St. Boniface)
Haidasz
Harquail
Herbert
Holt (Mrs.)
Hopkins
Horner
Isabelle
Jamieson
Kaplan
Lajoie
Lalonde
Lamontagne
Landers
Laniel
Lapointe
Leblanc
(Laurier)
LeBlanc
(Westmorland-Kent)
Lee
Lefebvre
Lessard
Loiselle
(Saint-Henri)
Lumley
MacDonald
(Cardigan)
Macdonald
(Rosedale)
MacEachen
MacFarlane
Maine
Marchand
McIsaac
McRae
Milne
Munro
(Hamilton East)
Nicholson (Miss)
O'Connell
Olivier
Ouellet
Parent
Pearsall
Pelletier
Penner
Philbrook
Portelance
Poulin
Railton
Raines
Roy
(Laval)
Saltsman
Savard
Smith
(Saint-Jean)
Stewart
(Cochrane)
Trudeau
Trudel
Turner
Watson
Whelan
Yanakis
Young—95.

[Mr. Lessard.]

NAYS

Messrs.

Baker
(Grenville-Carleton)
Beatty
Benjamin
Caouette
(Villeneuve)
Cossitt
Crosbie
Crouse
Darling
Dick
Ellis
Epp
Fraser
Gauthier
(Roberval)
Gilbert
Grafftey
Hargrave
Hnatyshyn
Johnston
Knowles
(Winnipeg
North Centre)
Knowles
(Norfolk-Haldimand)
Lambert
(Edmonton West)
MacDonald
(Egmont)
MacDonald (Miss)
(Kingston and the
Islands)
Malone
Marshall
McKenzie
McKinley
Munro
(Esquimalt-Saanich)
Neil
Nystrom
Oberle
Orlikow
Paproski
Peters
Pigott (Mrs.)
Rodriguez
Stanfield
Stevens
Symes
Woolliams—40.

● (2200)

Mr. Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

Motion agreed to and bill read the third time and passed.

* * *

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Baker: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the government House leader what he intends to deal with tomorrow and, if this is possible, later on in the week and into next week?

Mr. MacEachen: Tomorrow we shall continue with the third reading of the unemployment insurance bill, and consultations will take place with respect to what we shall be considering after that.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[*English*]

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 40 deemed to have been moved.

AGRICULTURE—PROPOSED REFERENCE TO COMMITTEE OF POLICY STATEMENTS ON CATTLE INDUSTRY—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Bert Hargrave (Medicine Hat): Mr. Speaker, the occasion for this adjournment debate arose as far back as last February 4, as reported at page 2720 of *Hansard*.

One of the most serious criticisms of our parliamentary procedure I have noticed in close to five years spent in this House relates to a practice which is slowly but surely increasing, to the great detriment of our parliamentary tradition. I refer to the government's deliberate policy-making by order in council, or by direct ministerial authority.

This portion of the adjournment debate will deal with that situation, especially with respect to three policy announcements which were made by the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Whelan) during the last Christmas recess, dealing with Canada's beef cattle industry, at a time when no proper debate or comment in the House was possible. Today, seven months later, as we prepare to adjourn for a summer recess, we find there has been no opportunity to examine and debate these policy pronouncements, especially in committee.

● (2210)

The first one was on December 23, 1976, which was the announcement of Canada's offshore beef quotas, against Australia, New Zealand, and United States beef imports into Canada. The facts which should have been pointed out in a proper debate in committee, immediately after our Christmas recess, would include this long overdue action which was a full year late. Cattlemen had asked for action more than a year earlier. Approximately nine months before this announcement the signs were clearly evident that we were headed for massive levels of offshore beef imports over the remainder of 1976, a 60 per cent increase in the offshore beef imports over 1975 which came to a total of 186 million pounds. This is the equivalent of approximately 535,000 Canadian cows. These came in at very badly discounted prices of as much as 31 cents per pound below the equivalent beef entering the United States from offshore. During 1976 there was the largest supply of domestic beef in Canada's history. The result was a massive displacement of our fresh cow beef to the United States market.

I want to point out that I have no criticism of Canada's participation in the North American market, but those displaced cows moved to that market because our own market was $3 lower due to offshore imports. That exercise cost our Canadian cow market at least $30 million. The most sinister aspect of this 1976 situation was that it was so deliberate that no action was taken until a year later when the damage was done. Beef to the consumer was held at cheap levels, and the control policy and the cost of living factor appeared to be working for the consumer's benefit.

The second announcement occurred on January 4, 1977. The minister announced his cow-calf stabilization policy for the calendar year 1977, following the minister's own stabilization policy. I have no quarrel with that aspect, but I do quarrel with the fact that this cow-calf policy was not retroactive to 1976. That was the worst year ever in our cattle industry with costs of production taken into account.

The minister had repeatedly promised this policy would be announced in 1976 for 1976, including a promise to the provincial ministers of agriculture during the summer or fall of that year. This lack of action for 1976 contributed to the very depressed cattle market, and of course was another contribution to the ongoing cheap food policy.

The third one was on January 23 or 24 of 1977, when the minister announced the details of his feed cattle support policy for last year. In this policy announcement the minister departed from a traditional departmental announcement which followed a prescribed and accepted pattern or guideline. He changed the rules in two ways: by using 95 per cent of the previous five year average market price instead of 90 per cent, and by using a flat dollar figure of $1.79 to be added to the stabilized level of $40.16 in order to make a payout possible. This $1.79 was the cost of production increment when the feed grains and feeder cattle, the two principal input costs in producing feeder cattle, were both down in 1976. This cost factor should have been a reducing factor.

These are facts and items of debate which should have been brought out in a parliamentary forum at least six months ago, and not now in a politically charged atmosphere. That is the trouble in our Canadian cattle industry—there is far too much politics involved in our market orientation. Why not let the market work?

Mr. Irénée Pelletier (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to note that in asking his question on February 4, 1977, the hon. member for Medicine Hat (Mr. Hargrave) acknowledged the importance of the programs which this government has put into place for the benefit of the Canadian cattle industry. The three programs which he mentioned—the cow-calf stabilization program, the slaughter cattle stabilization program, and the beef import quotas—have since been supplemented by an additional program at the request of producers in western Canada. I am speaking, of course, of the drought program.

As the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Whelan) explained in his response on February 4, he has no objection in principle to the referral of these programs to the Standing Committee on Agriculture for discussion. In fact he would welcome such an opportunity further to explain their value to Canadian cattlemen. However, he is also aware that there is generally a very heavy demand on the time and resources available to both members of committees and the committees' branch itself.

The agriculture committee has recently expended a considerable amount of time and effort in studying the report of the commission of inquiry into the marketing of beef and veal. Issues of concern to the industry, such as those mentioned previously, were provided with an excellent forum for discussion during these meetings. The other place has also been most active in this respect. In addition, the Standing Committee on Agriculture considers the agriculture stabilization estimates, as well as those of the department, each year. Discussions are very broad in scope at these meetings, and issues such as the hon. member has mentioned tonight are regularly discussed with the witnesses who are present.

Although I am aware of the hon. member's concerns as they relate to the cattle industry, I have also noted the specific

concerns of other members relative to different commodities. I am sure that the request of the hon. member would, therefore, give rise to a request for discussion by several other commodity interests. In view of the foregoing, and under the present circumstances, I do not believe that the minister would support the hon. member's request.

TRANSPORT—REQUEST FOR INCREASE IN FEDERAL SHARE OF COST OF HIGHWAY PROGRAM FOR ATLANTIC REGION

Mr. Jack Marshall (Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe): Mr. Speaker, I am debating tonight the reply given me by the Minister of Transport (Mr. Lang) in which he advised that he was not prepared to accede to the request by the Atlantic provinces highways ministers and myself for a more deserving cost sharing formula in regard to the $100 million highway strengthening program for the Atlantic region announced recently, other than that the federal government would contribute 50 per cent of the cost.

I say with all due respect to the minister that I find it difficult to reconcile his creating a new precedent when another precedent has been set in two other areas of highway programs. Under the original agreement to build the Trans-Canada highway in Newfoundland during the Pearson regime, the federal government participated to the extent of 90 per cent of the cost. The minister replied to me that he was not sure that the generous treatment offered at that time should necessarily be repeated.

I remind the minister through his parliamentary secretary that even though the portion of the highway through Newfoundland was called the Trans-Canada highway, any similarity between what exists under that name in my province and that which exists in other parts of Canada is strictly coincidental and primarily a misnomer of the worst degree. I feel that on this basis alone the federal government should even pay 100 per cent of the cost to correct the accepted ridiculous standards of that highway in Canada.

Secondly, his colleague, the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion (Mr. Lessard), has entered into several highways agreements with the province of Newfoundland, which are still existing, to build highways in the province on a 90-10 basis.

● (2220)

Thirdly, I wonder at the answers given to me according to which the program for the four Atlantic provinces of $100 million—about $25 million to each province—is deemed to be so generous when a similar amount of almost $100 million is to be provided to one other province under a $264 million Quebec highway program.

I would venture to say that the most deteriorated section of the Trans-Canada highway exists in my province and in my district, the portion from the Port aux Basques entry to Cornerbrook, a most important section of the corridor which is so necessary for the highway traffic to St. John's, Newfoundland.

It is interesting to note that in the Quebec agreement the basis of the financial contribution of $100 million is for

[Mr. Pelletier (Sherbrooke).]

industrial development, to facilitate access to tourist areas and, to improve safety and capacity along the traffic corridor, and I can only wonder why it is not recognized that the same need exists for the Newfoundland corridor to give that province the infrastructure base which is so vitally necessary for our economic development and for a fundamental transportation base so that Newfoundland can finally contribute toward the Canadian dream.

Certainly it should be recognized, from the slow progress made in developing and marketing our resources, that a reasonable transportation system is vital in order to overcome the handicap of transportation costs in competing for distant markets where we sell our products.

I hope that the minister will have his officials drive over the Trans-Canada highway in Newfoundland to see the deteriorated sections which are a danger to the traveller, and which can only be termed an embarrassment to Canada. What can our province do with $30 million? Our share of the program can do little to meet the needs, especially when it is spread over a three year period. I can only ask again that the matter be looked into with a view to meeting our regional objectives the fulfillment of which which we have awaited with too much patience over the past years. I hope that the very efficient parliamentary secretary can give me an answer which will give some hope for the future and which will meet the needs of Newfoundland in line with the highways agreement which was signed.

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, in considering the question of an appropriate role for the federal government in supporting the upgrading of the primary highway system in the Atlantic provinces, it is important to recognize that for the most part highways are a provincial responsibility.

However, as evidenced by a recent announcement, the federal government proposes to spend up to $125 million over the next three years to help improve transportation services in the four Atlantic provinces. The major highway strengthening program to which the government will contribute $100 million is, of course, of the highest priority.

An analysis of the highway proposal, or at least of those parts of the proposal that were put forward as having priority in the context of an initial three year agreement, submitted jointly by the provincial governments, indicated that the standardization of minimum truck weight and related regulations would indeed result in significant benefits that could be considered to be national rather than purely provincial in nature. This conclusion formed one of the main arguments in support of federal assistance.

As to the question of the cost-sharing ratio, the government feels that a 50 per cent federal share of the eligible costs would appropriately reflect the extent of "national" interest in the program. And, Mr. Speaker, given the need for fiscal restraint, the federal government is unable to assume additional liability at this time.

In conclusion, it is useful, I think, to point out that the federal proposal does make provision for a review of the first three year program, an analysis of future needs, and a recommendation regarding further programming.

LABOUR CONDITIONS—POSITION OF CANADIAN LABOUR CONGRESS ON PARTICIPATION IN MULTIPARTITE NATIONAL FORUM

Mr. John A. Fraser (Vancouver South): Mr. Speaker, my question arises out of questions which I asked of the Minister of Labour (Mr. Munro) on July 13 as reported in *Hansard* commencing on page 7626. On June 13, during a speech which I was making, the Minister of Finance (Mr. Macdonald) interjected when I was suggesting that the evidence was overwhelming that the Canadian Labour Congress would not take part in the Minister of Labour's multipartite national forum which he has been proposing since last autumn. The Minister of Finance interjected and said, "That's not what they say in private".

Subsequently, on July 13, I asked the Minister of Labour the following question which is reported at page 7626 of *Hansard:*

> Can the minister tell the House whether there have been private talks between the CLC and cabinet ministers which indicate that they are prepared to participate in the multipartite national forum or is the position of the CLC as it has been publicly stated, namely, that they are not prepared to participate in that particular forum?

I do not want to use undue language in this Chamber, but I must advise this House that the minister failed to answer that question because he did not want even to seem to be in disagreement with the Minister of Finance. However, the fact of the matter is that the CLC has never privately, publicly, or in any other way given any support to this multipartite national forum which the minister runs around the country saying is the keystone to labour policy on behalf of the Government of Canada.

I pointed out to the minister the other day that he has no commitments whatsoever from business to support a multipartite national forum. That has been made very clear on a number of occasions, if one refers to the press, but it was made very clear when Mr. Sydney Jackson of the Canadian Manufacturers' Association, in a statement which was reported in the *Globe and Mail* of July 13 of this year, said that the whole idea was just window dressing, that he had not talked to a single leader in industry who agreed to it, and that his understanding was that labour did not support it either.

I put it to the parliamentary secretary, to the Minister of Labour and to the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau), and I have put it to the Minister of Finance in the past: how can there be a government policy, and how can ministers go around the country and say seriously that this is the policy, when two of the groups which absolutely must be part of this multipartite national forum—which the Minister of Labour said is to decide the "big economic issues of the day"—labour and management, have not agreed to participate in it? What commitments does the government have from labour? Frankly, I do not believe there are any. I think the government has been pulling the wool over our eyes for months, and to the degree it is doing that it is destroying the ability of business, labour and the government to get together to have meaningful discussions.

Second, what commitment does the government have from any section of the business community? I do not want to be met tonight with a lot of nonsense about the fact that these are ongoing discussions having something to do with decontrol. When the Minister of Labour put these things forward in October he was not talking about decontrol at all; he was talking about a forum for discussion in the post-control period, not to determine what decontrol is. The Minister of Finance confirmed to me some days ago in the House that his discussions which are going on right now are not in the multipartite sense but are strictly with business and labour.

I think it is time the Minister of Labour and the government generally stopped this silly little dance of pretending to have policy when they do not have it, and they do not have the support of the sectors of the community—meaning labour and business—which they must have to support the proposal which was put forward by the Minister of Labour. It would be far better to admit that, and come up with another idea. It is absolute folly to continue to waste public funds by putting out public documentation, advertising brochures and the like, which have been appearing on all hon. members' desks recently touting a multipartite national forum to decide the big economic issues of the day many months after it was first proposed when in fact there is no agreement from either labour or business to participate in it.

● (2230)

Mr. Irénée Pelletier (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, in the recent report of the executive director of the Canadian Manufacturers' Association presented at its annual general meeting, the following statement appears:

> . . . the Association has not fully assessed all of the 14 initiatives proposed by the federal Minister of Labour for improving labour relation climate . . .

This makes it all the more difficult to be able to conclude that the statement of any representative of the Canadian Manufacturers' Association does, in fact, represent the considered views of that association on the basis of an appropriately careful evaluation of any of the 14 points, including the national consultative forum.

Over the past number of months the Minister of Labour (Mr. Munro) and the officials of his department have gone to considerable lengths to consult with business and labour across this country with regard to the 14-point program. They have heard the concerns of businessmen for such issues as the competitiveness of Canadian industry in international markets, productivity, wages, and the climate of industrial relations within which economic decisions will have to be made once controls will have been lifted. They have also heard new and much more broadly framed concerns of organized labour for a more influential voice in matters of broad social and economic consequence. The very consultations in which we have engaged

regarding the 14 points have already served to broaden the perspectives from which labour, business, and government look at matters of common interest and concern.

This process of enlarging the awareness of the other person's interests and points of view can be a powerful force for bringing greater wisdom into economic decisions, especially if the various considerations are brought into focus for intelligent analysis and consideration by all interested groups and individuals through the mechanism of the proposed national consultative forum. The forum we envisage would be representative not only of business, labour and government, but also of other interest areas including, but not necessarily restricted to, consumers, co-operatives, professionals, and primary producers such as farmers and fishermen.

Our assessment of the numerous consultations we have had with business and labour about the forum is that the concept has been enthusiastically endorsed and generally enjoys a wide measure of support. Indeed we have found no one who is actually opposed to consultation among those concerned with and affected by decisions on economic and social matters. The report of the executive director of the Canadian Manufacturers' Association referred to above contains references to consultations in which the association has been involved, and the contexts of those references would lead one to conclude that the C.M.A. has just as much to gain from consultation as anyone else.

Mr. Fraser: That is no answer to the question.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Order, please. The motion to adjourn the House is deemed to have been adopted. Accordingly, this House stands adjourned until tomorrow at 2 p.m.

At 10.36 p.m. the House adjourned, without question put, pursuant to Standing Order.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Tuesday, July 19, 1977

The House met at 2 p.m.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

TORNADO

PROPOSAL THAT AREA OF MANITOBA AFFECTED BE DECLARED DISASTER AREA—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Jake Epp (Provencher): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a matter of urgent and pressing necessity under provisions of Standing Order 43. In view of the unfortunate loss of life and devastation of property caused by a tornado which struck southeastern Manitoba, namely, the areas of Rosa and Carlowrie, on July 18, 1977, I move, seconded, by the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Whiteway):

That this House urge the Government of Canada to send officials into the affected areas with the view of declaring the affected areas a disaster area, thus making affected persons eligible for disaster payments.

Mr. Speaker: Such a motion can be presented for debate only with the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

* * *

[*Translation*]

BILINGUALISM

SUGGESTION BONUS BE GRANTED BILINGUAL EMPLOYEES IN QUEBEC—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Roch La Salle (Joliette): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the terms of Standing Order 43, I request the unanimous consent of the House to present a motion dealing with an important and urgent matter.

Since the Montreal regional council of the Public Service Alliance of Canada has declared its determination to continue boycotting the second language as long as the Treasury Board refuses to respect its promise to pay a bilingualism bonus; since the government has repeatedly stated formally that it considers it fair and equitable to pay that bonus; since an increasing number of federal civil servants in Quebec intend to ask that their jobs now classified as bilingual be reclassified as unilingual because, to quote them almost textually, they are fed up with claiming compensation they are being denied; and since it is imperative that the citizens being served by the civil servants concerned should have the choice of either official language in this country, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Brome-Missisquoi (Mr. Grafftey):

That the House unanimously recommend that the minister in charge solve immediately the problem of the bonus for bilingualism and that, should the matter not be solved quickly, no disciplinary measures be taken in the meantime against the functionaries concerned.

Mr. Speaker: Order. Pursuant to the terms of Standing Order 43, such a motion cannot be put without the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

* * *

[*English*]

HOUSING

SUGGESTED INQUIRY INTO YORK PLACE DEVELOPMENT IN HAMILTON—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Dean Whiteway (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a matter of urgent and pressing necessity under the provisions of Standing Order 43. In view of the fact that the answers to the order paper questions of the hon. member for St. John's East (Mr. McGrath), which were tabled on July 5, are incomplete and some answers deliberately mislead the House, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton (Mr. Baker):

That this House do now order a full public inquiry into the York Place low rental housing development in Hamilton.

Mr. Speaker: The presentation of such a motion pursuant to Standing Order 43 requires the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

* * *

SPORTS

REQUEST FOR DEVELOPMENT PAYMENTS FROM NATIONAL HOCKEY LEAGUE—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Otto Jelinek (High Park-Humber Valley): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the provisions of Standing Order 43, I rise on a matter of urgent and pressing necessity. In view of the fact that professional hockey teams continue to benefit financially, and in fact depend on the development of junior hockey

players in Canada, many of them financed through federal assistance programs, without contributing towards that development, and because the report by the president of Hockey Canada, Mr. Douglas Fisher, regarding the funding provisions between the NHL and Canadian major junior hockey leagues, concluded that: "there is no hope of an agreement or a compromise between the NHL and the juniors", I move, seconded by the hon. member for Joliette (Mr. La Salle):

That this House instruct the Minister of State (Fitness and Amateur Sport) to approach directly the president and officers of the National Hockey League and request that development payments for each drafted amateur be made forthwith and retroactive to the last drafts, failing which the government would be compelled to introduce legislation dealing with this serious and unjust matter.

Mr. Speaker: The presentation for debate of any such motion pursuant to Standing Order 43 requires the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[*English*]

FOREIGN INVESTMENT

OUTFLOW OF CAPITAL FROM CANADA—EFFECT OF REVIEW PROCEDURES—ESTIMATE OF NUMBER OF JOBS LOST

Mr. Sinclair Stevens (York-Simcoe): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister. The Bank of Canada has revealed that in the last four years there has been an acceleration of Canadian direct investment abroad and a deceleration of foreign investments here, so that in 1976 there was a net outflow of nearly $1 billion, costing tens of thousands of Canadian jobs. Would the Prime Minister indicate if his administration anticipated such a turnaround when it introduced its foreign investment review procedures, bearing in mind that such a flight of capital has resulted not only in higher unemployment but also in a brain drain of some of our most talented people?

• (1410)

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the least I can say is that the question is extremely complex. Certainly, the Foreign Investment Review Agency did have as its stated objective screening investment so that it would be allowed only when it brings significant benefit to Canada. I would be surprised if the hon. member would disagree with that. As far as Canadian capital being invested elsewhere is concerned, there are no exchange controls on the Canadian dollar, and the Canadian investor is free to invest wherever he will get the maximum return for his dollar.

Mr. Stevens: Mr. Speaker, I would like to explore this subject a little further with the Prime Minister. Faced with an 8 per cent unemployment level at the present time and the anticipation that it might go even higher—in fact, it is now at a higher level than any major industrialized country—would the Prime Minister go further and indicate to what extent his foreign investment review procedures or other related government policies have contributed to unemployment by discouraging foreign investment and job creation?

[Mr. Jelinek.]

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, I must repeat in part my previous answer. Foreign investment continues to be welcome in Canada, but only if it brings significant benefit. This, of course, includes the creation of jobs. It is on that basis that a great deal of foreign investment has continued to be allowed over the past several years since the creation of the Foreign Investment Review Agency. If the hon. member checks the figures, he will see that it is a small proportion indeed of foreign investment which is screened out, and one of the considerations of the review agency is to see if the investment will bring jobs or not. In the latter case, the investment is not encouraged unless there are other benefits.

Mr. Stevens: With almost daily press reports of further Canadian investment in foreign lands, would the Prime Minister tell the House whether he is concerned about this trend or, at least, would he indicate if he has received any report on this apparent exodus of money, know-how and jobs, and if so, could he estimate how many jobs have been lost so far?

Mr. Trudeau: No, Mr. Speaker. I have not received any report on this nor an estimate of jobs lost so far, but the facts the hon. member raises are facts of which we are aware, and they change from time to time. There is a period in the cycle when members of parliament complain that there is too much foreign investment, and at other times they complain that there is too much Canadian investment going abroad. We have always taken the view that the economy should function in such a way that investors in normal times can be free to seek the best possible return for their dollar, and if that is not the case in Canada, that means we have to manage our economy better and increase our productivity.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Beatty: You have seen the light.

Mr. Trudeau: I am glad I made hon. members opposite smile.

* * *

THE CANADIAN ECONOMY

UNEMPLOYMENT—ESTIMATE OF LEVEL NEXT YEAR—REASON PRIVATE SECTOR UNABLE TO CREATE JOBS

Mr. Lincoln M. Alexander (Hamilton West): Mr. Speaker, while we are talking about managing the economy better, it should be noted that the Prime Minister has some indication in terms of unemployment. As even the budget concedes that the current level of 8 per cent unemployment will worsen by the

end of this year—and private sector forecasts are even more pessimistic—can the Prime Minister tell the House what the level of unemployment will be by this time next year?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): No, Mr. Speaker, I do not have my crystal ball handy.

Mr. Alexander: As far as I am concerned, the Prime Minister never has a crystal ball, or any balls whatsoever, in terms of meeting this very serious situation.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Alexander: With reference to the steadily worsening unemployment situation, can the Prime Minister tell the House what the business leaders he has consulted with told him about why there is so little job creation? I know the Prime Minister registered his concern about this. Have the business leaders indicated to him why the private sector has not been able to create the jobs he thought it would as a result of that insignificant budget?

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, I really could not answer that question in a short period of time. Many business leaders have brought many reasons forward having to do with government expenditures, the level of productivity, the level of wage rates and the attitude of entrepreneurs in our country. When I say "we" have to manage the economy better, the hon. member knows me well enough to know this "we" is not the we of majesty; I am speaking of Canadians generally.

Mr. Epp: That is a new twist.

Mr. Alexander: Mr. Speaker, may I ask a further supplementary. Since this administration has offered no solutions for Canadians seeking employment in Canada, would the Prime Minister follow through on his suggestion that unemployed Canadians leave the country to find work by indicating what country he had in mind that might receive unemployed Canadians? Is this the contingency plan the Prime Minister has for our youth?

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member is perhaps making a telling point against his own argument. People continue wanting to migrate to Canada because they feel it is a country with a future in spite of the opposition always trying to poor-mouth—

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Alexander: What are you telling our kids to leave for? That is all I want to know.

Mr. Trudeau: I am not sure this is the proper forum in which to have a substantive economic debate on a question and answer basis.

Miss MacDonald: It never is for you.

Mr. Trudeau: I think even the opposition must realize that the economic questions which face Canada and most industrialized democracies are—

Mr. Alexander: And which you brought into play and which have destroyed this country.

Mr. MacFarlane: Don't embarrass us in Hamilton, Linc.

Mr. Trudeau: —very serious.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Trudeau: Come forward so that we can see your shorts.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, I must say to the right hon. Prime Minister that jealousy will get him nowhere.

* * *

ROYAL CANADIAN MOUNTED POLICE

ALLEGED ILLEGAL BUGGING OF HOTEL ROOMS OF THREE EDMONTON POLICE OFFICERS—REQUEST FOR CLARIFICATION OF MINISTER'S STATEMENT

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, June 9, the hon. member for New Westminster put a question to the Solicitor General regarding the evidence given before a judicial inquiry in Edmonton in relation to a charge that RCMP officers had illegally bugged the hotel rooms of three Edmonton police officers. At that time the Solicitor General said that the Deputy Commissioner of the RCMP had been delegated by the commissioner to investigate the matter and that he found there was no bugging. The minister's statement is completely at variance with an evidence given to the Laycraft Inquiry yesterday reported in yesterday's *Globe and Mail* as follows:

> The inquiry also heard Assistant Commissioner Peter Wright, head of the RCMP in Alberta testify that Ross Paisley, Alberta's deputy attorney-general told him that the bugging was "a fact," not "an allegation," and that Assistant Commissioner George Paquette, in charge of the RCMP in Manitoba at the time of the bugging, had approved it.

Has the minister been in touch with the deputy attorney general of Alberta, to determine if the assertions the deputy commissioner of the RCMP made on the stand are accurate? More especially, has the Solicitor General been in touch with Assistant Commissioner Paquette, to determine if he approved the bugging?

● (1420)

Hon. Francis Fox (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, I have no information at variance with the previous statement I made in the House in this regard. I am not sure if the hon. member is quoting a newspaper story about the commission of inquiry.

Be that as it may, the result of the investigation conducted by the deputy commissioner of the RCMP was negative. That matter is before the Laycraft inquiry for determination. I understand that the Laycraft inquiry has suspended its proceedings for the summer, but I shall be more than willing to look into the allegations the hon. member brought to my attention, allegations raised in the House yesterday, as I see from reading *Hansard*.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Did the Solicitor General receive from the commissioner of the RCMP a report saying the results of the investigation were negative, or did he actually see and read the report of the deputy commissioner? If he did, can he tell the House if the deputy commissioner interviewed Assistant Commissioner George Paquette in charge of the Manitoba division with respect to the bugging of the rooms of the three Edmonton police?

Mr. Fox: Mr. Speaker, I answered that question. I received the assurances of the commissioner of the RCMP that the report of the deputy commissioner was negative.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): A final supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I take it the minister himself did not receive a copy of the report, or did not read it. I take it also that he does not know if Assistant Commissioner Paquette was interviewed. That, I suggest, is extremely serious in view of the statement the minister made on June 9, when he assured the House that no bugging had taken place. I therefore ask him, and my question bears on the credibility of the statement he made on June 9, if he will get in touch with Mr. Ross Paisley, the deputy attorney general of Alberta, to ascertain if the statements an assistant commissioner of the RCMP made on the witness stand before the Laycraft commission were accurate? If they were accurate, will he take the matter up with Assistant Commissioner Paquette, to see if the statements of the deputy attorney general were accurate and report the results of his investigation in the next few days?

Mr. Fox: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member's question intimates that I am not entitled to accept the word of the commissioner of the RCMP. If the commissioner of the RCMP tells me that, after undertaking some investigations he delegated the deputy commissioner of the force to look into the matter and the deputy commissioner's report concerning bugging is negative, it is appropriate for me to accept the commissioner's word in that regard.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): But you told us that previously.

Mr. Fox: If I may deal with the allegations the commission is considering, I am told that it has heard only hearsay evidence with respect to the bugging of the rooms. The Alberta attorney general commissioned the inquiry, to determine precisely if such bugging had taken place. Of course, we shall examine those conclusions carefully. As to the rest of the hon. gentleman's question, I do not object asking the commissioner to verify facts which the hon. member believes were brought to the attention of the Laycraft commission.

* * *

[*Translation*]

AIRPORTS

DATE FACILITIES IN CHIBOUGAMAU WILL BE COMPLETED

Mr. Armand Caouette (Villeneuve): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Transport. In view of the fact that the people of Chibougamau have undertaken through the Canada Works Program, to clear the piece of land where the future Chibougamau regional airport should be located, can the minister tell the House whether his department has made or will soon make a decision with a view to providing the people of this area with the regional airport they have long since been asking and working for?

[*English*]

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, a report has not been presented to me but I will be glad to look into the status of the planning concerning that region and report further to the hon. member.

* * *

FARM CREDIT CORPORATION

PROPOSED REFERENCE TO COMMITTEE OF MANAGEMENT AUDIT BY SIBBALD GROUP

Mr. Arnold Malone (Battle River): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Agriculture. Since the audit of Farm Credit Corporation by Sibbald group indicates gross mismanagement in the higher echelons of the corporation, would the minister give the Standing Committee on Agriculture an opportunity to review the report and hear witnesses so that we may determine the details relating to the audit of that corporation?

Hon. E. F. Whelan (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, as I am sure the hon. member is aware, the Farm Credit Corporation asked for this inquiry itself. They have followed the suggestions in the report more rapidly than in most cases. It is an internal study made at the request of the Farm Credit Corporation. They should not be condemned but congratulated for checking out their own organization to find out if they can improve on their operations.

Mr. Malone: They did call for the audit themselves. However, the fact is the audit implicates some of the very people who called for the audit. This raises the question that it ought to then be brought before the committee rather than the Farm Credit Corporation. Again I ask the minister whether he will consider bringing it before the Standing Committee on Agriculture so that we can examine the report and see what has happened in that organization.

Mr. Whelan: Mr. Speaker, I do not want to give the impression that the Farm Credit Corporation does not appear before the Standing Committee on Agriculture because it does every year. I am not beyond considering that this go before the Agriculture Committee because it is no longer an internal document. If other people have it, it is now public. It is a working document for which they asked. They asked for it themselves to make sure they understood what the Farm Credit Corporation was doing and what it should be doing. It should not be condemned, but congratulated for trying to rectify any mismanagement within that corporation.

* * *

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

ALLEGATION FUNDS APPROVED FOR YORK PLACE HOUSING PROJECT IN HAMILTON MISUSED—REQUEST FOR INQUIRY

Mr. Dean Whiteway (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of State for Urban Affairs, I will direct my question to the Minister of Justice. It will be of some interest to him both in his capacity as chief law officer of the country as well as referring to incidents during his term as Minister of State for Urban Affairs. It has to do with questions on the order paper in the name of my colleague, the hon. member for St. John's East, answered on July 15. One question asked, paragraph 16, of question No. 812 was this: "Is CMHC satisfied that all funds approved—"

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Does the hon. member have a question?

Mr. Whiteway: Mr. Speaker, it is important that the Minister of Justice understand. The Minister of State for Urban Affairs, in charge of CMHC, admitted in answer to a question in the name of the hon. member for St. John's East that CMHC was not satisfied that all funds approved in advance for York Place were indeed used for York Place. Did the Minister of Justice consult with his colleague, the Minister of State for Urban Affairs, as to where the money went, who got it, was it diverted and what has the minister done in terms of follow up to lay charges in this regard?

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, I would have to review, which I have not had a chance to do, the question that the hon. member wanted to put.

Mr. Whiteway: Mr. Speaker, in this House on October 27 of last year, the hon. member for St. John's East asked the Minister of State for Urban Affairs to conduct an inquiry in this regard. To this point all we have is a coverup. I want to know whether the Minister of Justice will now, in order to clear up questions regarding top officials of CMHC and indeed other ministers of the Crown, order a full public inquiry?

Mr. Jean-Robert Gauthier (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of State for Urban Affairs): Mr. Speaker, if I may answer in the name of the minister, there is no obligation on CMHC, or any lender for that matter, to ensure that mortgage funds are expended or used exclusively for any particular project. It would be virtually impossible to require such a thing. The mechanism required would be unworkable. It would be impossible for the mortgagers to carry out their work.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Gauthier (Ottawa-Vanier): I would like to make it very clear that neither CMHC or any other lender is obliged to follow construction to ensure that funds are expended for the purpose for which they are given.

● (1430)

Mr. Whiteway: A final supplementary, to the Prime Minister. Without debating or questioning particular aspects, because the Prime Minister has the responsibility for his ministers and for seeing that public funds are directed in the right way, would the right hon. gentleman undertake—

An hon. Member: Why don't you lay charges?

Mr. Whiteway: You condemned yourselves in the answer to question No. 16! Would the Prime Minister order, now, a full, public inquiry?

Mr. Basford: Mr. Speaker, the other part of the question was directed to me. I am not quite sure, because I did not hear one or two words, to which project the hon. member was referring. But the Minister of State for Urban Affairs and I have been consulting with regard to certain aspects of the National Housing Act. With reference to the latter part of the hon. member's question, if there is any evidence of obtaining funds by fraud, that is a matter clearly covered by the Criminal Code which will be properly investigated by the appropriate police authorities.

* * *

CENTRAL MORTGAGE AND HOUSING CORPORATION

ALLEGATION MINISTER MISLED HOUSE IN ANSWERING ORDER PAPER QUESTION NO. 812

Mr. Walter Baker (Grenville-Carleton): The parliamentary secretary said the department has no obligation with respect to the direction funds are going to take. I assume he has heard of progress reports which are made regularly to CMHC with respect to the advancing of funds. But my question relates to another obligation of government, that is, the obligation to answer questions in this House truthfully. On July 15, the minister misled the House. The fact is that on June 3, 1977, an officer of CMHC, named Shaw, and one Domenec Morgenti, who is not an officer of CMHC, were convicted in Hamilton of an offence.

Mr. Speaker: Order. I do not know whether the hon. member wants to put a question or raise a point of order on the subject.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): In the absence of the minister, Mr. Speaker, I think I have to put the proper preamble.

Some hon. Members: Oh!

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): My question is to the government House leader. On July 15 we were told that there had been no conviction; in answer to a question, an unequivocal "No" was given on behalf of the Minister of State for Urban Affairs. I would ask the government House leader, who is primarily responsible for the answering of questions in the House, whether he has investigated this matter, since on the face of it the Minister of State for Urban Affairs appears to have misled the House, perhaps inadvertently, perhaps not. If he has not investigated this matter, would he do so and would he ask the Minister of State for Urban Afffairs to make a statement in this chamber to clear up the questions which obviously arise as a result of his answer last Friday.

Mr. Gauthier (Ottawa-Vanier): In answer to the first question, I would like to say—

Some hon. Members: Order!

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, the answers provided are the responsibility of each particular minister and I believe the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton will have to follow up the matter with the Minister of State for Urban Affairs.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): I think it is the responsibility of the House leader as well to ensure that answers are correct. The answer we were given brings into question every answer the minister made on Friday, answers which for the most part were incomplete at any rate.

Now, on October 27, 1976, the former minister of state for urban affairs told the House that he would check into allegations that the Minister of Labour had played a role in securing a $1.5 million loan increase to Morgenti. That is on the record for October of 1976. In the absence of the Minister of State for Urban Affairs, I ask the government House leader whether he has followed up that inquiry. If the answer is no, why not, and if the answer is yes, what were the results and would he be prepared to table that report in the House? I am not asking the parliamentary secretary. I am asking the government House leader for this information.

Mr. Jean-Robert Gauthier (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of State for Urban Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I want to make it very clear that there have been no charges against any officer of CMHC at any time. There was a case made against a compliance inspector in Hamilton. He was accused and found guilty. He was not an officer of CMHC. Let's not have any more of these attempts to tar reputations.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Gauthier (Ottawa-Vanier): The corporation follows normal procedures with regard to the payment of mortgages. The legal agent of the corporation has to go through the procedure of searching title; he has to make sure that there are no liens against the real estate—

[Mr. Speaker.]

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): We know all that.

Mr. Gauthier (Ottawa-Vanier): —and there is nothing involved in this case which warrants any inquiry. I think the hon. member knows that. The facts are public.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): In October of 1976, the then minister of state for urban affairs, now Minister of National Defence, indicated he was making inquiries following questions put to him by the hon. member for St. John's East. This implies there will be an answer from the Minister of State for Urban Affairs in relation to that inquiry, supplemental to the questionable answers on the order paper of July 15, 1977. I do not expect the parliamentary secretary to be able to look into the mind of his minister. Very few people can do that. I am asking the government House leader whether or not that inquiry did proceed, whether there was a report made with respect to the matter and, if so, whether it will be tabled.

Mr. MacEachen: Once again, I must repeat that in this case the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton should direct his questions to the appropriate minister. Otherwise, we would be embarking on an entirely new course involving the leader of the government in every question raised by every member, an innovation which I would vigorously oppose.

* * *

TRADE

SUGGESTED LEGISLATION TO DEAL WITH INTERNATIONAL BOYCOTTS—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Hon. Herb. Gray (Windsor West): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Prime Minister. The United States and France, which to no lesser extent than Canada wish to expand trade with the Middle East, have both adopted legislation recently to protect their companies, and individual residents, from being forced to comply with international boycotts like the Arab boycott. Will the government therefore, now change its earlier decision not to introduce such legislation, and present legislation along these lines to parliament thereby implementing the sentiments of its policy statement of October, 1976 more fully than through the administrative measures taken to date—the kind of measures which the United States, at least, has already found not to be an adequate substitute for general legislation.

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, legislation is not contemplated at this time. Naturally, we shall want to review the effects of the policy statement and assess those effects before reporting in due course.

TRANSPORT

UPGRADING OF PRAIRIE RAIL NETWORK—REASON FOR FAILURE TO PROVIDE AMOUNT OF MONEY PROMISED

Mr. Les Benjamin (Regina-Lake Centre): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Transport. The Hall Commission recommended an amount in excess of $445 million for the rehabilitation and upgrading of the prairie rail network, and on May 27 the minister said in Regina that in the period immediately ahead there would be a firm commitment of $200 million to start the railways on this program of rehabilitation and upgrading. Yesterday, however, the minister announced in Calgary that the sum of $100 million would be provided. I should like to ask him what happened to the other $100 million he gave a firm commitment to provide in Regina in May. Can the hon. gentleman assure the House that he will not accept any excuse from the railroads that they can only spend $100 million during the period envisaged, because I can assure him that there are private companies which are able and willing to carry out some of this work?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): I welcome the hon. member back to the House, but I must say I regret his selective quoting, in the course of which he left out the important word "seeking". The initial commitment of $100 million is intended to accommodate the construction and rehabilitation work which can be accomplished in the construction years 1977 and 1978. It is, however, an extremely constructive step and a maximum move forward in further commitment following the recommendations of the Hall commission. I think hon. members, particularly those from the west, should appreciate the willingness of the government to commit $100 million for this purpose at this time of serious fiscal restraint.

● (1440)

CROWSNEST PASS RATES—REQUEST FOR CLARIFICATION OF MINISTER'S STATEMENT

Mr. Les Benjamin (Regina-Lake Centre): Mr. Speaker, we welcome the $100 million but we would welcome more the commitment from the minister to implement the recommendation of the Hall report, which will amount to about five times that which he is talking about at the moment. The minister also said in Calgary, to quote from the press, that "the west should consider if it would not be better served by having the Crow benefit paid in a more neutral way". What does the minister mean by that statement, since the west has already considered how it wants the benefits of the Crow rate applied? The recommendations of the Hall commission have been accepted and agreed to by the wheat pools and the prairie governments. Would the minister explain what he means by "a neutral way", and will he say whether the government accepts the recommendation of Mr. Justice Hall about the retention of the Crow rate and the payment direct to the railroads of any losses on grain hauling?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, our approach to rehabilitation evidences a willingness to move along those lines. I will send the hon. member several previous speeches of mine which analyse the alternative ways that the Crow rate will be paid. As the hon. member may know, from the western point of view I do not consider this matter closed. I have said, and I said again in that Calgary speech, that I considered it my obligation as a minister representing the west to attempt to persuade the government about the amount of money required to ensure the Crow rate for the west and the benefit of that rate, and that I will continue to do and I make that known at all times. But I will continue discussing, as a westerner, the possibility that developments in the west may be better encouraged by other arrangements than those which are contemplated at the present time. However, that is a subject regarding which I keep saying that I will not propose any move or take any action unless there is general agreement and a move in that regard in the west. I hope the hon. member will not reject continued discussion of issues as important as this and somehow treat the question as totally closed for all time.

FREIGHT RATES—REQUEST FOR CHANGE IN RATE ON RAPESEED PRODUCTS

Mr. Les Benjamin (Regina-Lake Centre): A final supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. It is obvious to all but the minister that the west has accepted the Hall commission recommendation on the Crow rates. That is the position of my party and certainly it is what the wheat pools and the prairie governments feel. The Hall commission recommended that freight rates on rapeseed and its derivatives be set at levels which do not discriminate against the natural location advantage of rapeseed crushers in the west. By recommending retention of the Crowsnest rates the commission has, by implication, recommended that the inequity discriminating against western rapeseed crushers be resolved by lowering the freight rate on rapeseed products. When will the minister act on this recommendation and when will the necessary changes be made to have rapeseed products qualify for lower freight rates?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, the Hall commission did recommend a good number of things in regard to freight rates and products. It also said that the question whether the statutory Crow rates should be set at a particular level or at some other level is something that ought to be decided by the government; and obviously that did not answer a question but opened a question.

In relation to grain products moving out of the west there is a very serious issue, which again I raised in my speech in Calgary, namely that the only alternative to inequity in the west against processing which is produced by the low grain rate is the putting of all kinds of other products on a similar low rate. That was not quantified by the commission, but probably if you include western movement of meat and other products, presumably by trucks as well as by rail, this amounts to many hundreds of millions of dollars. In addition, I am not sure whether the hon. member is suggesting that there would be a way to put that low meat rate in place in the west without

putting a similar low meat rate in place in other parts of the country. This would also add several hundreds of millions of dollars. That in addition to the problem of the Crow rate itself, plus rehabilitation, would probably add up to somewhere between $600 million to $800 million or $1 billion a year and growing. While the hon. member may think that that kind of burden on the taxpayer instead of a sensible economic arrangement regarding freight is a good thing, I believe the people of this country will resist that kind of thinking, whether it comes from a socialist in the NDP or from the neo-political socialist in the Conservative party.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

* * *

HEALTH

EFFECT OF POSTAL STRIKE ON TESTING OF URINE SAMPLES AT SHERBROOKE HOSPITAL—GOVERNMENT ACTION

Mr. Hal Herbert (Vaudreuil): Mr. Speaker, my question is addressed to the Minister of National Health and Welfare. Is the minister aware that the testing of the urine of babies born in the province of Quebec is carried out at the University Hospital in Sherbrooke, that the post office strike in Sherbrooke is holding up delivery of the urine samples, creating a very serious health hazard affecting between 2,000 and 3,000 newborn babies each week, and will the minister use his influence to put an end to this disastrous situation?

Hon. Marc Lalonde (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, I have raised this matter with my colleague the Postmaster General and he is aware of the difficulty. Quebec regional post office officials are studying the extent of the problem, and I might advise the hon. member that a temporary court injunction has been granted by the court in this respect. We hope that the situation will be resolved very soon, if it has not been resolved already.

* * *

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

ALLEGED ILLEGAL ACTIONS OF REED PAPER AND CANADIAN FOREST PRODUCTS—GOVERNMENT ACTION

Mr. Allan Lawrence (Northumberland-Durham): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs my question is for the Minister of Justice. I wonder whether the minister could tell the House whether an opinion has been asked of the law officers of the Crown, either by him or by any member of the government, respecting the rather scurrilous business practice of the Reed Paper Company and Canadian Forest Products Limited, both Canadian companies, which is designed obviously to keep hidden certain facts from Canadian shareholders as well perhaps as to evade foreign business taxes or income taxes. Would the minister find out whether, in the opinion of the law officers of the Crown, there has been abridgement either of the Canada Business Corporations Act or the Canadian Criminal Code, or any other related statute?

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, not to me personally, but whether the matter has been taken up with either my colleague or his department or with officers of mine, at the present time I do not know. I have read the reports from which I assume the question arises. Personally, I am not aware whether the companies involved are formed under the Canada Business Corporations Act or not, but I will take note of the hon. member's question and make inquiries.

* * *

INDUSTRY

POSSIBILITY OF FEDERAL FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE IN MODERNIZATION OF SYSCO PLANT—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Halifax): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the government leader. I suppose, knowing him formerly as a university professor, I might ask him to explain the difference between a neo-political socialist and a neo-political Liberal.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Stanfield: I have a serious question for him, Mr. Speaker. Has the government received, either directly from Sysco or from the government of Nova Scotia, a specific request for financial assistance and co-operation in the modernization of the Sysco plants? I direct the question to the government House leader, knowing his great interest in this subject as well.

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, no matter how much I should like to respond to the question of the hon. member for Halifax on this subject I feel it would also be creating a precedent that I do not want to encourage.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The reference obviously is to the administrative responsibility of the individual member. There is nothing wrong with the question; it seems to me to be directed to the wrong minister.

Mr. Stanfield: Mr. Speaker, I assumed that the government House leader, particularly on this subject, would know what requests had been made to the government. Perhaps I could direct my question to the Prime Minister. Surely he knows, and surely it comes within the terms of his responsibilities.

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I will take notice of the question on behalf of the minister.

● (1450)

CONFEDERATION

PROPOSED COMMITTEE ON NATIONAL UNITY—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Heward Grafftey (Brome-Missisquoi): Mr. Speaker, my question has to do with the establishment of a parliamentary committee on national unity, and it is directed to the right hon. Prime Minister because I am sure he has had time to reflect on the constructive speeches made on both sides of this House regarding this matter some days ago and the questions put last week. In so far as the vast number of members of parliament on the government side are from my province and a vast number from western Canada sit on the opposition side, and in order to assure that the debate on national unity does not develop into a political fiasco, will the right hon. Prime Minister now assure the House that when we reconvene this session next fall he will immediately establish an all-party parliamentary committee to give elected members of parliament an opportunity to make constructive contributions to this matter?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, if and when we have the Speech from the Throne in the fall, it will deal with the question of national unity. The House will be given an opportunity to examine policy proposals and examine ways in which they can be dealt with by this House.

Mr. Grafftey: Mr. Speaker, if a crunch comes in this matter, the right hon. Prime Minister will need goodwill from all sides of this House. In so far as members on the task force are defeated members of parliament, why cannot the right hon. Prime Minister announce now, without any further consideration, that elected members of parliament will be let in on this matter—

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Provencher.

* * *

TORNADO

POSSIBILITY OF DECLARING AFFECTED AREA OF MANITOBA A DISASTER AREA—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Jake Epp (Provencher): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the right hon. Prime Minister as well. In view of the unfortunate loss of life and devastation of property caused by a tornado which struck southeastern Manitoba yesterday, I should like to ask the Prime Minister whether the government of Manitoba has contacted the federal government with a view of declaring the area a disaster area, thus making it eligible for payments under the federal-provincial plan?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I have no notice of any such request. It would normally come to the Minister of Finance or from the premier to myself. I have had none, and I do not think the Minister of Finance has had any either.

GRAIN

REQUEST FOR SPECIAL DELIVERY PERMIT FOR PRODUCERS WHOSE CROPS AFFECTED BY TORNADO

Mr. Jake Epp (Provencher): Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question is directed to the minister in charge of the Canadian Wheat Board. In view of the devastation that occurred yesterday in which many graneries were destroyed and grain is now lying exposed to the elements, I should like to ask the minister whether he can instruct the Canadian Wheat Board to grant a special permit to those farmers who want to deliver the grain in order that it might be saved from spoilage. I consider this question important in view of the fact that upon a similar request last week the Canadian Wheat Board turned it down. Elevator space is empty. I checked that out today.

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I will discuss the matter with the Canadian Wheat Board. Obviously it does attempt to respond to problems of this specific nature, but it has to bear in mind other considerations in terms of its shipping obligations. I will see if the two cannot be accommodated at this time.

* * *

CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

DISPUTE WITH ACTRA CONCERNING NON-CANADIAN PERFORMERS—GOVERNMENT ACTION

Mr. Bill Jarvis (Perth-Wilmot): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Secretary of State and relates to the cancellation by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation of its planned production of the Stratford festival's performance of Richard III, which cancellation was caused by the threat of an ACTRA boycott. The union boycott was initiated because three non-Canadian performers were scheduled to appear along with 43 Canadian actors and actresses who have now lost their jobs in connection with this performance. Has the minister discussed this continuing situation with the CBC? This is not an isolated incident. Is he prepared to take any steps to correct it?

Hon. John Roberts (Secretary of State): Mr. Speaker, from time to time I have discussed this matter with the CBC, as well as with ACTRA. The hon. member might not have noticed that last week the government indicated that in the revision of the immigration regulations concerning the entry of entertainers we, that is, my hon. colleague sitting beside me, Mr. Cullen, would develop regulations with the interested parties to ensure that ACTRA and other unions would have a full participation and consultation in the process leading to the decision as to whether entry visas should be permitted. It was my hope that this assurance to the unions would lead them to feel more secure in their position and that the kind of situation which developed at the end of last week would not occur. That hope on my part was disappointed.

Oral Questions

HEALTH

PROPOSED COMMITTEE TO STUDY PROGRAMS FOR THE DISABLED

Hon. W. G. Dinsdale (Brandon-Souris): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of National Health and Welfare and arises from the statement in the annual report of the Public Service Commission that the development of a comprehensive program for employing handicapped people in the public service has been hindered by a lack of knowledge about the handicapped. Now that the Minister of National Health and Welfare has tabled the new Social Service Act, will he be recommending the setting up of a subcommittee to gather together the information necessary for action programs for Canada's disabled and to provide background information for Canada's delegation to the Rehabilitation International Conference to be held in Winnipeg in June of 1980?

Hon. Marc Lalonde (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, the social services bill has been introduced for first reading, but I am afraid it will not be passed before the adjournment of the present session. I intend to reintroduce that piece of legislation as soon as possible early in the new session. I would be pleased to examine the issue raised by the hon. member at that time.

Mr. Dinsdale: Mr. Speaker, has the minister received the reports of the pilot projects which were operated in four regions during 1976? Will the government soon announce a comprehensive program for hiring handicapped persons, based on the experience gained from these pilot projects?

Mr. Lalonde: Mr. Speaker, I have not seen the reports. I will inquire whether they have been delivered to my department at the present time.

HYPERLIPEMIA—GOVERNMENT ACTION TO ASSESS MEANS OF CONTROL

Mr. P. B. Rynard (Simcoe North): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of National Health and Welfare, regarding a question which I asked on July 7, 1977 as reported at page 7414 of *Hansard*. As was stated at that time, the minister gave an address in Vancouver to a professional group of doctors and nurses which covered the field very well, except the field of scientific work. At that time the minister said the following:

> . . . there is no consensus within the medical profession on the usefulness or cost effectiveness of a nation-wide screening program for children.

It is an accepted fact that they are doing lipid profiles on people in labs all across Canada. They have even been done on children. If we are going to effectively treat this disease, we must get those cases early. Now they are doing testing from 20 years of age on. Why not return to the starting point, because once cardiovascular disease is established little can be done about its cure. It is progressive.

This should be carried on as a public health program. After all, he was talking to public health doctors and nurses. Why should this not be carried on as a public health program or a pre-school examination which is already paid for? They could have their blood tested at that time. One must keep in mind that some of those lipid diseases are hereditary. Some would be picked up there and others would be picked up as well, thus reducing the terrible mortality he referred to.

[Mr. Roberts.]

Hon. Marc Lalonde (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, in the view of my department, children with a known strong family history of hyperlipemia should be investigated at different levels. The question arises as to the general screening for children. I have noted the suggestion made by the hon. member. I will investigate the matter further with provincial officials, and I will ask my officials to examine it with them as well, in order to determine the advisability of extending such a project. As I told him before, it would have to be started as a pilot project rather than as a national program. It is a matter which deserves investigation, indeed.

Mr. Rynard: Mr. Speaker, since the minister believes in prevention, would he suggest this as part of a pre-school examination.

● (1500)

It does not have to be a pilot project, it has to be a pre-school examination because otherwise it would take too long. The minister said in his own speech that this is a ravaging disease, which is the case, and it should be drawn to the attention of the public. I suggest we start this program right now.

Mr. Lalonde: I appreciate the suggestion made by the hon. member and I will certainly ask my officials to discuss it with provincial officials who are responsible for the program.

* * *

Mr. Whiteway: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege which has to do with questions on the order paper standing in the name of my colleague, the hon. member for St. John's East, which were answered on July 15, which answers are misleading and certainly incomplete. The answers to these questions affect the rights and privileges of all members of this Chamber.

To begin with, the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of State for Urban Affairs, in answer this afternoon to questions, also misled the House, specifically in answer to question No. 22 on the order paper which asked whether or not any officials of CMHC—not officers of CMHC—were charged in relation to the York Place development. The parliamentary secretary said categorically that no officers of CMHC were charged. The man charged and convicted was not an officer of the corporation, but the question was not whether any officer had been charged; it was whether an official had been charged. He was an official, he was charged and convicted, and he was sentenced to three months in jail and a fine of $2,000. The question was answered by the parliamentary secretary this afternoon in such a way as to mislead the House, just as the answer of the minister on July 15 misled the House.

With regard to question No. 12, the minister clearly evaded answering the question. I, as well as other members of the House, am clearly aware of the difference between direct loans and guaranteed loans under CMHC. The question was whether or not CMHC at all times was in a first mortgage position. The minister answered in a way that made it impossible for us to ascertain whether or not CMHC was, in fact, always in a first mortgage position. Philosophically, I recognize the absolute right of the government to govern, but to be able to fulfil my responsibilities as a member of parliament and to scrutinize the government, to criticize the government, indeed to act as a watchdog, I must be sure that answers to questions which are put on the order paper must at least not be misleading. I understand that I cannot question the quality of the answers—but I must be sure that they are not misleading.

Specifically speaking, question No. 16 on the order paper deliberately misleads the House. The question was whether CMHC is satisfied that all funds approved and advanced to York Place were actually used in York Place. The answer was no; the minister was not satisfied that all funds approved and advanced to York Place were actually used in York Place. Surely it is the responsibility of the minister to set up the kind of public inquiry to ask the kind of questions—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. It seems to me that the hon. member has raised three different kinds of problems. The first was that the question which he put on the order paper was answered incorrectly. He asked whether officials of CMHC had been charged and convicted, and the answer was "no". The hon. member charges that the answer was misleading to the House. Whether that was deliberate or inadvertent is one category of argument.

The second problem had to do with the evasive answer, which, of course, is not a question of privilege. Now the hon. member seems to be dealing with a third category of argument which refers to a rather direct answer and suggests that there should be another ministerial answer. That may be a logical follow-up for the hon. member, but it certainly does not constitute a question of privilege. In respect of the first argument as to whether or not the House has been misled, I would be prepared to hear the argument concluded, but the other two matters certainly do not constitute a question of privilege.

Mr. Whiteway: Mr. Speaker, let me make a point specifically on whether or not the House has been misled by both the parliamentary secretary and the minister in regard to question No. 22 on the order paper asking whether any charges had been laid against any official of CMHC with regard to improper acts relating to the construction of York Place and, if so, what are the details. The answer to that question was "No". On June 3 there was the conviction, in Hamilton, of Clifford Shaw, an inspector with CMHC who can clearly be described as an official of CMHC, although not an officer. Judge Scime, in his judgment, said that this crime "involves the integrity of our public service and is of national interest". Shaw was convicted and sentenced to three months in jail and a $2,000 fine. It is clear that he was an official of CMHC; he was charged as an official of CMHC and convicted and sentenced as an official of CMHC. But that clearly was not the impression the Minister of State for Urban Affairs or his parliamentary secretary gave either, in answers to questions on the order paper or in the parliamentary secretary's verbal in the House this afternoon.

Mr. Gauthier (Ottawa-Vanier): Mr. Speaker, may I be allowed to comment on this matter. I interpret the word "officer" as meaning a member of the executive of CMHC, or an official. In my answer the word "official" was synonymous with the word "officer". Perhaps the hon. member is referring to a member of the staff of CMHC. No charges have been laid against any officers of CMHC: we know that. If he describes an employee of CMHC as being an official of CMHC, then I must say that yes, Mr. Clifford Shaw was an employee of CMHC. He was a former compliance inspector, officer, official or employee—it does not matter to me. The fact remains that he was convicted in court for actions to which he admitted and which he was found guilty of committing, and since that time he has left the corporation. So far as I am concerned, whether you call him an officer, an official or an employee, it is the same—a gentleman working for the corporation who has resigned and is no longer an officer or an official of the corporation.

On the other point, the matter of the first mortgage position, I am not a lawyer, but I understand—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I indicated that questions which may be unclear or vague in respect of the first mortgage position, or the other question which relates as to whether or not there should be a follow up by the minister in respect of an answer which he gave, do not concern me at this time as questions of privilege. The only one which concerns me is the allegation that the House has been misled, and that is the only area on which I am prepared to hear a discussion.

Mr. Gauthier (Ottawa-Vanier): It was not my intention to mislead the House. I was trying to make it clear that an "official" and an "officer" are synonymous terms to me. That is all I have to say.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, it was to me that this question was directed. Just so there is no doubt on the narrow point Your Honour has defined and which is being discussed, question No. 22 put by the hon. member for St. John's East, as recorded in the order paper, was as follows:

● (1510)

Have there been any charges laid against any officials of CMHC with regard to improper acts relating to the construction of York Place and if so, what are the details?

The answer which was supplied on July 15, 1977, was one word, "No". It is very clear—and if it needed any underscoring or reinforcement, it has been underscored and reinforced by the answer just given and the statement just made by the parliamentary secretary—that the minister misled the House on July 15, 1977. I know we cannot discuss the effect that

might have on the other answers he gave, but a question must remain in hon. members' minds, and surely this clear, unequivocal misleading of the House requires an explanation.

I think it is important that the House and Your Honour know that yesterday, in anticipation of this line of questioning, I telephoned the minister's office and asked whether the minister was going to be in the House of Commons. The answer given to me by one of his staff was "Yes". I said, "Thank you very much. Would you please tell the minister that I intend to raise questions about the York Place matter in Hamilton". The minister did not turn up yesterday.

Miss MacDonald: Nor today.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): I know he is in town. An official of the official opposition telephoned the minister again today to find out whether he would be in the House of Commons today to answer questions with respect to this matter. The answer we were given was, yes, he was to be in the House today.

Mr. Poulin: This is not on the point raised.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): I think it is important that the minister be in the House for questions put by members of the opposition. He does not have to be, but it is important that he be here. It is certainly important that he not evade, and I think it is important that all hon. members of this House demand his presence here tomorrow to make a statement with respect to all the questions which arise out of those questions on the order paper. His books are on his desk. Obviously, he was expected to be here at some time. It is not unusual for a minister, if he is in town, to be in the House during the question period, and I can come to no other conclusion than that he is evading the House of Commons and questions about this whole matter.

Some hon. Members: Shame!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I have no exact and precise description for the arguments just raised by the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton. In any case, I have no motion before me for action with respect to the question of privilege. The argument as to whether the answers given to questions on the order paper are misleading was in part responded to by the parliamentary secretary with respect to the differentiation in his mind between an "official" and an "officer" of the company. There seems to be nothing more to be contributed in this discussion at this particular time. On the face of it, this matter does not constitute a question of privilege.

Mr. Gauthier (Ottawa-Vanier): Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

An hon. Member: Let him talk.

Mr. Gauthier (Ottawa-Vanier): I want to make one point clear. The gentleman was not charged with regard to the York Place development project.

[Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton).]

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The parliamentary secretary has made his contribution to the argument. The matter is now closed.

Mr. Gillespie: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. We are all familiar with the following situation which occurs from time to time. Because of the enthusiasm of hon. members on both sides of the House during question period, *Hansard* reporters frequently take down the comments of hon. members when ministers are still on their feet giving answers to questions put. This can create real problems for the record. I would like to ask for an amendment to *Hansard,* because that situation occurred yesterday while I was answering a question asked by the hon. member for Kingston and the Islands. I had not completed my answer when the hon. member for Kingston and the Islands flipped in, while I was still on my feet—

Miss MacDonald: I don't flip.

Mr. Gillespie: —and put a further question which was not a supplementary in any official sense of the word. That question was taken down by the reporter. I refer to page 7741 of *Hansard* for July 18, 1977. I believe the account would be accurate if my words, "That is the interpretation I placed on Mr. Campbell's comment", were added to my answer as set forth prior to the comments of the hon. member, because that is precisely what I said.

If Your Honour reads the transcript, Your Honour will recognize that the hon. lady did not have the floor, did not ask an official question and did not put her question through the Chair to me. I was on my feet. There was a good deal of noise. The noise masked the hon. member's question. It was taken down by the reporter. This can happen from time to time. All I am saying is that it would be an accurate description of my answer if it were completed without the interjection of the hon. member.

Some hon. Members: Oh, come on.

Mr. Gillespie: I am not complaining as long as it appears after my full answer, because the question completely distorts the meaning of my answer.

Mr. Speaker: That is an editorial comment. The minister has had an opportunity to put his description of the events on the record. There would, of course, be no hope of altering the record.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Gillespie: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Gillespie: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Sit down.

Mr. Gillespie: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege. Because of the juxtaposition, I am going to be put in a position

of having given an answer to a question which was never properly put to me and which I never heard.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. It seems to me that the minister has been given an adequate opportunity to rectify any false impression which may have been left. He was given rather wide latitude to put his explanation on the record, and it seems to me that that ought to be a very complete answer to any fears he might have that the record as described by the reporter somehow creates a mistaken impression. The reporters can only do the best they can.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: We do not permit hon. members to rise in their places the following day to say that the impression created by their words as recorded by the reporter is really not the impression they intended to create. We do not enjoy that right. The reporters must attempt to catch what they hear and report it in the way they see fit, and if an hon. member says that that somehow creates a mistaken impression, he is always given the courtesy, as the minister was, of being allowed to make an amplified explanation for the record. However, to attempt now to go back and rearrange the language as it was reported is simply out of the question, whether it be attempted by way of a point of order, a question of privilege, or anything else.

Mr. Jones: Mr. Speaker, I rise on the same matter. I am certainly not going to bat for the minister, but having read the minutes of this chamber, I agree that on many occasions remarks made by hon. members who are not recognized by the Chair are recorded. I think remarks should never be recorded in *Hansard* unless there is a recognition by the Chair.

Mr. Paproski: No.

Mr. Jones: Don't swear at me, Mr. P. C. party whip.

Mr. Paproski: I didn't swear at you. I would not dare do something like that to you.

Mr. Jones: I make these remarks in all sincerity. *Hansard* is supposed to be a record of the proceedings in this chamber, and unless hon. members are recognized by Mr. Speaker or by the chairman of a committee meeting, their remarks should not be recorded. I do not say that to take the minister off the hook, but I question what is going on.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Moncton makes a suggestion. This is not the first time it has been made. It is a very serious situation and one which has given the administration some concern in the past on whether there are certain members in the proximity of the reporters who enjoy an advantage in relation to comments made off the record and heard by the reporter.

● (1520)

There is great difficulty in the point raised by the minister and contributed to by the hon. member for Moncton on comments heard by the reporter and not heard by those who have the floor and, in fact, never heard by the Chair. When they appear in the record the following day, therefore, they incline to give a distorted impression of the events that have taken place. Often, when no answer appears in the record to such comments, the impression is given that the person to whom the comment was directed has not taken any action in respect of it, when in fact the comment was not heard except by the reporter. Indeed, some hon. members who have positions close to the reporter are able to take advantage of that.

I am not so sure that the answer suggested by the hon. member for Moncton is any better than the situation which prevails at the present time. It does raise a very serious difficulty, however, in respect of those who may on occasion take advantage of the fact that the comment made audibly to the reporter, but not audibly to the person who has the floor or to the Chair, is recorded in *Hansard* and only comes to the attention of those persons the following day. If there is a suggestion to the Standing Committee on Procedure and Organization that we ought to revise our procedures and have reporters record only the remarks of the member who has the floor, that is something that I hope the committee would examine very carefully one day.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): I hope they turn it down. Make sure you get that on the record.

An hon. Member: Hear, hear, for *Hansard*!

Mr. Alexander: Hear, hear, for the reporters!

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

CANADA PORTS ACT

MEASURE RESPECTING CANADIAN PORTS

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-61, respecting Canadian ports.

Motion agreed to, bill read the first time and ordered to be printed.

* * *

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, the following questions will be answered today: 1,889, 2,726 and 2,821.

Order Paper Questions

[*Text*]

BAHAMARINE LTD., NASSAU, BAHAMAS

Question No. 1,889—**Mr. MacKay:**

1. How many charters or similiar arrangements has the government made, either through departments, Crown corporations or other agencies with Bahamarine Ltd. of Nassau, Bahamas, or with shareholders of Bahamarine Ltd?

2. What are the details of each charter and the area in which it is operative?

3. What is the total yearly cost of each charter?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): 1. The Department of Transport has made one charter agreement with Bahamarine Ltd. of Nassau, Bahamas. The Canadian National Railway Company has made one charter agreement with Rideau Shipping Company Ltd., a shareholder of Bahamarine Ltd.

2. One charter for the *Marine Cruiser* formerly the *Princess of Tasmania* is with Bahamarine Ltd. The charter period for this vessel is five years running from October 5, 1972. A copy of the Bareboat Charter Agreement No. 94153 is on file with the Department of Justice and is available in the offices of the Water Transport Assistance Directorate of Transport Canada for inspection of details. The second charter for the *Marine Packer* is with Rideau Shipping Company Ltd., a shareholder of Bahamarine Ltd. The charter period for this vessel is three years running from July 28, 1974. A copy of the Bareboat Charter Agreement No. 98120 is on file with the Department of Justice and is available in the offices of the Water Transport Assistance Directorate of Transport Canada for the inspection of details. Both vessels are warranted to operate on the East Coast of Canada and USA not north of 52°10′ north and not south of 44° north including Gulf of St. Lawrence not west of 64°.

3. The total yearly cost for the *Marine Cruiser* amounts to $509,905 and for the *Marine Packer* the amount is $359,525.

COMPETITION FOR INSTRUMENT STANDARDS INSPECTOR

Question No. 2,726—**Mr. Friesen:**

1. Was a Department of Transport Employment Competition No. 77-MOT-VAN-AIR-IV-2 Class AO-CAI-1 instrument standards inspector held at Vancouver on or about April 11, 1977 and, if so, what is the name of the candidate who ranked (a) first (b) second (c) third (d) fourth?

2. How many flying hours as pilot-in-command (PIC) of aircraft with a gross take off weight (GTOW) of 12,500 pounds or more did each of the top four candidates have at the time of the competition?

3. How many years did each hold a valid Class 1 instrument rating or it's military equivalent?

4. How many flying hours as (a) PIC (line captain) with a licensed air carrier operating IFT (b) an instrument instructor did each possess?

5. Which, if any, possessed a pilot's licence endorsement for the Lear 35 aircraft?

6. For each such candidate, what was the total length of time since his first solo flight to the date of the competition?

7. Was any of the top four ranking candidates informed by Mr. L. M. Prest, DOT staffing officer at Vancouver, that he was not successful because he had insufficient heavy aircraft flying time?

8. Did the candidate that was chosen have any flying time (hours) as pilot-in-command of aircraft weighing (GTOW) 12,500 pounds or over and, if so, how many?

9. Are there plans for a similar competition in 1977?

[Mr. Goodale.]

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): 1. Department of Transport employment competition 77-MOT-VAN-AIR-IV-2, AO-CAI-1 was held on April 6, 1977 resulting in two successful candidates. (a) W. T. Cole, appointed; (b) T. R. Foreman, (c) not applicable; (d) not applicable. In accordance with the Public Service Employment Regulations, section 25, "The name of a person who is a candidate for a position, unless his name is on the eligible list established for that position and the information and material supplied by or on behalf of the candidate, shall not be disclosed, without the consent of the candidate, to any person who is not directly involved in the process of selection for appointment to the position".

2. Total hours as pilot-in-command: (a) W. T. Cole, 5100 hours; (b) T. R. Foreman, 2020 hours; GTOW was not relevant to the selection process in this competition.

3. Not relevant to this selection process. Both successful candidates, W. T. Cole and T. R. Foreman presently hold a valid Class I Instrument rating.

4. Not relevant to selection process.

5. Not relevant to selection process.

6. Not relevant to selection process.

7. No.

8. Not relevant but both successful candidates had flying time as pilot-in-command of aircraft weighing (GTOW) of 12,500 or over. Numbers of hours unknown and not relevant.

9. Similar competition highly probable in 1977.

SAULT STE. MARIE

Question No. 2,821—**Mr. Symes:**

What was the total amount spent in Sault Ste. Marie from October 1972 to date by the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs?

Hon. A. C. Abbott (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Since April 1973 Consumer and Corporate Affairs Canada has spent approximately $40,800 in Sault Ste. Marie. Figures on expenditures prior to April 1973 are no longer available.

* * *

[*English*]

QUESTION PASSED AS ORDER FOR RETURN

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, if question No. 1,079 (revised) could be made an order for return, this return would be tabled immediately.

[*Text*]

WHARFINGERS IN EASTERN CANADA

Question No. 1,079—**Mr. McCain:** (Revised)

1. Is a wharfinger appointed to each small craft facility in Eastern Canada and, if not (a) which facilities have individual wharfingers (b) does a wharfinger serve more than one facility (c) on what basis is a decision made with respect to

whether or not a wharfinger is appointed to a small craft facility or a group of small craft facilities (d) how many small craft facilities have no wharfinger service and, in each case, what is its name?

2. What is the procedure involved in the appointment of wharfingers?

3. (a) What is their rate of pay (b) are all wharfingers paid at the same rate and, if not, what are the different methods and rates of pay?

4. What responsibilities do the wharfingers have other than the collection of wharfage fees?

Return tabled.

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker: Shall the remaining questions be allowed to stand?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Beatty: Mr. Speaker, last Thursday, July 14, I asked about question No. 632 which was placed on the order paper in the last session of parliament, over a year ago, and is as yet unanswered. The parliamentary secretary indicated the reason for such tardiness was that the question had not been brought to his attention. It has now, but it remains unanswered.

Question No. 1,070 was placed on the order paper on November 17, 1976. I am particularly concerned about this because it is a straightforward question and should have been answered long before now. It may be of particular interest to the parliamentary secretary because it asks for the criteria used by the Prime Minister in the selection of parliamentary secretaries. I, for one, am getting rather curious about the answer to that question.

Mr. Basford: The merit principle; that is the answer.

Mr. Beatty: Mr. Speaker, there is another question I should like to draw to the attention of the parliamentary secretary. Question No. 1,180 was placed on the order paper on November 23. It asked, how many times since he became a minister, has—

Mr. Speaker, if the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources is concerned about interjections occurring in *Hansard*, perhaps he could give me the floor.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. In the circumstances, I think if I were to call anybody to order it would be a number of members much closer to the hon. member.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Beatty: On November 23 I placed question No. 1,180 on the order paper, which asked how many times since he became a minister, the Minister of Agriculture has personally made use of government aircraft. We know that he has become the Waldo Pepper of the cabinet. Members on this side would like to have that information, and I cannot understand why the parliamentary secretary has been so tardy. There are a number of other questions which are of similar concern, but I will leave them for today.

Mr. Goodale: Mr. Speaker, I will certainly take note of questions Nos. 1,070 and 1,180. I did not catch the number of the first question, but I will check the number in *Hansard*.

Mr. Speaker: Shall the remaining questions be allowed to stand?

Mr. Cossitt: Mr. Speaker, since this House is apparently going to adjourn shortly, or dissolve shortly, or whatever the Prime Minister may decide, I think I am in order to raise a question that I have raised many times in the past about questions that have not been answered. I have put 27 questions on the order paper since this session opened, although most of them were there in the last session of parliament and some go back for 1½ years. In the first ten days of the present session, 79 questions placed on the order paper by me and other members of the opposition were not answered.

I should like to refer to specific questions concerning the international service of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, on the order paper since the last session, which bring out my documented evidence of interference in the affairs of the international service by the Department of External Affairs, and so on. Every time I bring this up, the parliamentary secretary tells me how many questions have been answered, but there is never a direct answer on these specific questions.

In reference to questions Nos. 29 and 30, I do not know why they are not answered. At least, I do know why. I would say it is because of political considerations and nothing else. One asks the amount of travelling done by cabinet ministers on Department of Transport aircraft at government expense; where they went, who went with them, the cost, etc., and the other asks the amount of travelling done by cabinet ministers on Department of National Defence aircraft. Those questions have not been answered since the first day of the session. I do not think it should take months and months to arrive at the answers.

I think I am within my rights to serve notice that when we come back in August—as I believe we have been told, but it is a good question as to whether we will—as a private member I will exercise my right to move the adjournment of the House if all the questions regarding the international service of the CBC, and the questions regarding cabinet ministers gallivanting at the taxpayers' expense are not answered. I refer to the ministers who went down to the riding of Matane. I have questions on the order paper about what they did there, why they did it, and how much it cost. We get nothing from the President of the Privy Council or his parliamentary secretary. I do not think this practice should be allowed to continue. I do not think we should be presented with silly generalities or hear hon. members opposite boast about how many questions they have answered.

• (1530)

I conclude by asking three questions. Perhaps the parliamentary secretary can answer. How long will this sham continue? How long will the government get away with stifling democracy by not answering questions in this House; and how

long will the government get away with thumbing its nose at members of parliament?

Mr. Goodale: Mr. Speaker, the last three questions asked by the hon. member for Leeds who was doing quite well up to that point, do not warrant a response because of the thinly-veiled innuendoes contained therein.

An hon. Member: They are not thin.

Mr. Goodale: They are unworthy and unwarranted innuendoes. The hon. member perhaps could guess what my response would be if he had listened to my previous reply to the hon. member for Wellington-Grey-Dufferin-Waterloo. I asked him to clarify, specifically, the nature of the first questions to which he referred. I asked if the hon. member was referring to questions concerning CBC international, and he said he was not.

The hon. member for Leeds then rose and referred to that series of questions. Mr. Speaker, I expect very shortly to present answers relating to CBC international. I expect the answers to be at hand within a day or two. If I may respond to the hon. member's general comments about answers to questions on the order paper, may I repeat the assurances I have given on other occasions which relate directly to his comments about the session of this House proposed possibly for August. May I indicate that I intend to provide answers to all questions standing on the order paper before the present session ends.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

EMPLOYMENT AND IMMIGRATION REORGANIZATION ACT

MEASURE TO ESTABLISH DEPARTMENT OF EMPLOYMENT AND IMMIGRATION, ETC.

The House resumed, from Friday, July 8, consideration of the motion of Mr. Cullen that Bill C-27, to establish the Department of Employment and Immigration, the Canada Employment and Immigration Advisory Council, to amend the Unemployment Insurance Act, 1971, and to amend certain other statutes in consequence thereof, be read the third time and do pass; and the amendment thereto of Mr. Peters.

Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North): Mr. Speaker, when I spoke on this legislation some days ago, I said that the bill, which proposes to deal with serious unemployment by making it more difficult for the unemployed to draw unemployment insurance benefits, seeks to apply the wrong solution to the wrong people. By dividing the country into 53 or 54 regions, in each of which claimants may qualify for benefits on the basis of different period of employment, the bill will create an administrative jungle.

[Mr. Cossitt.]

I shall try to show this afternoon how the unemployment insurance bureaucracy treated—"mistreated" is a better description—a poor woman unfortunate enough to be unemployed. You can imagine how much greater the confusion will be with the administrative nightmare of 53 or 54 different areas. My involvement in the case was greater than usual. I discussed the case with the claimant and local officers in Winnipeg. Not being satisfied with the response, I discussed it with the chairman of the Unemployment Insurance Commission here in Ottawa. Although the operation was successful, the patient, my constituent, died. Of course, I am speaking figuratively about her dealing with the Unemployment Insurance Commission. I shall put on record certain facts to enable members of parliament and the public to know what happened. I want the officers of the commission to explain to the minister what they have not explained to me, namely, what actually happened, and to justify it.

My constituent, Mrs. Ruth Hirsch, is a social worker with a number of years experience in her field. Her most recent employment was with the family service organization of Winnipeg. She became unemployed when her agency was reorganized and her services were no longer required. She received unemployment insurance benefits for some weeks, then was called in for an interview with the benefit control officer who made a report of that so-called interview. I have in my possession a copy of what purports to be a complete file on the matter, a copy which I obtained from the chairman of the Unemployment Insurance Commission. I shall return later to the question as to whether it is the entire file and if it depicts the entire story. The benefit control officer, B. Kolisnyk, wrote a report on February 10, 1977, which said in part:

> Claimant has a Bachelor in social work and a number of years experience. Claimant will work days only as she must be home evenings and for no less that $10,000/year. Claimant will work anywhere in Winnipeg. Claimant has not been sick or out of Winnipeg since filing her claim.

On February 15, Mr. W. Chimchak, an insurance officer wrote an official letter to Mrs. Ruth Hirsch as follows:

> Dear Madam:
>
> We find that you are not entitled to benefits from 14 Feb., '77, as you failed to prove that you are available for work and unable to obtain suitable employment in that, after being unemployed for a reasonable period, you are imposing restrictive conditions on your acceptance of suitable work in respect of the type of work (social worker or counsellor) you will accept.

Mrs. Hirsch replied immediately and on February 17 sent a letter to Mr. Chimchak, which said in part:

> Re your letter of February 15/77, and further to our telephone conversation of today, I wish to appeal the decision that I am not entitled to benefits from Feb. 14/77.
>
> As far as the "imposing restrictive conditions",
>
> (1) accepting work only as a social worker or counsellor. This, in fact, is not accurate. I am prepared to accept work that involves helping people (which may or may not be defined as a social worker or counsellor)—such as personnel officer, mental health worker, UIC interviewer, rehabilitation officer, mental retardation worker, etc., etc.
>
> (2) "re days only". I have 2 retarded school age children living at home, and therefore I must be home with at night. I am prepared to submit a report from their and/or my doctor(s) to that effect.
>
> (3) "re not less that $10,000 per annum". This was the salary of my last position. I am prepared to work for less.

She appealed the case, and the appeal board in its decision dated March 15, 1977, said in part:

She is still unemployed and still searching for work, but everything points to the fact that she is still restricting her search for work in the field of employment that deals with people. In other words, a form of social work for which she is trained and has experience, but in no way can this board find justification in altering the decision of the insurance officer, and the appeal is disallowed.

Mrs. Hirsch wanted to appeal to the office of the umpire. She got in touch with me and I suggested to her that she should make it clear the benefit control officer never informed her what kind of work she should look for. What would the commission consider to be suitable work? She stated in her appeal, and I quote:

● (1540)

At no time during my unemployment was I informed or encouraged to seek employment outside of my specialized field. As a matter of fact, I was asked to apply for a position with Canada Manpower. This I immediately did.

She went on to list some of the things she did. Her request for right to appeal was turned down in a letter dated April 20, which reads in part:

Your application for leave to appeal to the umpire from the decision of the board of referees given in Winnipeg, Manitoba, on 15 March, 1977, was forwarded to the chairman of the board of referees for his consideration.

We wish to inform you that the chairman has not approved your application for leave to appeal to the umpire—

I was pretty upset about this. I felt she had been mistreated. I took the matter up with the local office and with Mr. Tuck, the chairman of the commission. Mr. Tuck wrote to me saying that Mrs. Hirsch was being given permission to have another hearing before the same appeal board. The appeal was held. I will come to that in a few minutes. She was turned down.

When I again raised my voice, I got what are purported to be copies of the complete file. Nowhere in the file is there any explanation as to why, having been refused permission to go to the umpire, she was permitted another appeal. There is no mention, in the supposedly complete record, that her member of parliament intervened on her behalf. I wonder why. I am not ashamed of the fact that I intervened. Maybe I was wrong, but I am happy to intervene when I think a person has a good case. If I do not think a person has a good case, I say that I cannot intervene or that I cannot do anything more. In any event, there is nothing in the record. I say the record is defective; it is incomplete.

In the course of my discussion with Mr. Tuck, I was assured again and again that benefit control officers clearly understand that they should be telling those whose claims are turned down or are being cut off what are their rights.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I am very concerned about the interest of the hon. member. However, I also wonder how his remarks refer to the bill before us. The hon. member seems to be talking about the administration of the act in relation to those in charge of the administration. The question before the House at this time is third reading of Bill C-27 and the amendment to the motion not to read the bill at this time but to postpone it for six months. Of course, I do not suggest that the hon. member must speak only to postpone third reading of the bill. However, he should at least speak to the bill. The hon. member should make some effort to relate his remarks to the bill before us.

Mr. Orlikow: I submit, Mr. Speaker, that that is precisely what I am doing. In this bill the minister is proposing to divide the qualifying period of those entitled to receive unemployment insurance benefits: he proposes to divide the country into 54 districts, each of which will have a different qualifying period. One of the main reasons I intend to vote against this bill is that I believe the administration of the Unemployment Insurance Commission is incompetent, or the Unemployment Insurance Act and the regulations are deliberately being used by the commission, with or without the knowledge of the government, to reduce the number of people who qualify. That is precisely the point I am making.

I intend to prove my case by quoting from the guidelines under which Unemployment Insurance Commission employees are supposed to work. I have here a document entitled "Insurance policy guildelines, Conduct of the active job search program, Commission minute 73-144, August 1973". I received this from Mr. Tuck, chairman of the Unemployment Insurance Commission. I want to put various parts of this on record in order to show what UIC officials should be doing, rather than the way they dealt with my constituent. I do not raise this matter because I think my constituent's case is an isolated one. In a letter I received last week, Mr. Tuck virtually admitted that this has been the policy of the government, and they are now changing it. I am not vain enough to believe they are changing it only because I raised the matter with them. I presume there have been many complaints.

I will give the page numbers of the document so the minister and his officials can check them. I quote, first, from page 15-32, a draft letter, or to be used verbally when giving information to a claimant before being cut off by the benefit control officer:

You have been receiving unemployment insurance benefits now for a period of———weeks. In order for you to maintain your eligibility for benefits, you must now broaden your search to seek other suitable employment in any occupation . . . It is necessary, therefore, that you contact as many potential employers as possible to see if you are able to fill any vacancies in suitable employment that exist.

What is suitable? There is nothing in Mr. Tuck's letter to indicate that Mrs. Hirsch's claim is not valid. There is nothing in this document to indicate what is suitable employment. The benefit control officer did not tell Mrs. Hirsch what is suitable employment. I quote from page 16-32:

To find where jobs may be available, you should either check with your Canada Manpower centre and Canada job bank listings, search through newspaper advertisements, job posters, yellow pages of the telephone book or enquire from your friends, neighbours or the people with whom you used to work. You should contact possible employers by telephoning, writing, or visiting them to see if employment is available.

Mrs. Hirsch did all that. I now go to page 19-32, criteria for issue of job search statement. I quote:

No claimant will be required to search for work unless it is known that there are opportunities of employment in the area of his residence and/or in the area

where he usually earns his living. The area of residence is intended to include the area within daily commuting distance.

I quote that section because the benefit control officer in her statement says that Mrs. Hirsch, restricted herself to looking for work in Winnipeg. Winnipeg is a big city. Do the UIC people believe that Mrs. Hirsch, or someone else, should travel 50 miles every day in order to fill a job? If so, they did not say that. I now quote from page 21:

Full advantage will be taken of this interview to ensure that the claimant is aware of his obligation to actively search for work and that he understands what in his circumstances would be considered a reasonable and customary effort.

There is no question in the documentation that Mrs. Hirsch was looking for work. She listed a series of places in which she had looked, including employment as a social worker and other places. If that was not broad enough, it was up to the UIC officer to tell her what was required. That is the position I have taken from the beginning.

● (1550)

On page 22, the document says a claimant is required to prove that he is capable of working and is available for work, that he is unable to find suitable employment and that he has made reasonable and customary efforts to find suitable employment. The question I want to ask is this: Who decides what is suitable employment? If it is the Unemployment Insurance Commission, then it is surely elementary justice to the claimant that the commission should be required to indicate the kind of work they expect a claimant, in this case Mrs. Hirsch, to take. If the commission felt she ought not to receive benefit because the work she wanted as a social worker, in the field of treating those mentally retarded, or as a personnel officer, was too restricted, it was surely up to those concerned to say to her, "You are restricting yourself too much. Instead of being prepared to work at those jobs for $10,000 a year"—which amounts to about $5 an hour—"you should be prepared to work as a filing clerk or as a dishwasher to earn, not $5 an hour but the minimum wage". But Mrs. Hirsch was not given such advice.

The guidelines go on to say that if a reasonable job search is not done, a person would be disqualified retroactively, notified of this decision in writing, and "informed of the manner in which the denial of benefits can be removed, that is to say, the carrying out of a reasonable job search and the reporting the results to the commission." This was never done by the commission. Then on page 26 we read that if circumstances warrant—

—the claimant is to be contacted by the insurance agent and counselled either in person, by telephone or letter, on his or her responsibilities in maintaining eligibility for benefits. In addition, the agent should determine when a claimant's change in status occurred and make the necessary revision to the claim.

That was never done. Then it says:

A disentitlement should not be imposed . . . if investigation reveals that a claimant was ignorant of the requirement to conduct an active search for work, or misunderstood the procedure.

I submit it is obvious that Mrs. Hirsch did not understand the procedures because the procedures were never explained to her. I wish the minister or the chairman of the Unemployment Insurance Commission would explain to me how a claimant is supposed to understand and follow the procedures if the real meaning of those procedures is either inadvertently or deliberately kept from him. I say the result of this procedure is that the commission has been able to cut off thousands of people from benefit—a disgraceful situation. On pages 27 and 28 of this document they say:

The number of contacts made with employers and employment agencies or the manner in which these contacts are made cannot be enunciated in a general policy directive. Both quantity and quality of contacts must be determined by the number of potential job opportunities in the community within the claimant's occupation, the number of employers, the length of time a claimant has been employed and the manner in which unemployed persons with the claimant's occupation would customarily find re-employment. The assessment of a reasonable and customary search for work is therefore a matter of judgment on the part of the adjudicator.

Mr. Speaker, of course they cannot enunciate these things in a general policy directive, especially if they wish to use it as a device for cutting off people. I submit it would take a lawyer to understand all the ramifications of that paragraph. I suggest the wording of that clause is not the result of inadvertence—that the clause is there precisely to give the commission, on the advice of the government, the opportunity to cut off people. That, again, is a disgraceful situation.

Anyway, despite the fact that there is nothing in the record to show that I intervened on Mrs. Hirsch's behalf, her case was reheard. But it was a hearing by the same board, bound by the same jungle of laws and regulations, bound by the same prejudices—and I say this advisedly; I know at least two members of the board. And despite the fact that Mrs. Hirsch indicated clearly the whole range of job applications she had made, not just in the field of social work but in the field of personnel and other work, her application was turned down. I might say that Mrs. Hirsch did apply for work as a clerk at Eaton's. She was told that she was overqualified. The application form required her to list her previous experience, and she whas then told by Eaton's that she was overqualified. Yet the board referred to this in a way which would seem to indicate that it was her fault she was overqualified. So despite my intervention, Mrs. Hirsch lost her case.

However, I have been pressing the department pretty hard, and after a number of other communications I received a letter, addressed to me from the commission, dated July 14, 1977. It stated in part:

I would like to advise you of specific developments that will, I believe, go a long way to resolving the problem you have noted to my attention.

A second appeal to a board of referees on Mrs. Hirsch's case was held on June 29 and again the board ruled unanimously that the decision to deny her benefits was proper. It is my understanding that your office was advised before the hearing in order for you or another representative to attend. As a result of this second hearing it must be concluded that appeal action on this case has been essentially exhausted.

I would also like to advise, however, that we are in the process of developing refinements to the existing interview and active job search programs that will provide more specific information to claimants required to search for work. It is our intent to include on the active job search form a portion to be completed by the insurance agent showing the occupation(s) in which the search should be carried out together with the type and number of contacts that should be made. Specific indications of the need for an expanded job search will be shown and

discussed with the claimant as part of the interview program. These changes should be effected within the next few months.

If the commission does what Mr. Tuck has indicated in his letter, people will be told in future what kind of work they will have to look for if they are to continue to get unemployment insurance benefits. But it does not help Mrs. Hirsch. Why did this happen? When I spoke to the labour member on the board of referees—he is a good chap and I know he is concerned about people—he said, "We do not have the authority to do what you suggest, because the act is written in a certain way". I said, "There is nothing in the act to prevent you". He said, "The regulations are written that way". I asked to see them, because I thought he was misinformed. I went to Mr. Tuck, and Mr. Tuck said, "It could not have happened. All my officers know they have to tell the people these things." Well, there is not a tittle of evidence that the benefit control officer said to Mrs. Hirsch, "This is what you have to do."

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please! I have to interrupt the hon. member because his time has expired.

Mr. John Rodriguez (Nickel Belt): Mr. Speaker, I think the amendment which has been proposed by my hon. friend from Timiskaming (Mr. Peters), namely, that this bill be hoisted for six months and be reconsidered at that time, is a very wise one. Since we last discussed this measure a couple of weeks ago I have received further correspondence from across the country. I should like to put some of it on the record. The first is a telegram from the International Woodworkers of America, the Canadian Labour Congress affiliate, local 1-118. A copy of the telegram was sent to every member of the Liberal caucus. The gist of the telegram is as follows:

● (1600)

The membership of local 1-118, IWA Victoria, are protesting very strongly the enactment of Bill C-27 and particularly those parts that will have the effect of creating unnecessary hardships on those people unemployed and those who will become unemployed. As we are sure you are aware of the unemployment and lack of employment in this area, we feel sure you must be aware of the extreme hardship this bill will create on your constituents. Please reply.

That telegram was signed by Murray Drew, business agent. I received a letter from a Parti Quebecois member of the Quebec national assembly, Mr. Gérard Gosselin, the deputy for Sherbrooke. He wrote to me as follows:

[*Translation*]

Mr. Rodriguez,

Allow a member of the Quebec National Assembly to congratulate you on your most relevant comments on the effects of Bill C-27 on the Canadian unemployed.

I am deeply concerned about the matter and according to my estimates, over 60,000 Quebec jobless will thus be stricken from the unemployment insurance rolls in Canada. This is an abominable transfer of the responsibility for supporting the unemployed from the federal to the provincial government, thus increasing considerably the costs of social welfare in Quebec, even though the federal government is still trying to deceive us about the effects of its legislation on the provincial welfare schemes. For your information, sir, please note that the Quebec social welfare scheme is already supporting 98,600 people who are deemed employable. Because of the new federal policies, this number of recipients will probably increase by some tens of thousands.

The present Ottawa administration assumes unfairly its responsibilities for fighting unemployment and supporting the unemployed; even though the benefits paid by Ottawa to Quebec jobless are rather substantial, it is a fact that the high rate of unemployment in this province is the direct result of the broad economic policies of the central government which have disastrous consequences on our economy: for instance, its tariff policies on Quebec textiles, footwear, clothing and agricultural industries; its oil (the Borden Line), automobile, transportation, purchasing and capital investment policies.

The broad economic policies of the central government are the cause of unemployment in Quebec and of the ever decreasing number of jobs in the sensitive area of secondary industries.

Sir, I should appreciate very much being advised of the gist of the remarks you have made in the House on Bill C-27, as well as of any relevant material against this legislation.

I am much concerned about the implications of this bill, and I intend, together with a number of my colleagues, to denounce it.

Thanking you in advance for your co-operation, sir, I remain,

Yours truly,

[*English*]

I have touched on the questions raised by the Premier of New Brunswick respecting the lack of any meaningful consultation between the federal government and provincial government. Premier Hatfield has accused the federal government of conducting a monologue rather than a dialogue. As I pointed out, the premier indicated this was an *ad hoc* response to what is a grave concern, rather than a long term plan to create employment opportunities in Atlantic Canada.

We in the House know that when the government first brought in this bill it moved the minimum attachment period to the work force from eight weeks to 12 weeks. It was only because of the fear of embarrassment on the part of the government that its backbenchers would vote against it and embarrass the devil out of the government that it brought in the compromise solution which is now in the bill. Once again the Liberal party has shown that it is prepared to compromise its principles; it could not even hold to the principle it established in the bill originally.

Mr. Symes: Typical.

Mr. Rodriguez: Yes, it is very typical. The premier of New Brunswick also pointed out the difficulties he is having in regard to regional rates of unemployment. He expressed concern not only about the minimum attachment period and the length of benefits, but also about job sharing and the so-called creative use or developmental use of unemployment insurance funds.

The other surprising and most disappointing thing about this debate on Bill C-27 so far has been the performance in the House of the official opposition. By its silence, the Conservative party has acquiesced to this measure. It has broken faith with the unemployed in regions of the country where unemployment has unfortunately become a way of life. Not one voice in the Conservative opposition has been raised in the discussion of this bill, even though it has been at third reading stage for the last three to four weeks. A Conservative premier even took the time to write me a brief respecting the amended bill. But when the votes come on the amendments at third reading stage, members of the official opposition run for cover. They sit in their seats until the votes come; they then run behind the curtains. That is most regrettable and shameful.

As for the reasons for wanting to give this bill a six months' hoist, I can reiterate old arguments and add new ones. We have already said that the bill is based on a false premise. It is based on a document known as the comprehensive review. The last time I spoke on this bill I pointed out several inaccuracies in the review. In many instances outdated statistics were used. In addition, they were far too narrow. For example, in section B the review states the Canadian labour force is characterized by a high degree of mobility. To support that statement they use job separations for one year only, 1974, and use address changes in 1970 and 1971. That is garbage, Mr. Speaker. It is absolutely useless in making a meaningful decision on unemployment insurance. It indicates that high wage increases have exceeded productivity increases. They have used only one year, 1974, and have made a comparison between Canadian and United States increases, which are not comparable in the first place. Thus, it is completely useless and inaccurate.

● (1610)

Approximately a week ago the hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby (Mr. Broadbent) made reference in his speech to the automotive industry. He showed conclusively that Canadian workers are far more productive than their American counterparts. Yet we pay more for the same automobile selling in the United States made by Canadian workers. In the comprehensive review, which was criticized and on which this bill is based, there is a statement that was arrived at by the UIC people. It refers to the fact that males with eight to 11 insured weeks in both years have a higher rate of disqualification than those with 12 or more insured weeks. On the other hand, females with 12 or more weeks have a higher incidence of disqualification and disentitlement than those with eight to 11 insured weeks.

On May 28, 1975, the former minister of manpower and immigration, in the Standing Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration, said the following:

The incidence of disentitlement or disqualification, as an effect of failure to meet one's obligation under the act, is lower amongst the group with a minor attachment to the work force—

Again, we have printed information which has no relevancy to the bill we are dealing with. The entire bill is based on this comprehensive review which is not worth the paper it is written on. Members of parliament were asked to debate a bill which was based on inaccurate information.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Rodriguez: Hon. members opposite can sit there yelling and screaming, but they never get up to make meaningful speeches. This bill was also based on an in-house report which contained a section devoted to the employment patterns in the Atlantic provinces. I have dealt with that section at some length before, but I should like to point out some of the things that were said about Canadian people, particularly those in Newfoundland where the latest rate of unemployment is over 13 per cent.

[Mr. Rodriguez.]

The report indicated that there was an indication some employers in smaller isolated communities deliberately hire seasonal workers in such a way as to provide at least a minimum number of insured weeks to as many persons as possible, thereby ensuring an adequate work force at their doorstep when needed. This report was prepared by the people of UIC, obviously to rationalize a piece of legislation to be stuck in front of this minister's nose. The minister was told to legislate, and like a monkey on a string he acts out the power trips of the bureaucracy, as the Liberals sit and dream of ways to move each other up the ladder, to lift the ceilings on executive salaries in the public service and give themselves raises.

These salaries are now at a point where they are going past $60,000. What does this minister, elected by the people of Canada to make decisions, do? "How high do I jump", is what he says. That is not what we expected from the minister. He should lay down a policy in this country and not be subject to their policy-making. It is a complete reversal. The employment patterns in the Atlantic provinces, as referred to in the report, indicate that the seasonal inshore fishermen may have some difficulty operating for ten weeks in the Stephensville area. It has been said in committee by the bureaucrats that there is no reason in the world why the people of Atlantic Canada cannot get eight weeks of work. The employment patterns in the Atlantic regions have no relevance to this bill.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I have to interrupt the hon. member by informing him that this is a place for debate; it is not a place to throw things around. He should address himself to the bill. It is the hon. member's responsibility to see that decorum is followed.

Mr. Rodriguez: I suggest the bill is based on incorrect information. The report of the Standing Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration dated April 20, 1977, at page 13:9, in part, reads as follows:

MR. ALEXANDER: That is right. I think it is important, even if it does take up my time, that we have this . . .

MR. CULLEN: Mr. Hodder has the figures on this.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Hodder.

MR. H. J. HODDER (ASSISTANT DEPUTY MINISTER, STRATEGIC PLANNING AND RESEARCH DIVISION, DEPARTMENT OF MANPOWER AND IMMIGRATION): Madam Chairman, I had better make clear, I think, first, the assumptions under which these calculations rest. The first assumption, for calculation purposes, is a national unemployment rate of 7 per cent.

They are basing their calculations on a national rate of unemployment of 7 per cent. The rate now is 8 per cent, and rising. This bill is based on incorrect information, further evidenced by the remark of the planning director. Imagine—the planning director is even out of date! When he said that, the rate was already 8 per cent for the year. He will receive a big raise. He will be rewarded. It is the "Peter" principle at work.

The hon. members for Quebec ought to listen. There were polls conducted by the Toronto *Star* and *Le Devoir* regarding the referendum in Quebec. It is interesting to note that in both those polls the people placed a great deal of emphasis on the

economic health of their provinces and a great deal of emphasis on employment. This government thinks it has the national issue all locked up. They are missing the boat. Every time employment goes up a percentage point, Mr. Lévesque indicates that he has a federal yoke around his neck which he has to get rid of. He also indicates that there is nothing he can do about the economic situation in Quebec. "It is those maudits federalists, let us get rid of them and then I can do something". That is their game. Mr. Lévesque is gaining from the fumbling and bumbling and lack of economic policies by the federal government. Lo and behold, the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) runs around the country benefiting from everything that has any connection with a poll which shows the separatists are gaining ground. The Prime Minister says to the Anglophones, "I will save the country; I will unite it." The Liberal party members have been wearing their great big buttons. That is the greatest threat to unity in this country—the Liberal party.

● (1620)

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Rodriguez: There they sit, an alliance for power. We have seen the defections. We have seen how they are prepared to compromise their principles. Indeed, the other day somebody said that the Liberal Party of Canada was like a whore—it will take anyone.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

An hon. Member: Even Jack Horner.

Mr. Rodriguez: What are the solutions? Have they put forward anything at all with respect to employment opportunities in this country? What do I read in "Integration"? Obviously, the bureaucrats have already passed the bill themselves. They have put out a new document called "Integration". It is a document put out by the Department of Manpower and Immigration. It quotes the deputy minister's view on what full employment is from the point of view of the government. This is what Mr. Manion says:

"We are aiming at a full employment policy through these public programs coupled with developmental funds," added Mr. Manion. "Our employment strategy is designed to reduce the impact of unemployment and maximize employment opportunities".

The deputy minister is proposing that the job sharing programs and the developmental uses of UIC are the government's approach to full employment in Canada. It is rather interesting to see another article in the same paper, "Integration", written by a young woman who has never worked in her life. After graduation she went down to the Manpower office to look for work. They have a new system there now. They feed information into a computer which then tells them what are the job inclinations of the person applying for a job. The young woman who wrote the article is named Heather Hand, and the article is entitled, "Talk to the computer". Do you know what the computer spewed out that that young woman, who has never worked in her life before, is qualified to do? This is what she wrote:

I couldn't stand the suspense—

As she waited for the computer to give the answers.

—so I asked what they were:

3330-110 Producer, motion picture

3330-118 Producer, broadcasting

3330-150 Director, motion picture

3330-158 Director, broadcasting

That is what the machine said the young woman is qualified to do. That is the approach of matching people to jobs and full employment. Manpower offices now have computers, and computers are supposed to find jobs for people. It is marvellous! I think we had better disintegrate "Integration". The other provision that we oppose in the bill concerns the developmental uses of the unemployment insurance fund. We are opposed to this sort of thing. In effect, the government could use the unemployment insurance fund to give supplementary payments to those involved in a job sharing situation. It proposes, also, that the unemployment insurance fund be used for training people. All of us can subscribe to the theory that people should be trained, either on the job or anywhere else. Surely if the government wants to do that, then it should take the money out of the general revenues of the government so that the taxpayers can see that this much money is going to training and this much money is going to unemployment insurance.

We say that you cannot prostitute the unemployment insurance fund by using the fund to do other things than what it is supposed to do. Indeed, as an employee group which came before the committee said, they were completely opposed to job sharing and had grave doubts about the training programs which were proposed. The minister, with all his bureaucrats, proudly stood up in the committee and said that they had an advisory committee which gives them advice, and they welcomed the advice. The advisory committee reported in the annual report of 1976, and this is what they had to say about developmental uses of unemployment insurance:

A further meeting was held in December, 1976, for the specific purpose of reviewing the developmental uses of unemployment insurance in the areas of job creation and work sharing. The committee expressed very serious reservations about these approaches, particularly as they do not, in the committee's view, represent an appropriate use of the unemployment insurance program.

The committee feels very strongly that the minister should give careful thought to these views, which are unanimously shared by members of the committee.

He has received advice from the advisory committee to the Unemployment Insurance Commission, and he has received advice and evidence in committee from employer and employee groups. He has received it from the opposition parties in committee before the Conservatives lost their tongues. All the advice said: No, we should not use the fund for developmental uses of unemployment insurance. There is no point in having an advisory committee if its advice is thrown aside or ignored completely.

We have grave doubts about the whole thrust of the length of benefit period. As you know, in this bill the government, as

a sop to the backbenchers in the Liberal party, proposed the imposition of 54 unemployment regions. Those of us who deal with the unemployment insurance fund every day of our lives as members of parliament know how complicated it is. The unemployment rate in each of these 54 regions will determine the minor attachment period and the length of the benefit period. I gave some examples of how it would work. If a person who lives in Nova Scotia, where the unemployment rate is approximately 13.2 per cent or more, works ten weeks, that person would get unemployment insurance benefits for 42 weeks. If a person who lives in the lower mainland of Vancouver, where the unemployment rate is 8.5 per cent, works ten weeks, that person would get no benefits. I suggest to you that 8.5 per cent is above the national unemployment rate in this country and it should not matter where you live in the country. If you are unemployed in Toronto, in Newfoundland or in Vancouver, you are unemployed, and the effects of unemployment on the lives of our people, regardless of region, are equally bad. It is just as debilitating to be unemployed in the east as it is in the west, north or south. In no way could this party support the discriminatory legislation this government is proposing in Bill C-27.

● (1630)

Another concern we have expressed time and again has to do with where unemployment hits hardest. We have said the important issue at the moment is unemployment opportunities. We have asked questions day after day in this House. We identified this issue months ago. We have made specific suggestions about creating short-term employment opportunities as well as long-term employment opportunities.

This government is a typical Liberal government which recognizes shifts in the wind. It can accept the biggest fascist in Canada into its ranks. I suppose it could also accept any well known leftist. It can absorb anyone, and I referred to an analogy earlier. In this particular instance, the Liberal Party has perceived that there is a move to the right in Canada, and it is tightening-up things like unemployment insurance to show the Canadian people how tough it is. It is easy to be tough with the unemployed, especially when they are young. Those who can find work are laid off very quickly, or they move from one job to another because of the present state of our economy.

A growing number of women are heads of households. They are no longer so-called working wives, a situation which the minister would have us believe is a luxury. Women with children are contributing in a meaningful way to the support of their families. We can no longer dismiss them. I can think of no better way to describe the problem than the way in which the leader of my party described it. He described it as follows:

> Is it any wonder the Parti Québécois has such strong support from young Quebeckers when one in every five persons under 24 is without work in that province and when half of the new unemployment in Canada in the past two years has occurred in Quebec?
>
> The duty of an effective national government of whatever stripe is to govern in such a way as to see that its citizens can lead useful and productive lives. The Trudeau government has failed to meet this responsibility in nine years of office—

[Mr. Rodriguez.]

I recall 1968 when the swinging Prime Minister was diving off springboards. He never made any promises. Everybody said, "Isn't it wonderful; for a change, a politician who doesn't make a promise?" However, I remember two things the Prime Minister said during that 1968 campaign because I was very actively working at that time for our party's representative in Nickel Belt. The Prime Minister said that while he would not make any promises, he would work at two things. He said he would try to eliminate regional disparities in this country, and that he would work to bring about national unity. Here we are, nine years later. Is the country any more united than it was nine years ago?

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Hogan: It's worse.

Mr. Rodriguez: Have we eliminated regional disparities?

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Hogan: They are worse.

Mr. Rodriguez: There seems to be a consensus that this government has failed on the two most important issues today, the issue of national unity and the issue of the elimination of regional disparities.

Mr. Symes: No wonder the Prime Minister does not want to talk about them.

Mr. Rodriguez: He does not want to talk about them. The Liberal party has the ability to shift its position to accommodate whatever it thinks is in the wind. We, in this party, have said to the government time and again that we need short-term approaches as well as long-term policies which would set the base for employment as the work force grows. The government made a great big hullabaloo about the most recent budget brought down by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Macdonald). That hullabaloo was echoed in the province of Ontario over the budget which was brought down a few weeks later by that darling of the Chamber of Commerce, Darcy McKeough. That budget was a carbon copy of the budget brought down by the federal Minister of Finance. The federal Minister of Finance accepted the fact that full employment nationally is going to be anywhere upwards of 8 per cent. Tweedledee in the province of Ontario said we must live with 5.3 per cent in Ontario.

In its budget the federal government said that we still must depend on the private sector to create employment, and it gave out all kinds of hand-outs to the private sector. It handed out tax concessions when there are already too many tax concessions, in spite of the fact that we are operating at only 82 per cent of plant capacity. The chickens are coming home to roost. In a recent statement a chap by the name of Hugh Stevens, president of the Canadian Manufacturers' Association—

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Sinclair's brother?

Mr. Rodriguez: They could be related. They are in the same field, banking. In a statement, he said he shared the concern of the President of the Treasury Board (Mr. Andras) about unemployment, but he said that manufacturers cannot invest to create new jobs until the idle plant and equipment they already have is more fully used. That is why members of my party criticized the budget of the Minister of Finance. We asked why he was priming the pump when the pump was not being fully utilized. We asked why he was giving tax concessions for plant expansion when plant capacity was operating at only 82 per cent. Mr. Stevens went on to say:

> Investment can only be made when the economics justify it. The fact is that much of Canadian manufacturing is in an extremely precarious position as a result of the excessive increases in Canadian costs in recent years, including wages, fringes, taxes, construction costs and interest rates.

The article which quotes Mr. Stevens also notes that perhaps the major factor dampening business expansion plans is the low operating rate of existing plant and equipment. Mr. Stevens observed that the average capacity utilization rate in manufacturing is stagnant at about 82 per cent. We have said that the government should not prime the pump at the top; that should be done down at the low income levels. We have also said that we should not go on developing the economy of Canada as a hinterland. We cannot go on shipping out raw materials. We cannot go on shipping out jobs with those raw materials. Many Liberals who sit on the back benches come from the hinterland parts of their provinces. Many hon. members from the Atlantic region come from the hinterland of the economy because their constituents take raw materials out of the ground. They fish for raw material. They cut raw materials down. We keep shipping out raw materials, and along with them go jobs.

We have said that we need policies geared to economic planning. We have said that if we are going to mine in Canada, the products we mine should be finished to a final product here. Not only do we encourage outsiders to take our resources but we even pay them to depreciate our resources. In the province of Ontario there are depreciation allowances, and we pay mining companies to depreciate our raw materials. We need long-term policies.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Order, please. I regret to interrupt the hon. gentleman, but his allotted time has expired.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Let him continue.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Nevertheless—

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Rodriguez: Who said "No"?

Mr. Symes: For that, there will be ten more speeches.

● (1640)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gilles Caouette (Témiscamingue): Mr. Speaker, the former speaker could have finished his remarks in two or three minutes but, unfortunately, he was denied the chance to do so by the party in power. I deplore such an attitude. Yet, the fact remains that this attitude permeates all their actions. They claim to have the right to say everything and deny it to others who could point out their errors. More often than otherwise they just fool around. Even now, they do not have the decency to rise and speak on as important a topic as Bill C-27. We hear them shout, joke, show off, as we say in French "péter de la broue", but they do not have the decency to rise in the House as the hon. member for Portneuf (Mr. Bussières)—

An hon. Member: He did not speak at all, he is incapable of it.

Mr. Caouette (Témiscamingue): —to rise in the House and discuss those topics their electors would have them bring up. There are more than enough unemployed in the riding of Compton, just as there are in that of the hon. member who was shouting a moment ago. They did not have the decency to take into consideration the remarks made by their electors.

Yet those people sent in lists of names, they signed petitions to point out to the government and its members their disappointment, their disenchantement with Bill C-27. We are now discussing at the third reading stage a motion to stand Bill C-27 for six months, so that government members can read their mail and bring the corrections that are needed to this piece of legislation that is a disaster for the working population in Canada. The intent with this bill is to put the blame on the worker. If he cannot find work, if for some reason he finds it difficult to keep a job, he is accused by the government of abusing the system, so they want to make it more restrictive. The government, however, find no way that would allow the worker to find acceptable employment on a steady, yearly basis.

But they found the way to penalize him by increasing to 12 weeks the eligibility period. This is hurting those who find it hard to keep a job. We often receive letters from employers who make the personal effort of keeping an employee on the job one or two weeks more than the six or seven weeks they would normally employ them. Small businessmen make that effort so that the workers involved at least make up in unemployment insurance benefits for the little time they could spend at work. Such an effort the government do not make. They put forward the bill to reduce workers to the bare minimum, and they put the blame on the individual. And indirectly, especially in the province of Quebec, when they disentitle the greater number of unemployed, they know that automatically they will depend on welfare, so that the blame will be on the big bad government that was elected on November 15.

Well, Mr. Speaker, we know that this problem has been with us much longer than that. With an 8, 10, 12 week period there is disparity. It was said earlier that the government is committed to eliminating regional disparities, but it is quite the opposite. They are creating 54 disparities, 54 regions where they will be playing with 8, 10 and 12 week periods. They are going to play with that and another department of the government will say to the workers: now, we are going to

move you to another area. I can hardly wait to see the problems those people are going to be faced with when they move from an eight-week area to a twelve-week area. I can hardly wait to see their faces when they argue with the officials. They tell them nothing about that. Indeed not, they hold a knife against their throat and tell them: Well, that is your problem. Does the bill talk about employment insurability? Not at all.

We have stacks of cases, discussions, and the UIC is now taking refuge behind the taxation department and tells people: Well, your job is not insurable, you are not entitled to unemployment insurance, you do not even have the right to contribute to unemployment insurance, you do not even have the right to pay unemployment insurance in order to draw benefits when you lose your job. I know of specific cases where a storekeeper hires one of his children—he does not have the right. If he hires his neighbour's son and sends his own son to work for the neighbour, then after such an exchange the employment is insurable. But under the regulations, if he wants to hire his own son, the latter is not insurable, he does not have the right to pay unemployment insurance premiums on a seasonal basis.

I am talking about a tourist area—Témiscamingue—where during the summer there are what are known as outfitters, people who work for a specific period, from May to September, who need a job for eight, seven, six or ten weeks, it depends, people who look after the tourists who come to those areas. If one hires his son, the son will not be entitled to unemployment insurance benefits. If he hires the neighbour's son, then it is all right, he is entitled to unemployment insurance. That is the rule of the game. The government, through all kinds of means, through bills such as Bill C-27, has created situations where individuals are forced to be as crooked as the government to get what is due to them.

● (1650)

They are forced to cheat with the officers and search for reasons.

We know of a case now in the province of Quebec where the provincial government, through its highways department, is hiring people in the riding of Témiscamingue for only eight weeks. Then they are laid off, after eight weeks only, and another group of 75 people is hired for another eight week period. If that is not a fight between two government levels, I wonder what it is with the crazy regulations we now have. What change will be brought into it? The federal government says: No, we will block the unemployed and passed the buck to the provincial government through welfare. The provincial government answers: No, we will never accept that. Let those people take their responsibilities. Yet, those people are laid off after eight weeks of work.

It is a game of political confrontation instead of an administration that assists people. A further point: there is no change in sections 172 and 173 concerning leave credits and terms of employment. Nothing at all! They took advantage of that again last week, when we had to go before the board of referees and plead cases successfully before three judges who ruled unanimously in favour of the recipient. However, the next day, the board informed us that the case will be referred to the umpire. The three judges of the board of referees appointed by the government cannot even make a unanimous decision. But it is an never-ending game where they always lay the blame on the individual instead of trying to find a solution.

We are told that the government is trying to assist small businesses so that they may create work and produce more. Canadian productivity is increasing, but we know that it is gradually increasing through automation which undeniably causes unemployment. But the government is there precisely to deal with the affairs of the country, to be able to give. The number of jobs is reduced but the government is there precisely to establish policies which would ensure the individual the necessary purchasing power to buy the production of the machine. Unfortunately, the government lacks the decency to think this way. It tries to put the blame on the individual. When in trouble, it says that the situation depends on other countries, that if we have inflation in Canada, it is because of some other countries.

As far as inflation is concerned, prices increase and companies have to spend more to obtain the supplies they need to manufacture. Therefore some companies close down. And if the workers are unemployed, it is their fault; they are lazy because they worked only from eight to ten weeks, depending on the area, or perhaps for twelve weeks. The blame is always put on the individual. Bill C-27 should be entitled "Import controls" rather than deal with unemployment insurance. If, at the very outset, something had been done to deal with the problems of importation into Canada, there is no question that this would have promoted employment. In the Eastern Townships, textile plants are going out of business; furniture manufacturers have gone bankrupt, five of them, one after the other, in Victoriaville. The shoe manufacturers are also going bankrupt. They are all closing down because of the free flow of imports! And then, people will say: "We have too many unemployed"! If we have too many unemployed, something has to be done to reduce their number, and to this end, a bill is introduced, Bill C-27, intended to reduce the number of unemployed.

But what has been done to create jobs for these people? Absolutely nothing. This amounts to putting band aids on wooden legs. There are all kinds of excuses, investing in a given field, to create four, five or six jobs, while at the same time 50 or 60 jobs are destroyed in the same area. There is such a case in my own riding at the present time. We have to fight with various departments in order to get the grants needed to help small businesses. We have to appeal to both the provincial government and the federal government for investments in a region where there is about 22 to 24 per cent of unemployed. But, when we meet them in the streets, or try and count them, we are more likely to find 30 per cent than 24 or 22 per cent.

But the government allows this situation when it refuses to help small businesses, as was the case recently with Quebec Iron Foundries, in Noranda. There was an agreement between

the Department of Manpower and Immigration and the company to retrain the employees in other fields. They are not guaranteed a job, they are retrained in a field other than the foundry, which served the Noranda mine. There was no thought given to retraining the company. It gets benefits from something else to guarantee jobs to the employees. But the blame is placed on the employees. The company closes down and the employees are dismissed. After that, they are told: "Very well, we shall retrain you." But in what field? Where? How? Why? No one knows. But they will be retrained. Afterwards, if they have not found a job, on the basis of Bill C-27 they will be told: "Well, my friend, you will have to get busy. You will have to look for a job, everywhere, like the unemployed are now doing." They are looking for jobs. They are now being told that they have not searched for employment in their area. They have looked only in their municipality, yes, in their municipality. You can ask the officials and the minister: "What is the municipality? What does it mean?" The previous speaker spoke about Winnipeg. If I live at one end of Winnipeg, I can tell you that it is quite a long way to go to work at the other end. The problem is the same in Montreal. If I live in Pointe-aux-Trembles and if I have to go to work in Dorval, this poses a transportation problem. But no consideration is given to that. The unemployed has not looked for a job; he restricted his search to his municipality.

In rural constituencies like my own where the next town is 40, 50 or 60 miles away, where there is no public transport, where the unemployed has been looking for a job in his town or the neighboring town, with a population of perhaps four or five thousand people, it is impossible to find a job. He is still cut off from the unemployment benefits because he has not looked in his area. When we try to find out how many miles does the area cover and what services are given, it is impossible to find out. The unemployment officials do not know what is an area. That person is on the unemployment roll, he has no car, no public transportation. How could he go 40 or 45 miles away, twice a day, to find a job? And people are denied unemployment insurance benefits on grounds such as these!

The bill refers to 54 districts. Employment opportunities, means of transportation to and from work and the total number of unemployed should at least be considered in these 54 districts! I suppose there is some assessment, to a certain extent but these things are not being considered. They apply the same scale to a region or a large urban centre, no matter what employment opportunities there are in a given area. They do not take those factors into account. For the same reasons, these people are denied unemployment insurance benefits and in addition, the onus is on the worker. He must prove he has been actively seeking employment. The applicant goes to the federal manpower centre, to the provincial manpower office and comes back home because they have nothing to offer him. He contacts the four or five industries where he used to work. They have nothing for him either. After a while those workers have to accept any job that is offered to them. What will Bill C-27 do to give workers adequate protection against officious civil servants? Nothing at all. All they try to do is to put the burden on the worker's shoulders.

What should our position be on this? When workers are displaced by machines, are they entitled to make a living or not? When, for economic reasons, whether from within or without the country, such sclerosis, and unemployment is created, resulting in financial disaster for the people concerned, are the jobless not entitled to a living? That is the whole question we must ask ourselves. If it is admitted they have a right to a decent living, well, legislation should provide a decent living for them. No bill like C-27 should be tolerated, the impact of which is to back the unemployed into a corner and gag and belittle them or force them on welfare, and then, once they are there, make it even worse for them, by making them crawl to officials for a mere pittance. That is why, for years now, the Social Credit Party of Canada has advocated and still does a guaranteed annual income for everybody, so that if someone loses his job, he will at least be assured a sufficient amount to live on. And he will be entitled and allowed to look for another job, and when he has found it, this guaranteed annual income will be a supplement to his income. It will not be a penalty as it is now.

• (1700)

If someone collecting unemployment insurance does a little work in a week, he is penalized and his benefits are reduced. If he works for more than four weeks, then he is "cancelled", out! He cannot get benefits for four weeks then this clause is used and he is kicked out, he is no longer eligible. He is not entitled to unemployment insurance benefits anymore. We have at least cancelled that one a little bit but only to find some other devious way, a little better than bear traps this time. Not mouse traps, bear traps this time.

That is why we support this motion to put this bill off for six months; if it were possible to put it off for two years, we would do it, because it does not solve the problem. It does not help to improve some situations. This bill creates a situation which is worse than the one existing before. It brings a small improvement on one side and a big failure on the other. A small correction is made on the right for an even bigger failure on the left. It is a continuous game. So, we oppose that bill, and we support the motion to put it off for six months, because in our opinion, many people have representations to make, there will be many petitions drawn by people who were caught in the unemployment problem, people who had to live with it. These are not businessmen.

I had a conversation with a member of the government who met businessmen in his riding; they told him: "That is a good bill". That man has never been on unemployment insurance in his life. He does not know what it is and he even added: I do not know what it is. I have never been on unemployment. But eight weeks is too short. Twelve weeks, you should put a longer period. Such is the advice given to some government members. They should have seen those who are on unemployment insurance, those who have to rely on unemployment benefits for some part of the year to be able to eat during 52 weeks. They

should have consulted those people before introducing a bill such as Bill C-27, and maybe we would not have such a long debate. Chances are the government would have come up with a legislation likely to solve the problem instead of creating one as it is the case now.

Those are the general comments I wanted to make. Mr. Speaker, we are going to continue to make such comments, such representations in the House of Commons as well as outside the House, because we know that most Canadians do not want a discriminatory measure but legislation which will allow them to live decently in this country. If we do not have enough jobs to go around we should at least give them an opportunity to rely on some sort of guaranteed income. It should not be an everlasting fight between men who seek the right to live and civil servants who always wonder whether the unemployed or the person without a job is entitled to the payment he needs to survive. Those are the comments I wanted to submit to the attention of the House and I hope hon. members will vote for that six month delay to allow the civil servants to read their correspondence and become conscious of the problem this bill will create for simple workers.

Mr. Gauthier (Roberval): Mr. Speaker, I do not think I have exaggerated—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): I regret to have to interrupt the hon. member, but it would be appropriate now to announce the questions to be debated on the adjournment motion.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[*Translation*]

QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Order. It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 40, to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: the hon. member for Kootenay West (Mr. Brisco)—Regional Economic Expansion—Degree of support for British Columbia—Government position; the hon. member for Northwest Territories (Mr. Firth)—Northern Affairs—Enforcement of mine safety regulations in Northwest Territories—Request for report on consultation with Minister of Labour; the hon. member for St. John's West (Mr. Crosbie)—Energy-Conservation—Grants for home insulation—Availability to other provinces of program similar to that of Nova Scotia and P.E.I..

[Mr. Caouette (Témiscamingue).]

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*Translation*]

EMPLOYMENT AND IMMIGRATION REORGANIZATION ACT

MEASURE TO ESTABLISH DEPARTMENT OF EMPLOYMENT AND IMMIGRATION, ETC.

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Cullen that Bill C-27, to establish the Department of Employment and Immigration, the Canada Employment and Immigration Commission and the Canada Employment and Immigration Advisory Council, to amend the Unemployment Insurance Act, 1971, and to amend certain other statutes in consequence thereof, be read the third time and do pass; and the amendment thereto of Mr. Peters.

Mr. C. A. Gauthier (Roberval): Mr. Speaker, as I said a while ago, I do not think that I have taken too much of the time of the House in connection with this bill and this afternoon I wish to support the motion introduced by the member for Timiskaming (Mr. Peters) suggesting to the government a six months's hoist in the consideration of this bill. Actually, Mr. Speaker, we would have many subject matters to deal with. And the reason we want that bill sent to the committee for six months to undergo a further study, is that we want, for example, a review of clause 29 which deals with the insured's qualification, of clause 38 which deals with sickness or pregnancy, of clause 27 which deals with the much talked about insurability, and of clause 31 which extends the qualifying period.

We also wish to discuss the board of referees, the immense power wielded by this body, the issue of the search for work and above all those explanations which the civil servants would have to give to the claimants. Finally, we want to study the issues raised by strikes, by vegetable and fruit pickers, by voluntary designations and make it mandatory for the employer to send immediately the termination of employment form, and so on. These are only a few points which I just mention and we would like all these matters to be dealt with in depth. This is why we want that bill sent back to committee in six months for it to undergo a more thorough study.

Mr. Speaker, for instance I find that clause 29, asking a claimant to have at least from ten to fourteen weeks of prior insurable employment to qualify for unemployment insurance benefits, is a direct attack against the unemployed, because it gives credence to the allegation that they should be considered guilty for their being unemployed. This new clause of the bill proposed by the government is a direct attack against the most defenseless people among the working class, in the sense that the majority of workers who only qualify with a minimum number of insurable weeks of work are the aged and those who have a low level of instruction who generally keep their jobs a shorter time because the type of jobs that are available to them are often for a short period. Students, for instance, who do not intend to go on with their studies and who, as their first work experience have been hired for the summer season, will find

themselves without a right to these benefits according to the new clauses of the bill.

● (1710)

The eight-week requirement could quite easily be met by those families or individuals who worked as fruit, vegetable tobacco, tomato or cucumber pickers in the various parts of Canada or elsewhere, but I say it will be very difficult for them to get twelve or fourteen weeks of employment. In its proposal the government completely overlooks modern personnel requirements in the private, public and quasi-public sectors. Increasingly businesses require specialized workers for short periods of time only. Specialized people are hired for definite jobs of a short duration.

Through this provision increasing the qualifying period to eight, ten and even fourteen weeks, the government and its supporters leave the impression that most unemployed who qualified with a minimum period of eight weeks were hard-core unemployed. For instance, jobs are marginal in my riding. Our unemployment rate of 26 or 27 per cent is a clear indication that job-seekers must search for a long time to get one of the few jobs. It is obvious that with such a bill, such a provision and many others, the government is trying to make an insurance scheme profitable by eliminating the factors which are more risky. Social legislation such as this one should not be administered according to the same criteria as those governing private enterprise, even less so when the workers are the ones paying for this insurance.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the insured who pays the premium is entitled to the benefit of his insurance.

I have always considered that unemployment insurance was like any other insurance, like fire insurance or accident insurance: when your house burns down or when you have an accident, you have the right to claim benefit from your insurance company. But I think that is the major problem with the insurers: once you have paid the premium, there are indeed so many investigations of all kinds that in the end, even with a paid up insurance policy, you cannot get any benefits. Yet, when dealing with a commercial insurance company, let us say a fire insurance company, if one is not satisfied with the settlement, one may sue the company and the latter will have to pay. But when you are dealing with government agencies, it is useless to think of taking any legal action since it is so difficult to have officers transferred and they always have the last word. I say that those who deprive the unemployed of their rights are in my opinion outright criminals.

Mr. Speaker, such cases happen every day. A member's office is a good place to get to know of such things and I am sure that government members experience the very same problems. I feel that what is lacking in all this is a little light and a little more understanding. Some may say that I am overdoing it, that I am going too far. Yet, after my party leader spoke this afternoon and gave us an idea of what is going on among the people, I should like to call upon the media in order to substantiate our claims.

The fall 1976 issue of *Le Quotidien,* our regional paper stated the following, and I quote:

Reduced benefits. Five civil servants denounce . . .

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Order, please. I regret to interrupt the hon. member, but I must inform him that we are discussing at this point a motion to give the bill a six months' hoist. I would like to hear his reasons rather than quotations from newspapers.

Mr. Gauthier (Roberval): Mr. Speaker, this is exactly what I am doing. As I said at the outset, I suggest that the bill should be deferred for 6 months. I am now telling why I am making this suggestion. I am not going to tell that all I am asking for is a motion to adjourn the House. I want to explain myself. I am in the process of stating why we are right in giving the bill a six months' hoist. This is what I have been in the process of doing all the time. I do not know if you are grasping what I am saying, but I am simply suggesting that this bill should be deferred for six months because the unemployed are dissatisfied, because the media are saying that we are doing the wrong thing.

It is stated here: Five officials denounce UIC roll reductions. That is why I was telling you that we must refer the bill back to committee in order that it be fully looked into. Let us stop playing on words. We are doing nothing here in this House but playing on words. We are creating problems for everybody. We enact pieces of legislation that are so utterly nonsensical as to be illegible. There is not a single worker who can understand one single line of them. Even officials, imagine, five officials denouncing the cuts made by the UIC. I know the minister is aware of the fact, because I discussed it with him. I would like this to be looked into. We have reached the point where five UIC employees give an interview to tell the truth, but they are wearing hoods because they are afraid of being identified. Apparently, the truth must now be told behind curtains, because one is kaput if one is seen. I realize that there are still honest civil servants. That is why I want to mention this fact because everything is blamed on the officials who have to cope with the act all year long.

In my riding, I meet some officials twice, three or four times a year and that is what they tell me. Why don't you try to have more specific legislation and stop bothering us with all these troubles. That is also what we must do. This new legislation is even worse. Do you realize that for disqualification alone, there will be 54 different regions, 54 different cases to be assessed. I would not like to be in these officials' shoes. To say what they want to say, they have to hide under a hood. According to them, the department is trying to strike off 33 per cent more people from the rolls. Their heads hidden under a black hood and without telling names, these five officials have given—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Order please. I want to remind the hon. member, as I said earlier, that he should keep to the subject matter, namely the reasons why Bill C-27 should be given a six months' hoist and refrain from quoting press reports.

Mr. Gauthier (Roberval): Mr. Speaker, here are the reasons why I think consideration of this bill should be deferred for six months. It is because we have heard evidence such as this asking us to give the bill a six months' hoist. We want a six months' hoist. Do you understand? You have listened to all other members who gave their reasons why this delay is necessary. Why are you trying to prevent me from telling the truth when I am stating my case? It seems we are trying to hide the truth from the public. And yet, this is the truth, what is written, what appeared in the papers. It has to be said.

There are more jobless but less people who collect benefit. Such is the effect of the bill before us. This is why we want to send it back to the committee. Here we say: Mr. Cullen will want some explanations. But how come there are more unemployed and fewer benefits are paid. But no wonder, with the kind of bill we have; and if this bill is not amended, if it is not reviewed, if it is not referred to a committee for consideration, we will still have more unemployed and fewer beneficiaries, and the responsibility for it all will fall on the provincial government, as said the hon. member who spoke before me. The federal government collects the taxes, collects the contributions and when it has had enough, it says to the provincial governments: Now, you take the rest.

And once again the provincial government will have to assist those unemployed through the social welfare. This is the impact of this bill; this is why, Mr. Speaker, we want to give the bill a six month hoist. As far as I am concerned, I would like to give it a six year hoist so that I would not hear about it any more, but the amendment provided for six months only, and we have to comply with it. But, if we should pass this bill tonight, it will not do any good. We are going to be worse off than before. I was telling you earlier that we now have 24 per cent. That is again in the newspaper *Le Quotidien* of the 23rd. And some think that we are going to keep quiet in the House, that we are not going to speak out. No, Mr. Speaker, they are wrong because we are going to speak out and to denounce, because what is coming makes no sense. This bill must at all costs be referred to committee for a further detailed study, so that the unemployed may have what they are entitled to.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that it is absolutely essential that the powers of the board of referees be restricted in the course of the further consideration. At present, the board of referees is all powerful and solves about every problem in its own way, unless that is changed in the course of the further consideration of this bill. I just had a case in my riding. I will not mention names but that was very obvious to me. So, in its report, the board of referees states: the fact remains that the board of referees has the right and privilege to interpret the power, the power to decide which statement it will accept, and also to rule on the admissibility of the evidence. Imagine! It goes on to say: It should be noted, however, that it is not up to the claimant to decide on his availability. Imagine! The claimant, under the present act, has no longer even the right to say whether he is available or not. It is up to the board of referees—officials—to decide: You are available, you are not available.

[The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier).]

Such problems keep cropping up in our ridings. And what I do not understand is that such cases can be pleaded and when carried through, something finally comes out of it. But why did they not do it right away? Because the act quite simply, is not clear, it is too confused, and the officials are not wizards either. They do their best. Let us not forget, as I said earlier, that I am not trying to lay the blame on public servants.

● (1720)

Certain public servants want to make money out of unemployment insurance, but others are honest. I simply say that the legislation is too restrictive and not clear enough, and this is why we want a six month hoist to have the opportunity to say what we think about certain sections of the bill. I have something to say about insurability. Who determines insurability? There are many cases in my constituency, Mr. Speaker, of workers who had to contribute. I have seen such cases over a period of two and a half years. They were asked to contribute every week, and after two and a half years, they became unemployed. The Unemployment Insurance Commission told them: "Well, you were allowed to contribute, but you were not supposed to." The companies and the employers do not know what is going on.

The legislation does not clearly state when someone must contribute to unemployment insurance and is entitled to the benefits. Not only is the Unemployment Insurance office not authorized to tell those people that they are not entitled to benefits, but their case has to be referred to the Department of National Revenue since it is the one which decides if a worker is insurable or not. After two or three years, the worker is told that he has contributed for nothing. I know of such cases. I say this quite advisedly, Mr. Speaker. This is why a six months hoist would give us time to discuss this question of insurability.

It is essential to get the facts straight. I strongly object to the Department of National Revenue determining if someone can get unemployment insurance. There is a limit to the number of times departmental responsibility can change. I was talking about this with the officials of my area, in Alma, and they told me: "Listen, we do not have any influence, we must wait up to four months to know what the department will do." These poor people were saying: "We are like you, Mr. Gauthier, we have to wait." Is the government aware of the problem? There is a wall. I had to leave. I commuted between the office and the department because the civil servants could not communicate together. That is how they take the unemployed for a ride. What do you think happens to an unemployed man who can hardly sign his name and is facing such a problem? He will lose his unemployment insurance benefits. Those are real cases, Mr. Speaker, and for that reason we want to delay that study for six months so we could set the facts straight as we see them every day.

We have also the important issue of pregnancy or sickness. That is another trick: A guy gets sick and he needs a medical certificate. So I tell him: Send your doctor's certificate. Then he sends his certificate but they do not get it. I know workers who sent eight certificates within seven months but civil

servants never received those famous certificates. Now I have them photocopied and send a dozen at the first opportunity because civil servants seem to lose them too easily. What I am complaining about now, what I have always asked for in this House is that the medical certificate be the only argument allowing a sick person to get his or her benefits. I have discussed that with doctors in my area. The doctor brings in his findings but at the insurance office it is a civil servant who will weigh the diagnosis. The doctor says six weeks rest, but civil servants figure that two weeks is enough. That is wrong, they should respect the medical diagnosis.

● (1730)

This is very clear, and I have been urging this for a long time. But let us respect the diagnosis of the physician. The civil servant is there to dictate letters and he has never practised medicine and does not know beans about it. However, he is one who decides whether a person has the right to be on sick leave for two, three, four or five weeks. This is ridiculous! I have always asked for this, without success. The physicians ask for this too, they want their certificates to be respected.

When a person is operated on for appendicitis, he gets four weeks leave, and I had the opportunity to discuss this with one of these civil servants who confirmed this to me. There can be all kinds of complications with appendicitis, Mr. Speaker. Even if the physician says this is acute appendicitis, and the knows his patient's need, he knows whether the person needs to stop working for eight or ten weeks, the civil servants tells us that it is four weeks according to the law. This is ridiculous! I had to defend such cases. It seems funny to say, maybe some of you would not believe me, but I had to go and defend such cases.

I also believe that as long as the legislation will not say specifically that the physician's diagnosis should be followed, we will be in the wrong. It seems to me that the government is relying more on its officials than on the physician. I for one can tell you that I have more faith in the physician than in the local official. It is sad to say, but I have always defended causes like that. The same thing goes for strikes. I see that time is going fast, but I wanted to say a few words on this subject to note what we are supposed to do and consider in the next six months regarding this bill. It is the same thing for strikes. Of course, when an industry strikes its workers are not allowed to get unemployment benefits. But what about those who are not union members, why should they be treated in the same way as those who are members of the union?

Within six months, those cases will have to be studied in a very specific manner to determine who is entitled to unemployment insurance and who will be penalized because of strikes. It must be realized that when there is a strike, strikers are not 100 percent for the strike, especially when their type of employment is not entirely related to the work performed by the real strikers. I think that we are witnessing these problems day in and day out and that they will keep arising because of the bill before us, if tonight we do not decide, once and for all, to clarify this situation and send this bill back for six months for further study on this matter.

Mr. Speaker, as for the extension of the qualifying periods, I think that while reading the bill the minister did not even think of workers who are injured on the job. There must absolutely be a special extension of the qualifying period in order that such persons who have received accident compensation benefits for a month, two months or even three months and did not collect unemployment insurance, will be able as soon as they are back on the job market, and available for but unable to secure employment, to receive unemployment insurance benefits. I think that this is a very legitimate demand. I can understand or I would rather think that there was perhaps a mistake, but I also believe that if we do not take the necessary steps to try and correct the defects that we keep finding in the present bill, we will keep giving the unemployed the run around and make them wait indefinitely. Last week, somebody told me that he had been waiting to collect his unemployment insurance benefits for the past fourteen months.

He had waited 14 months for the results of the studies. He had received a letter saying his case was under review. Mr. Speaker, I believe we are serious enough in this House and sincere enough to see to it that this bill is not voted upon tonight but referred instead for a real study, and not to be discussed with civil servants. Not that I blame those who are here. They have never been out in the field. They have no idea what goes on out there. They write the laws but know nothing about what is going on. We, however, live the whole year round with the unemployed out in the field. I think it would do them good to have an hon. member in their midst from time to time, an hon. member who comes from those areas, but, no, we come third class. It is quite forbidden to consult us, to ask our advice. They are the ones who decide under what conditions such and such an unemployed will get benefits. And there again, if one has good friends, good connections, things won't be too had. But if, unfortunately, one has no friends, it is often difficult to solve the case.

Indeed, we do run into cases like that. Mr. Speaker, I do hope this bill will not pass third reading tonight and that the amendment of the hon. member for Timiskaming (Mr. Peters) will be accepted. I am sure that many government members would like to see the amendments I mentioned a while ago improve the shortcomings of the bill, and the only way to do that, once again, is to defer the bill and vote for the motion of the hon. member for Timiskaming.

An hon. Member: Question, question!

An hon. Member: What's the rush?

Some hon. Members: Question!

Mr. Adrien Lambert (Bellechasse): Mr. Speaker, one really has the impression that this is not a democratic Parliament. Our colleagues seem shocked to see us rise and express the views of our constituents. Our democracy will survive so long as our democratic parliamentary system will be respected. Otherwise our system will disappear and then everybody will

wonder how it happened. Freedom of speech! What has become of it?

Mr. Speaker, I hope that you at least understand me and will accept that I make some remarks on Bill C-27 and also on the motion to give the bill a six months' hoist for further consideration. I remember a few years ago when a similar piece of legislation was passed by the Canadian Parliament, the unemployment insurance act. Well, this Parliament wanted to safeguard the rights of the workers who happened to be out of work after the last world war. Before that war, Mr. Speaker, there was a period of acute unemployment during the economic recession from 1929 to 1939. At that time, there was no legislation to ensure the Canadian workers minimum income if unemployed. We had nevertheless various work programs. We had subsequently the relief program.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Order. I regret to interrupt the hon. member, but I must remind him once again that we have before us an amendment designed to give the bill a six months' hoist. Of course, it is allowed to criticize the bill during consideration of this amendment, but the amendment does not in any way allow for any correction or change in the bill. Therefore, I would appreciate it if the hon. member would address himself to the amendment under consideration at this time.

Mr. Lambert (Bellechasse): Mr. Speaker, with all due respect, but in order to say anything sensible on the amendment, I must deal with the bill. That is why I have to remind the hon. members of the history of our unemployment insurance legislation and I don't know of any rule that prevents me from telling the House that before the introduction of the present unemployment insurance act, other events took place. I consider that I respect the Standing Orders and the Chair precisely by recalling those previous situations which later led Parliament to adopt a law providing for the unemployed worker some benefits which have been called unemployment insurance benefits.

● (1740)

Mr. Speaker, in the course of my functions, I had to cooperate in many instances to complete forms for workers who happened to be unemployed, to help them take advantage of this law adopted by Parliament which provided they could receive unemployment insurance benefits. What Parliament wanted at that time was to guarantee them a minimum income so they would not have to get into debt when they were unemployed. And I think I must commend the lawmakers of that time who were concerned about protecting the economic situation of people who after the 1939-1945 war could eventually be unemployed.

Later the law was amended a few times, Mr. Speaker, as it was in 1971 and again in 1977. Now we are on Bill C-27 and an amendment motion has been proposed by the hon. member for Timiskaming (Mr. Peters), a motion which would delay the adoption of this bill for six months. Is it because the bill has to beget something in six months' time? Definitely not. It is not a period set aside for confinement but a period set aside for reasoning, for thinking, that will allow the law-makers, the minister and the officers time to study this legislation in greater depth, to make it more consistent with the actual needs of the workers, of those who could possibly be unemployed some day, not of their own will, but due to unusual economic circumstances.

So, Mr. Speaker, I think that since Bill C-27 was introduced in this House, there has been no reason for changing our opinion on it. Of course, I do not want to repeat the very serious comments voiced by my colleagues in the House of Commons, and especially by the hon. member for Kamouraska (Mr. Dionne) who is particularly qualified to speak on labour matters, on questions relating to unemployment insurance entitlement and contributions. I think, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. member for Kamouraska has shown during the last 15 years, in the speeches he has made before Parliament, that he is a truly responsible member, that he is sincerely working in the interest of his constituents, and that he is at the same time making sure that Canada can guarantee the security of the workers of our country, the security of our disabled citizens, of our widows, of our orphans and of all those who are destitute, so they are in a position to meet their obligations.

Mr. Speaker, are opposition members alone in objecting to Bill C-27? I do not think so. If we reread the comments made in the House by government members, on the majority side, I will not say in power, because they are not, but on the government or the majority side, well I remember among others the comments of the hon. member for Madawaska-Victoria (Mr. Corbin) who clearly stated in the House that he objected to Bill C-27 on second reading. He assumed his responsibilities and said that the bill did not meet the needs of workers for which it was meant and did not encourage them to work and contribute to the growth and development of our country.

Mr. Speaker, further on, the Minister of Manpower and Immigration (Mr. Cullen) in a document which he tabled and in his comments before the committee said:

> In amending the unemployment insurance system, we are obviously facing the following dilemma: ensure better income protection for the claimant while giving him an incentive to work.

I more than agree. We must have in this country a legislation which would encourage any able-bodied man to work, whether in his own interest, in the interest of his community, his province or his country. I fully agree, but we must take into account the economic situation in which we live. The minister added:

> The 1971 amendments have obviously helped provide adequate income maintenance.

That is true. The benefits granted to the unemployed helped them meet the needs of their families, or in the case of single persons, prevented them from sinking into debt, for otherwise they would have been compelled to borrow and mortgage their future.

Up to that point, I think the minister is right. He went on:

As well, the experience of the past five years abviously threw light on the elements of the system which had bad consequences on the labour force.

And yet, Mr. Speaker, you were here when the bill to amend the Unemployment Insurance Act was introduced in 1971. Members on the government side were saying that this legislation was the best in the world, that it would provide workers with a stable income while encouraging them to go back to work and get the available jobs.

● (1750)

The minister goes on:

Not only the comprehensive study on the unemployment insurance system in Canada, but also a wide variety of studies made by other agencies and individuals have enabled us to recognize and identify its effects. The proposals contained in Bill C-27 are designed to improve the balance between the components of the system and I am convinced of their appropriateness.

Mr. Speaker, it is either of two things: In 1971, it was logical to give workers the possibility of claiming unemployment insurance benefits after having contributed to the fund for eight weeks, whereas in 1977 we confess in the face of the whole country that this was a disastrous mistake. Well, Mr. Speaker, if we confess that this was a disastrous mistake to give benefits after eight weeks of work attachment in 1971, I think I am entitled to question whether at the end of one year, or two years of having had to live with Bill C-27, we would not ask the same question for the second time: was it not a mistake to establish a qualifying period of 10, 12 or 14 weeks according to the unemployment in each area, as the minister says.

And I quote what he said:

First of all, we shall increase by 12 weeks the benefit period during the regional extended benefit phase. During this phase, recipients will therefore be entitled to benefits for a possible maximum of 32 weeks instead of 20.

Additional weeks of benefits would depend on the regional unemployment rate, which appears in Schedule B which is annexed to the copy of my speech.

These are remarks which he made in the House when he moved the second reading of this bill. Well, Mr. Speaker, statistics are something which I believe in, but I do not trust them 100 per cent, and because of our experience with votes earmarked for the Canada Works and Young Canada Works programs, I am most careful because statistics are not always up to date. When we consider the figures published by Statistics Canada concerning the number of unemployed recorded on its rolls, and then consider the real number of unemployed people in our own regions, there are serious discrepancies, and this procedure affects unfavourably the poorer regions in our country.

It is on the basis of these statistics that, according to Bill C-27, unemployment insurance benefit entitlement will hinge for those who are unemployed. There is something which I may know better than anybody in Canada, Mr. Speaker, and it is that there are many Canadians who really want to work and earn their own living, but who simply cannot, because of economic conditions which are beyond their control.

Second, a percentage of the population wants to work in order to qualify for unemployment insurance benefits and then live on them without working, thus taking advantage of all the benefits that our partnership, our life in society has to offer. But even then, a distinction must be made. I think it is a small number. And I remember during the recession I referred to a moment ago, many jobless were termed as lazy by the authorities of the day because they did not want to work, but when the war broke out and all able-bodied men were called upon to enlist, they no longer were lazy. Thousands of our young people were willing to enlist because it was the only way to earn a living.

From 1939 to 1945, thousands of Canadians were called upon to work in our factories here and there and it was then acknowledged that those people were not lazy but hard-working who only want to earn good pay, to earn a decent living. Mr. Speaker, we are now going through an extremely difficult period when the best qualified people cannot find a job. I get mail every day in this connection from young people, people of all trades who write to me, who telephone me to ask me if it would not be possible to help them find a job.

I signed earlier some fifty letters before coming to the House recommending people to the Quebec manpower centres in Quebec City, Lévis and Montmagny, not to ask for unemployment insurance benefits but to ask the public servants in those manpower centres to help those people find a job. Mr. Speaker, how gratifying it is to be able to help someone find a job so that this person will have the pleasure of saying at the end of each day: I earned my daily bread. I have done something for my country and my country will benefit from it because my country has given me plenty. Mr. Speaker, when you reach age 24 or 30, and have scores of diplomas stuffed in your pockets, diplomas which have been paid for by your predecessors and which are very hard to get these days, because education has become terribly expensive, when we see these young people so healthy and so fully qualified, having acquired the great qualification of the day, the qualification to be unemployed, we wonder what this parliament has been doing to deal with such an unacceptable situation. But, except in wartime, the private sector alone is not in a position to provide jobs for all the qualified people in our country.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Order, please. It being six o'clock, I do now leave the chair until 8 p.m. tonight.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 8 p.m.

Mr. Lambert (Bellechasse): Mr. Speaker, before the dinner recess I had still a few minutes left to finish my comments on the motion under consideration. I was explaining how Canadian industries are at present unable to create the necessary jobs to cope with the manpower needs in Canada. That is one of the reasons why we now have more than a million unemployed.

In the province of Quebec, three large industries have to compete with imports and as a consequence the number of

people without jobs is increasing. I am referring to the textile, garment and shoe industries. These three industries used to provide jobs for a great many people but today thousands of them are now out of work. They are now unemployed; they are in good health, and able to work but there are no jobs available. I know there are retraining programs intended for the worker who may learn another trade. But in spite of the good will of all the governments, these programs cannot cope adequately with labour needs. This is not creating more jobs either. Workers are being retrained and taught new trades, but will they find jobs? There is another trick—let me put it this way—that we find in our legislation: retrained workers must obtain a working permit. You can imagine! I call that a permit to keep them out of work. Such is modern democracy. A working permit. You are qualified, you were trained as a heavy equipment operator, but that is not enough. You must first obtain a working permit in order to get a job. That working permit is no easy thing to get, and God knows if I am not aware of that. So we make things more difficult. I know the Minister of Manpower and Immigration is not responsible for that, and I would not like him to think I am laying the blame on him, but such is the sitution. Secondly, there is not enough room available in those schools for training all the applicants. In my area alone, there are already 1200 names on the waiting list, people who want to retrain as heavy equipment operators. They have to wait for 6, 12, 18 or even 24 months before they can attend classes.

● (2010)

Mr. Speaker, I have here a list of employers operating in the James Bay area, just to show that there are employers really willing to help workers to get a job. There may be 150 firms. I did not count them. Anyway, I have seven or eight full pages. Some are operating in the North, on the Labrador side, and when someone asks me for help in finding a job, I send him the full list to show that there are employers. But do those employers have jobs? Before I take action to help someone get unemployment insurance benefits, I do all I can to help him get a job. I assume that the officials administering the Unemployment Insurance Act do all they can, but they only have the tools they are provided with. So, when someone after all is unemployed, they send him a notice stating he is disqualified because he has not been actively looking for work. They know at the UIC office that he cannot find work because there is none.

Manpower centres in the area know full well that the claimant cannot find a job because there is none available. He is disqualified just the same, and he loses the revenue toward which he had been contributing in the hope of receiving benefits until he could find a job. And if he insists, he is told to apply to the welfare office. In my province, welfare benefits are paid 50 per cent by the provincial government and 50 per cent by the federal government, while unemployment insurance is financed solely by the federal government. So they play games with the poor fellow who can have no more unemployment insurance benefits because he cannot find a job, but he is not told that he cannot find one because there is none. Far from it, he is blamed for everything, and this is playing games with unfortunate people.

Mr. Speaker, even if someone wants a job for a few days or a few weeks, if an employer is willing to employ him for that period of time, the claimant would not dare take the risk for fear of getting into trouble. Most of the time claimants are not adequately informed of their rights, and often, through lack of information, they turn down offers of temporary employment.

He protests again and tells the Unemployment Insurance Commission that he does not understand why he was disqualified. He is then sent a notice telling him that he still has one possibility left open, an appeal to the board of referees. The board studies the case of this poor guy. They are not aware of all the details, and they are appointed ordinarily to do a job that comes under the jurisdiction of the government and they do not examine sufficiently the job opportunities in the area to know if the claimant is truly lazy and does not want to work or if he is not able to work.

That is the whole difference; there are those who want to work and those who do not want to do so. Being able to get a job and refusing it is not the same thing as not being able to find a job. The claimant is then told: "If you are not satisfied, you can appeal to the umpire. But for this, you need the authorization of the board of referees. You need the authorization of the chairman." But the chairman has decided that the poor boy is not entitled to benefits. He is the one to tell him: "It is true, you can appeal to the umpire or not." And if the decision of the umpire is not in the favour of the claimant, there is no other recourse. The case is closed. In other areas, you can still appeal to the Supreme Court. There are still some possibilities. Mr. Speaker, I would not want to close my comments without making some suggestions for improvement to the members of the House of Commons. I would not like my comments to be considered only as criticisms. This would not be in accordance with my true role.

There must be some change, and this according to the great formula of Major Douglas that is called the social credit, a credit which is more social and which serves everyone. He suggested that the community as a whole benefits entirely from the present inventions and progress as man is being replaced more and more by machines. We must find a formula that will enable society to receive an income earned by machines and progress. In our party we call this social credit, a credit which is distributed to the society because it is earned by machines and progress. We now have a different formula. Our politicians and political scientists have found another name for this. They call it guaranteed minimum annual income. Mr. Speaker, I do not care whether it is called a guaranteed minimum annual income formula or a national dividend formula, as long as we succeed in reaching our objective, that is the redistribution to all the workers of the income earned by machines if they have become unemployed because of those machines.

● (2020)

Mr. Speaker, the second formula suggested by the same Major Douglas is a discount on the price of Canadian products in order to increase the consumption of Canadian production as an incentive to our industries, which will enable them to produce more because sales will be activated. And if our industries are able to empty their warehouses, they will be urged automatically to increase their production and thus give a new impetus to the Canadian economy. Mr. Speaker, I make this suggestion earnestly because I realize that the purpose of production is not only to produce for trade fairs or for the sake of production, but rather for consumption, in order to satisfy individual or community needs. If we make fire engines, it is to help municipalities fight fires in their area and not only to exhibit them.

Mr. Speaker, there are in our society some jobs which are guaranteed, which are secured. Those who hold these positions do not need unemployment insurance, but there are also jobs which are not guaranteed, which are available on a seasonal basis only, and those who fill them do need unemployment benefits. I wish we would take a consistent approach to enable these people whose job situation is not secure to rely on a guaranteed minimum annual income, without preventing them from earning money from another source. It would be, Mr. Speaker, an incentive to work and it would ensure some security to the individual and to those who depend upon him for their maintenance. This is my way of seeing things, Mr. Speaker.

In conclusion, I wish to express my appreciation to all hon. members who have expressed their views on this very important bill which affects thousands of people. After this motion is voted upon, and since all members want to go on holidays—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Order please. I regret to interrupt the hon. member, but his time has expired. The hon. member for Compton (Mr. Tessier) has the floor.

Mr. Claude Tessier (Compton): Mr. Speaker, even though the hon. member for Nickel Belt (Mr. Rodriguez) wants to call me what we have often called him, I simply wish to tell him that this afternoon, he requested that I take part in this debate, saying that it was my right and privilege. Indeed, for my constituents and the House, I want to exercise this right and perform my duty, namely make representations on behalf of my constituents.

I find myself compelled to take part in this debate because he who doesn't speak out implies consent, and I certainly cannot associate myself with the remarks made by the opposition today. They have been either demagogic or simply election-minded, or even full of inconsistent jokes, accompanied by grotesque and disgraceful demonstrations as examplified by the member for Nickel Belt. Of course, I can only agree that unemployment is a sad situation and I am willing to associate myself with all those who accept to work positively and efficiently toward creating permanent jobs. To succeed in his task, we need the support of all economic agents in this country and even that of the opposition parties in this House.

Today's debate is a blatant demonstration that there is a lot of empty chatter, a lot of common places, a lot of principles restated and the result of this situation is that when we are all tired of talking around, we will come to a vote and because the opposition will not have been responsible and efficient enough, Parliament will go on without solving anything. No one in this House should forget that he is a member of parliament and if he claims that Parliament should solve every problem he has but himself to blame for these shortcomings. With an opposition of the type we now have, the result would be an unsurpassed catastrophe. Of course I agree that the solution offered by Bill C-27 will not make my task any easier, nor improve the lot of certain of my constituents. But starting from a temporary problem, I hope that the solutions we will all have to apply will lead us to the true solutions, namely the creation of permanent jobs in a balanced and viable economy.

If I accept the principles and the regulations spelled out in Bill C-27, it is because the excesses have reached such a state and are so many that I am led to conclude that the government would be unable to pay for them and so would the taxpaying workers. I cannot put off what can and should be done today. Giving Bill C-27 a six months' hoist would not resolve anything, and this is illustrated by the remarks of the hon. member for Roberval. He wants to delay discussion for six months, but to what avail? The hooded public servants he mentioned did not resolve anything, but what concerns me is not so much that public servants wear hoods, but that some hon. members also have them but are unaware of it. I would agree on a guaranteed minimum income, but I would not correct abuses by instantly creating another source of abuses.

Some hon. members have also talked about the zealous and interfering public official. What about hon. members who interfere with his work? As for imports, this is also a matter which can give rise to many lies. I am thinking about textiles. A glove factory in my constituency had to reduce its operations. We know that it costs $13.30 to produce a dozen of Canadian gloves whereas imported gloves cost $5.50. Will the opposition have the courage to tell the consumers that they want them to pay more? In the pulp and paper industry, everybody in the House knows it, Domtar has announced that they are going out of business in my constituency. How are we then to find a solution when we know that labour in East Angus is paid an hourly minimum wage of $6.61? Yet in the same industry on the American side of the border, people are getting an average salary of $4.50 an hour. Mr. Speaker, I must add that productivity in the pulp and paper industry is 20 per cent higher. What is there to say about the cost of raw materials when we know that a cord of wood at the mill costs nearly $70, while they manage to get it for $30 and $40 on the American side. That is the dead end we are in, and hon. members of the House should realize that it is not only the government which is at fault.

● (2030)

Mr. Speaker, there are also great sowers of illusions. There are also great liars. Yet, what we actually need in the House are great public administrators who can represent their con-

stituents in a complete and effective way, not only once in a while, as during a debate such as this. To promise is easy, but today we should be honest enough not only to make promises, but to list the items on the invoice and indicate the terms of payment. This is the way to act to be a politician who moves with the times, to be a great politician, and I would hope that in a near future this will be the only kind of politician sitting in this House.

Bill C-27 is a page of this new history which in some cases means new public men. The question is not to have the workers pay budget deficits, but to restrict abuse which have become institutionalized. We should repeat this and, if we have enough courage, act in consequence because our current system is too open to abuse. The government has the responsibility to be strong and courageous enough to correct this, and I would say that this abuse was quite well reflected by what went on today in the House. Mr. Speaker, I am fed up with those who pretend they are the heroes of democracy when all they can do is read or talk, sometimes only to accuse others; they accuse the government for remaining silent, and this is what should be said: To listen kindly to those who try desperately and awkwardly, if not dishonestly, to get re-elected by misleading the people, for it must be recognized that this country has far greater need of men of courage and know-how than of demagogues and liars. Mr. Speaker, I shall conclude by saying simply that I shall vote against the amendment for a six month's hoist—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Order. The hon. member for Roberval on a point of order.

Mr. Gauthier (Roberval): Mr. Speaker, this afternoon you called us to order repeatedly throughout the debate, yet you allow the hon. member to go on even though he is straying from the subject with his nonsense.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Order. The hon. member for Roberval has certainly brought up a very interesting point; I was about to stand and ask the hon. member for Compton to keep to the motion before the House. However, as he said he was concluding, I tried to be tolerant, but I shall now call him to order and ask him to talk to the amendment under consideration.

Mr. Tessier: Mr. Speaker, I just want to bring my remarks to a close, but as the opposition kept interfering all afternoon I felt I could indulge myself a little this time around.

[*English*]

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

Some hon. Members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

[Mr. Tessier.]

Some hon. Members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): All those opposed to the motion will please say nay.

Some hon. Members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Call in the members.

The House divided on the amendment (Mr. Peters) which was negatived on the following division:

(*Division No. 92*)

YEAS

Messrs.

Benjamin
Brewin
Caouette (Villeneuve)
Caouette (Témiscamingue)
Dionne (Kamouraska)
Gauthier (Roberval)
Gilbert
Jones
Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre)
Lambert (Bellechasse)
Nystrom
Orlikow
Peters
Rodriguez
Saltsman
Symes—16.

NAYS

Messrs.

Abbott
Alexander
Appolloni (Mrs.)
Baker (Grenville-Carleton)
Basford
Beatty
Béchard
Bégin (Miss)
Blouin
Boulanger
Breau
Brisco
Buchanan
Bussières
Caccia
Cadieu
Cafik
Caron
Clermont
Coates
Collenette
Comtois
Corbin
Corriveau
Cossitt
Crosbie
Crouse
Cullen
Cyr
Darling
Dawson
De Bané
Demers
Douglas (Bruce-Grey)
Duclos
Dupont
Dupras
Duquet
Epp
Ethier
Fairweather
Flynn
Foster
Fox
Francis
Gauthier (Ottawa-Vanier)
Gendron
Gillespie
Goodale
Guay (St. Boniface)
Haidasz
Hargrave
Harquail
Herbert
Hnatyshyn
Holt (Mrs.)
Hopkins
Horner
Huntington
Isabelle
Jamieson
Jarvis
Johnston
Kaplan
Kempling
Knowles (Norfolk-Haldimand)
Lajoie
Lalonde
Lambert (Edmonton West)
Lamontagne
Lang
Laniel
Lapointe
Lavoie
Lawrence
Leblanc (Laurier)
LeBlanc (Westmorland-Kent)
Lee
Lefebvre
Lessard
Loiselle (Chambly)
Lumley
MacDonald (Cardigan)
MacDonald (Miss) (Kingston and the Islands)

Messrs.

MacEachen	Parent	Scott
MacFarlane	Pelletier	Sharp
Maine	Philbrook	Smith (Saint-Jean)
Malone	Pigott (Mrs.)	Stanbury
Marchand	Portelance	Stanfield
Martin	Poulin	Stevens
McCleave	Prud'homme	Stewart (Cochrane)
McKenzie	Railton	Tessier
McKinley	Raines	Trudel
Milne	Reid	Turner
Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich)	Ritchie	Whelan
Neil	Roberts	Woolliams
Nicholson (Miss)	Robinson	Yanakis
O'Connell	Roy (Laval)	Young—130.
Ouellet	Sauvé (Mrs.)	
Paproski	Savard	

● (2100)

Mr. Speaker: I therefore declare the motion lost.

Amendment (Mr. Peters) negatived.

Mr. Speaker: The question is on the main motion. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Mr. Max Saltsman (Waterloo-Cambridge): Mr. Speaker, I shall intervene this evening in a way which will commend itself to all hon. members. First, I shall be brief. Second, my intervention will be a demonstration of party solidarity.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: Yes, but which party's?

Mr. Saltsman: Mr. Speaker, ordinarily I would be inclined to support amendments to tighten the Unemployment Insurance Act because, without doubt, as members of my party have often said, abuses under the act need to be corrected. The question is, is this the time to do it?

Mr. Epp: Yes, definitely.

Mr. Saltsman: I, and other members, Mr. Speaker, have often asked the government to change the Unemployment Insurance Act. But we called for changes when we had reasonably high levels of employment. Surely bringing in such changes, when around one million Canadians are unemployed, is both inappropriate and cruel. Instead of lessening unemployment the government will cut people off from unemployment insurance benefits.

The hardships these changes will work on the poor, and on our poorer regions, will be beyond belief. Surely only an unconscionable government, and its supporters, would cut people off unemployment insurance when jobs are few and unemployment rates high. That is really what concerns me. If we could not create employment in this country, perhaps I would feel differently. However, I do not think any government ever stood as condemned as this one does in its absence of understanding and its absence of imagination in terms of solving the employment problem. It can be solved. The government simply has not bothered to do it. To throw people off unemployment insurance as a way of saying O.K., we are doing something, is totally unacceptable, at least to myself and my colleagues.

● (2110)

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

Some hon. Members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): All those in favour will please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

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

Some hon. Members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): In my opinion, the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Call in the members.

The House divided on the motion (Mr. Cullen) which was agreed to on the following division:

(*Division No. 93*)

YEAS

Messrs.

Abbott	Duclos	Lalonde
Alexander	Dupont	Lambert (Edmonton West)
Appolloni (Mrs.)	Dupras	Lamontagne
Baker (Grenville-Carleton)	Duquet	Lang
Basford	Epp	Laniel
Beatty	Ethier	Lapointe
Béchard	Fairweather	Lavoie
Bégin (Miss)	Flynn	Lawrence
Blaker	Foster	Leblanc (Laurier)
Blouin	Fox	LeBlanc (Westmorland-Kent)
Boulanger	Francis	Lee
Breau	Gauthier (Ottawa-Vanier)	Lefebvre
Brisco	Gendron	Lessard
Buchanan	Gillespie	Loiselle (Chambly)
Bussières	Goodale	Lumley
Caccia	Gray	MacDonald (Cardigan)
Cadieu	Guay (St. Boniface)	MacDonald (Miss) (Kingston and the Islands)
Cafik	Haidasz	MacEachen
Caron	Hargrave	MacFarlane
Clermont	Harquail	Maine
Coates	Herbert	Malone
Collenette	Hnatyshyn	Marchand
Comtois	Holt (Mrs.)	Martin
Corbin	Hopkins	McCleave
Corriveau	Horner	McKenzie
Cossitt	Huntington	McKinley
Crosbie	Isabelle	Milne
Crouse	Jamieson	Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich)
Cullen	Jarvis	Neil
Cyr	Johnston	
Darling	Kaplan	
Dawson	Kempling	
De Bané	Knowles (Norfolk-Haldimand)	
Demers	Lajoie	
Douglas (Bruce-Grey)		

Messrs.

Nicholson (Miss)	Raines	Stanbury
O'Connell	Reid	Stanfield
Olivier	Ritchie	Stevens
Ouellet	Roberts	Stewart (Cochrane)
Paproski	Robinson	Tessier
Parent	Rompkey	Trudel
Pelletier	Roy (Laval)	Turner
Philbrook	Sauvé (Mrs.)	Whelan
Pigott (Mrs.)	Savard	Woolliams
Portelance	Scott	Yanakis
Poulin	Sharp	Young—134.
Prud'homme	Smith (Saint-Jean)	
Railton		

NAYS

Messrs.

Benjamin	Gauthier (Roberval)	Muir
Brewin	Gilbert	Nystrom
Caouette (Villeneuve)	Jones	Orlikow
Caouette (Témiscamingue)	Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre)	Peters
Dionne (Kamouraska)	Lambert (Bellechasse)	Rodriguez
		Saltsman
		Symes—17.

● (2130)

Mr. Speaker: I therefore declare the motion carried.

Motion agreed to and bill read the third time and passed.

* * *

AIR CANADA ACT, 1976

MEASURE RESPECTING REORGANIZATION OF AIR CANADA

The House resumed, from Friday, July 15, consideration of Bill C-17, respecting the reorganization of Air Canada, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications, and motions Nos. 1 and 2 (Mr. Mazankowski).

Mr. Speaker: Is the House ready for the question on motions Nos. 1 and 2?

Some hon. Members: Question.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour will please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

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

Some hon. Members: Nay.

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

Some hon. Members: On division.

Mr. Speaker: I therefore declare motions Nos. 1 and 2 negatived on division.

Motions Nos. 1 and 2 (Mr. Mazankowski) negatived.

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre) moved:

Motion No. 4.

That Bill C-17, An Act respecting the reorganization of Air Canada, be amended in Clause 7 by striking out lines 6 to 9 at page 4.

[The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner).]

He said: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this report stage amendment to Bill C-17 is to strike out a few ridiculous lines which were written into the bill when it was in the hands of the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications. The lines that I have in mind were not there in the original version of the bill, but in the sessions of the standing committee the Conservative members on the committee proposed that something along the lines of the user-pay concept of the Minister of Transport (Mr. Lang) should be written into the bill. Indeed they proposed that the main purpose of Air Canada should be stated to be the contemplation of profit. It turns out that in the standing committee the actual amendment which was proposed by the Conservative members was not accepted, but on the recommendation of the Minister of Transport their idea was accepted and was written into the bill at another place.

Accordingly, Bill C-17, at page 4, lines 6 to 9, now reads as follows:

(1.1) In discharging its responsibilities under this act, the Board shall have due regard to sound business principles, and in particular the contemplation of profit.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): I hear "hear, hears" from Tweedledee and Tweedledum, the Liberals and the Tories.

Mr. Paproski: You did not hear it from the Tories, you heard it from the minister.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Is not the member for Grenville-Carleton (Mr. Baker) a Tory?

Mr. Paproski: He did not say a word.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Oh yes, he did. He said "more socialist jargon".

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Order. The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) has the floor. I suggest hon. members continue their conversations behind the curtains.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): It is quite clear that the idea contained in this sub-clause was put there because the Tories proposed it and the Minister of Transport welcomed it. It sounds like a bit of motherhood to say that the Board of Air Canada should have due regard to sound business principles, but sometimes I wonder. The business world has had charge of this country for 110 years and has had plenty of opportunity to pursue sound business principles. And look at the mess we are in today.

● (2140)

The phrase in this subsection which bothers us the most is the phrase which calls for the Board to have regard in particular to the contemplation of profit. It is not our suggestion that the Board of Air Canada should work hard to achieve a loss, but we do think that the main purpose of a government owned corporation should be the provision of service. It is not even

mentioned in this clause. It is not even given a second thought. According to this bill, as amended by a Tory-Liberal combination, the main purpose of the Board of Air Canada is to be the contemplation of profit.

The whole reason for the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, Canadian National Railways, Air Canada and a host of other corporations and agencies which have been established in the public domain is to serve the needs of the people of this country. The reason that these bodies have come into being is because the private sector has failed this country and our people miserably through all these years.

Mr. Stevens: Like Saunders Aircraft.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): The hon. member can refer to any outfit he wishes. He will discover a certain number which have failed and a certain number which have succeeded. I say to the hon. member, arch representative of the private sector that he is, that it is because of what the private sector has done that we are faced with massive unemployment today, with runaway inflation and with conditions which deny to our people the kind of economy and justice to which they are entitled.

I am not arguing that the words that were written into the bill have any particular meaning. I doubt that the Board of Directors will pay any attention to them. The Board of Directors of Air Canada will realize that it has a job to do and will see to it that Air Canada continues to be one of the best airlines in the world. It has a service which must be rendered to the people of this country. But parliament looks downright ridiculous putting these words into a piece of legislation which establishes the Board of Air Canada and gives it its working guidelines. Therefore, that is why I have put down this amendment and simply ask that the subparagraph which indicates that in discharging its responsibilities under this act the board shall have due regard to sound business principles, and in particular the contemplation of profits, be removed from this bill before it moves on to third reading.

Motion No. 4 reads that the act be amended in clause 7 by striking out lines 6 to 9 at page 4. I have read lines 6 to 9 several times. They are a ridiculous declaration, and parliament should not make itself look silly by leaving these words in Bill C-17. Therefore I call upon the House to support this amendment and take this nonsense out of this bill.

Mr. Sinclair Stevens (York-Simcoe): Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak on motion No. 4, I should like to qualify my position first of all by saying that I am diametrically opposed to what the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) has just told this House. We have got to put this situation into perspective. There was considerable debate at committee with respect to the question before us as a result of the amendment by the hon. member. In committee it was originally proposed by my colleague that the wording in the reprint of Bill C-17 dealing with contemplation of profit and the fact that Air Canada should be carried on with due respect for sound business considerations should come into Clause 6, making it very clear that the corporation, within and outside Canada, should carry on business subject to those essential ingredients. It should carry on in a sound business fashion in contemplation of profit.

It is rather interesting that it should be the House leader of the socialists who would be the first to become almost hysterical at the mere suggestion that we should have one of our Crown corporations operated in a sound fashion and in contemplation of profit. One of my colleagues from Winnipeg will be dealing more specifically with the disasters which have occurred under an NDP government out in Manitoba with the same type of philosophy the hon. member is asking us to accept for Air Canada tonight. I am sorry the hon. member did not attend the committee hearings when this matter was considered. If he had been there, even he would have been swayed a bit by some of the arguments placed by members on the government side as well as members from my party.

After the debate which occurred at committee, even the minister was willing to accept the amendment before us, provided it related only to the operation of the Board of Directors as opposed to the capacity of the company itself. That would have been the effect if the amendment was inserted in Clause 6.

Let us get matters into perspective. Let us realize what the Minister of Transport (Mr. Lang) has asked us to do in this House concerning Air Canada. Up to the present time Air Canada has had a $5 million capital. Most of the money used by Air Canada—and it is a billion dollar organization at the present time—has been loaned by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Macdonald) on behalf of the people of Canada to Air Canada. It has been loaned at a nominal interest rate. Approximately $700 million of funds have been put into Air Canada, in addition to the $5 million of capital. The hard fact is that Air Canada has been running at a loss for the last three years. In fact, after 40 years of existence, Air Canada has total retained earnings of only $18 million as of today.

As further amendments are reached, I will put into evidence the contrast Air Canada's sad record has been over those 40 years compared to other airlines which it is competing with that have built up substantial retained earnings during the same period of time. The Minister of Transport is coming to us and asking us, on behalf of the Canadian public, to agree to an authorized capitalization of Air Canada at $750 million.

Mr. Benjamin: What has that got to do with the amendment?

Mr. Stevens: The hon. member is asking what that has got to do with this amendment. Obviously he has not read the amendment. Tonight, tomorrow, or whenever this bill may be passed, we will authorize the government to put $750 million of our capital into Air Canada without even the suggestion of a commitment of a dividend or interest from Air Canada back to the public treasury. In short, it will be $750 million that can go into Air Canada with no further reference to this House.

● (2150)

In today's money cost at 10 per cent, it means in effect that Air Canada will be entitled to a subsidy of $75 million a year out of the pockets of the taxpayers of Canada, and the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre has the audacity to stand up in the House and say it is wrong for us to propose an amendment which simply says that the directors, in the sleepy fashion in which they run Air Canada, should at least follow sound business practices and should try to make a profit.

Let us accept the facts. I have indicated that if we allow this bill to go through, $750 million will be the total capitalization that can be put into Air Canada, doing nothing. If Air Canada simply took that money and put it out at 10 per cent, it could make $75 million, and yet the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre tells us that, notwithstanding those facts, we should not expect it to make a profit, or we should not even hint to it that we would like it to carry on in contemplation of a profit.

Let us look at some of the evidence that was put forth in the committee hearings. For example, we were told that of the $750 million on a pro forma basis over the next five years, the government contemplates that only $370 million will actually be paid, in the form of paid in capital. I found it most interesting that there has been a misrepresentation with respect to the effect of that paid in capital. We have been told repeatedly that the reason the capitalization of Air Canada must be changed is that it has to be made vital and competitive with other airlines, that, in short, this capital is needed in order that Air Canada can somehow show a better profit picture over the coming years. We are simply saying in the amendment that if you intend to make a better profit over the coming years, then say so, write it into the act, let the succeeding boards of directors know at least that when this legislation was passed we in the House believed they should carry on their business in contemplation of profit.

The second thing I would like to point out is that not only do we feel they should carry on in contemplation of that profit but, what is rather remarkable, is that we had two pro forma statements furnished to us in committee. One showed what would happen to Air Canada if no financing change took place. Oddly enough we found that if no financing change should take place, the retained earnings as far as Air Canada is concerned, should be $70.7 million by 1981, but with the recapitalization, the retained earnings they contemplate would only be $69 million. In short, it makes virtually no difference.

The recapitalization that is being asked for by the minister, and which we have indicated should at least reflect a sizeable profit as far as the Air Canada pro forma statements are concerned, will in fact not result in greater retained earnings in 1981 than it would if the situation were left exactly as it is today. I think that is one thing, when we are considering the motion put forward by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre, that we should bear in mind. Air Canada is in effect stating that this refinancing will have no net effect on its retained earnings between now and 1981, but the important thing is that it will have no net effect provided Air Canada makes the money it contemplates it can make between now and 1981 which, contrary to what the socialists may think, means it has to make a profit. If it does not make that profit, the net result will be that the retained earnings between now and 1981 will be less for Air Canada and it will be the taxpayers of Canada who will have given the party. They in turn will be drained by an indirect subsidy in the form of free capital to the tune of possibly $60 million, $70 million, or $75 million in the form of lost interest.

That is why I believe, after having heard the sad tale of how Crown corporations are being operated in this country, how AECL lost $290 million last year alone, how virtually every Crown corporation which this government has ever had the responsibility to run has been a disaster, that when we are considering the recapitalization of an airline such as Air Canada we should say, fine, if you need this raw capital you should agree to carry on Air Canada in accordance with sound business principles and in contemplation of profit.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): And in particular the contemplation of profit. Do not forget the words "in particular".

Mr. Stevens: Is it not odd that the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre has stated that those lines to which I am referring are ridiculous lines? How far out of touch can that hon. member be? How far out of touch can these socialists be, these socialists who propped up this government in October of 1972 until May of 1974, and then had the audacity to say that somehow there is too much inflation in the country? It is their type of thinking that led to the inflation, the fiscal spending and the extravagance of the Trudeau government.

Mr. Breau: That is not true.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Are you against the pension increases we won?

Mr. Stevens: Let me get it clearly on the record. It is often stated by government representatives that somehow all airlines are finding it rather tough and that Air Canada should not be faulted for losing money, such as the $20 million it lost last year. That is just not true. Last year airlines made big money. American Airlines made $56 million; Eastern Airlines made $46 million, Allegheni Airlines made $14 million, Piedmont Airlines made $4 million, Pan American Airlines made $94 million, Braniff Airlines made $27 million, and Ozark Airlines made $7 million.

Mr. Benjamin: Tell us about CP Air.

Mr. Stevens: CP Air also made money.

Mr. Benjamin: They did not.

Mr. Stevens: The fact is that in the past year airlines made good money. Air Canada lost money, and our point is that we think it must be made doubly clear that if we give it this added capital, it must in future try to make a profit just like its competitors have been making.

Mr. Breau: Are you speaking for your party?

Mr. Stevens: It is time the reactionary views of the socialists receive less credence. It is time they are put in the waste basket where they belong. The socialists have been a plague in this country for three decades, and it is time the country got rid of that plague.

Mr. McKenzie: May I call it ten o'clock, Mr. Speaker?

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[*English*]

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 40 deemed to have been moved.

REGIONAL ECONOMIC EXPANSION—DEGREE OF SUPPORT FOR BRITISH COLUMBIA—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Bob Brisco (Kootenay West): Mr. Speaker, I have asked for the opportunity to speak tonight in the adjournment debate on a subject that has been of great concern to me from the time I first campaigned in the riding of Kootenay West, that is, the economic development, or lack of it, of both the Kootenays. Recently we witnessed the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion (Mr. Lessard) signing several agreements with the province of B.C., the first time that any substantive agreement has been signed by the government with that province since 1974.

My concern is that in terms of the general development agreement which provides the overview and the basic thrust as to how economic assistance will be provided to that province there are three areas within that framework of the general development agreement that are clearly singled out and designed for special attention. We have the northeast part of British Columbia, the northwest part of British Columbia and the Kootenays.

● (2200)

I was very disturbed and disappointed, when I reviewed the various agreements which had been signed, to note that the assistance under the Regional Development Incentives Act specifically earmarked for Kootenay West was not renewed on December 31, 1975. It had not in fact again been put in place. Certainly it has been put in place for the northeast and the northwest, and I do not deny that there is a need. However, it seems to me that the other areas, particularly the Kootenays, earmarked in the GDA have not been identified.

If we look at all the agreements we find that they are applicable to all parts of British Columbia except for the lower mainland and southern Vancouver Island and except for those areas earmarked under the RDIA. I note, for example, that $5 million in assistance has been earmarked for small enterprise. I must say that I am very disappointed when I look at the figures. We see $30,000 for small businesses, but we see that they are limited in that they cannot have a capitalization of greater than $60,000. What can be done to expand or establish a new industry with that kind of financing? Whether it is a grant, a loan or whatever, it simply is not going to be effective.

I would like to move on to my specific concern. I have difficulty in finding any specific reference to Castlegar. Castlegar has a potential for 150 new homes tomorrow. It will have a potential of 150 new jobs as soon as Can Cel expands. Castlegar is a bedroom community for the city of Trail. We will witness an expansion of the Cominco operations at Trail, costing some $425 million over the next six or seven years and employing 400 or 500 people for that period of time, and there are no accommodations. Why do we not have accommodations, and why can the industrial potential of Castlegar not be realized? Transportation is available, skilled workers are available, and everything else which is needed, except water, is available.

The Columbia River is right at Castlegar's doorstep, but the only way in which that community is going to be provided with potable water, and the only way that community is going to thrive, expand and realize its economic potential, is with proper provision for funding under the DREE program and under CMHC and with federal assistance and municipal participation. The municipality is prepared to carry its share of the load, but the only way it is going to survive is with a proper combination of those elements. The minister has indicated to me that there is provision under the new agreements which have been signed for that very specific problem, a very severe and acute problem which will shut down the industrial potential and the economic development of that community. It will also severely affect the livelihood of its citizens. I am pleased that the minister feels that there is potential within the agreement to provide that particular assistance, but quite frankly, I find it couched in such general and vague terms that I have difficulty in believing—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Order, please. I regret to inform the hon. member that his allotted time has expired.

Mr. Ed. Lumley (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): Mr. Speaker, on July 6 the hon. member for Kootenay West (Mr. Brisco) asked a question as to the scope of subsidiary agreements being signed with the province of British Columbia. I am pleased to remind all members of this House of the signing, on July 8, of two agreements between our department and the province of British Columbia. These agreements provide a vehicle for coordinating and highlighting ongoing programs of the federal and provincial governments which are concerned with creating opportunities in the industrial sector, in agriculture and, more generally, in the rural areas of British Columbia.

The Canada-British Columbia Industrial Development Subsidiary Agreement identified areas of potential development within the province, recognizing the heavy dependence on export markets, the relatively narrow industrial base concen-

trated in small businesses and on resource activities such as forestry and mining. This agreement will provide $110 million in funding to assist in the diversification and distribution of economic activity throughout British Columbia. It will also provide for a large range of programs, including financial incentives and loans for small enterprises, financial support for industrial parks, and infrastructure and support for industrial commissions. In addition our department has also recently designated a large area in northern British Columbia for eligibility under DREE's regional development incentives program.

Under the Agriculture and Rural Development Subsidiary Agreement, the federal and provincial governments have committed themselves to programs expected to result in the expenditure of $87 million over the next five years to increase opportunties and employment in rural areas and encourage increased agricultural production. Sixty million dollars of this will be cost-shared between the two governments, while the remainder will be provided from the private sector.

When the hon. member for Kootenay West asked whether assistance for the water problem being experienced by Castlegar and district can be provided under these agreements, I can only indicate that the new initiatives are sufficiently broad so as to enable the province and my department to provide assistance to areas outside the lower mainland-southern Vancouver Island areas, whenever projects can be accommodated within the stated objectives. With respect to the situation at Castlegar, I understand that officials of our department in Victoria and provincial officials are continuing to co-operate with municipal representatives in an effort to identify possible federal and provincial programs that might provide assistance. It is possible that assistance might be considered under the newly signed industrial agreement, but only if it can be related to infrastructure needs of an industry and in some way meets the objectives and criteria of the agreement.

I would indicate to the hon. member that years of study, together with months of discussion and negotiation, have produced these two agreements. Together, they represent both a good example of federal-provincial co-operation and a new emphasis on economic development in British Columbia. For the Department of Regional Economic Expansion they represent an important additional step along the road defined by our legislative mandate, which is to tackle regional disparities wherever in Canada they are encountered and, to a very large extent, in co-operation with the provincial governments.

NORTHERN AFFAIRS—ENFORCEMENT OF MINE SAFETY REGULATIONS IN NORTHWEST TERRITORIES—REQUEST FOR REPORT ON CONSULTATION WITH MINISTER OF LABOUR

Mr. Wally Firth (Northwest Territories): Mr. Speaker, this evening I raise once more the question of the appointment of territorial mining inspectors, a matter of great importance to those who work in the mines of the Northwest Territories. I raised this question on June 29 but did not receive a satisfactory answer. I directed it on June 30 to the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development (Mr. Allmand) but did not receive a satisfactory answer then, either. I asked the Minister of Labour (Mr. Munro (Hamilton East)) a question on June 14 about the appointment of inspectors in the Northwest Territories and was assured that my important questions would be answered. I am not satisifed with the government's non-answer to my question.

Surely I need not emphasize how important to people who work in the mines in the Northwest Territories is the appointment of mining inspectors who are concerned with the health and safety of miners. This concern is understandable because the mortality rate of miners in the Northwest Territories is very high.

As a result of this concern, and because the miners in the Northwest Territories do not feel the present federal mining inspectors are doing a competent job, the United Steelworkers Union got in touch with the territorial government, asking it to enforce the territorial mining safety ordinance by appointing territorial inspectors. This request was made to the commissioner at a meeting which took place on February 14, this year. The union received the assurance that this would be done.

Having heard nothing, the union wrote to the commissioner on May 25 this year, to learn what had happened. The commissioner wrote back on May 30 this year saying that he had written to the federal government on February 15, 1977, asking for authority to appoint territorial mine inspectors. He also informed that local of the United Steelworkers Union in the Northwest Territories that he had been trying for several years to get such authority but his efforts had not met with success.

That local of the United Steelworkers Union received, on June 8 this year, a letter from the office of the Minister of Labour. The letter said categorically that this matter does not come under the jurisdiction of the Department of Labour.

Quite apart from any question to do with mine safety and the appointment of inspectors to enforce safety standards, there seems to be some confusion in this area. Whose responsibility is it? The commissioner says it is not his responsibility. The Minister of Labour says it is not his. The Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development does not seem quite certain whose responsibility it is.

● (2210)

Again I ask the government to give the commissioner of the Northwest Territories authority to appoint mining inspectors. If it has already approved this, made some move toward it, or is ready to do so, why has it not notified the commissioner of this very important decision?

These are simple requests, although they deal with a very serious issue. There is no way that such a matter should drag on for months and months. I am quite sure that the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, the Minister of Labour and the government generally know of this issue because there have been many letters going back and forth.

I have raised this matter in the House three times, this being the third time. It is about time the government came forward

with some kind of answer to clarify the matter. There are lives at stake, and the health of many people who work in the mines. It is about time the government had an answer.

I now give the government another opportunity to answer to the people of Canada, and in particular the people of the Northwest Territories, as to what is the decision. Where are they now? May I ask the minister that?

Mr. Ed. Lumley (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): Mr. Speaker, when the hon. member for the Northwest Territories (Mr. Firth) first raised this question with the minister on June 29, he gave the impression that the responsibility for enforcing the mining safety ordinance was with the Minister of Labour (Mr. Munro). However, Northwest Territories Mining Safety and Rules is a territorial ordinance, the enforcement of which is presently the responsibility of the Yellowknife Engineering and Mine Inspection Unit of the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development.

On February 15, 1977 Commissioner Hodgson wrote the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development (Mr. Allmand) suggesting that mine inspection responsibilities be transferred to the territorial government effective September 1, 1977. His request was in response to a letter from the United Steelworkers of America, one of reportedly numerous requests made over the years from various mining related bodies in the Northwest Territories that the territorial government become actively involved in enforcing the Mining Safety Ordinance.

On May 25, 1977, the union again wrote to the commissioner inquiring as to the progress of his decision with respect to their proposal that the territorial government assume the responsibilities of mine inspection stating they are "ready to nominate suitable candidates for the new positions as they are established".

The request has been reviewed by officials both in Ottawa and in the field and the minister feels that the proposed transfer should be viewed positively.

However, the proposed transfer will affect the lives of many people. The views of mine workers, unions, mine management, territorial government and the department must be considered as to the effectiveness and the personnel implications of such a transfer. To be of any value, the proposed transfer must provide the Northwest Territories with a mining inspection service which better serves the mine workers and thus ultimately mine management.

In view of the fact that the busy summer season is now in full swing, it would appear that a complete study of the situation could not be made and a final decision taken in order for a transfer to take place by the September 1 deadline suggested by Commissioner Hodgson.

Mr. Firth: That is a non-answer. This is the fourth time I have given the government an opportunity to answer, and I still do not have an answer.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Order, please. This is the late show. The hon. member had seven minutes to put his argument, and the parliamentary secretary three minutes to reply.

ENERGY—CONSERVATION—GRANTS FOR HOME INSULATION—AVAILABILITY TO OTHER PROVINCES OF PROGRAM SIMILAR TO THAT OF NOVA SCOTIA AND P.E.I.

Mr. John C. Crosbie (St. John's West): Mr. Speaker, I rise in connection with a question asked on June 29 of the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Gillespie). The answer was less than satisfactory, as is usually the case with that minister. When asked a question, he adopts one of two ways of proceeding. He either grins inanely, or jokes and laughs about the question. He appears to suffer from the gas he is suppose to regulate. He is saucy and insulting with his answers. In this case he was both.

The question had to do with the new home insulation program which is now being extended to eight other provinces of Canada. I am not referring to the program which applies to Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island, but a lesser discriminatory program for the other eight provinces. There was nothing until we started insisting last February that they could not be discriminated against indefinitely. There was nothing until we started insisting that the government should not simply have a home insulation branch program in the provinces of Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island, which have Liberal governments, but should implement such a program across Canada. But it has now introduced this discriminatory program, and when the minister introduced it in his official release of June 27, he misled the people of Canada and he misled the House. In that statement, at page five, the minister said:

—all provinces have been briefed on the details of the home insulation program and are generally supportive of it.

Mr. Speaker, there is not a word of truth in that statement. Province after province has repudiated the idea that they were briefed in detail about the program. All that happened was that the minister got on the telephone to ministers in the various provinces and told them he intended to bring in the program he announced. Effective consultation did not take place with any of them. This was confirmed by the minister in Ontario and by his deputy minister, and by other premiers and ministers since. That was a wrong statement, an incorrect statement, an untrue statement.

Then at page six of the same release the minister said that four conditions had been set. The minister said:

At the present time the conditions have been met by Newfoundland, New Brunswick, Manitoba and the Northwest Territories. It is hoped that during the month of July the other provinces will formally declare their willingness to implement the measures which are not already in effect.

In other words, the minister was saying that Newfoundland, New Brunswick, Manitoba and the Northwest Territories had agreed. There was not a word of truth in that statement. The program has been repudiated by the province of Newfoundland—I give this as only one instance; I only have seven

minutes at my disposal. The hon. gentleman's statement has been repudiated by the minister of mines and energy in Newfoundland. In a release dated June 30 he spoke of the disappointment with which he viewed the announcement made by the government on June 27, hastily put together in such a way as to be uniform in its application and therefore giving the poorer provinces the same level of subsidy as the richer provinces.

I am still quoting the minister of mines and energy in Newfoundland. He said:

> It is a regressive and inequitable program. We have the highest unemployment and the lowest average income level and the highest petroleum products prices, yet we are offered the same subsidy as Ontario, Alberta and the other provinces.

The program is discriminatory because there are six conditions attached to it less favourable than those attached to the programs in Prince Edward Island and Nova Scotia. The same conditions will not apply there. The benefits are not taxable there. They get bigger grants in those two provinces. The project only applies in Newfoundland to houses constructed prior to 1941, though it applies to pre-1921 homes in the other provinces. It's a joke, a sick joke. I wish an election were called tomorrow so that we could get to the public with this issue and get the minister his answer from the people. I wish the mandarins of the Liberal party would get up their nerve and call an election tomorrow.

An hon. Member: Hear, hear!

Mr. Crosbie: The people of Newfoundland would inform the government of their adverse reaction to this hasty, inequitable, and highly conditional program in no uncertain terms, and demand that the program be withdrawn. Is this a province which agreed to the program?

The premier of the province issued a statement on July 5. He was extremely upset over the discrimination shown against the citizens of Newfoundland by the federal government in offering such an ill-conceived version of the program given to Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island. It was made in haste he said, without any meaningful consultations with the provinces, the reason for this unseemly haste being to gain political points which might have been lost through recent petroleum price increases. It is an interference with the internal policies of the provinces. It is obvious the federal government has decided to use the program for partisan, political purposes, and so on. The premier recommends that the province should withdraw from the scheme and that there be a federal-provincial conference with regard to it.

How does this square with the minister's statement of June 27 that he had engaged in meaningful consultation with the provinces and that they were supportive of this program? What poppycock! I never thought when I came, the greenhorn to this Chamber, that I would be speaking here tonight in 100 degree heat addressing myself to a federal minister who is attempting to fool the people with this type of poppycock. Who does he think we are that a minister of the federal government would give out a statement so inaccurate, so misleading, so grossly negligent, so deceitful—a major minister, I hate to say it—

[Mr. Crosbie.]

An hon. Member: Not very major.

Mr. Crosbie: In this government any minister is a major minister who can open his mouth and smile. Most of them cannot even do that.

● (2220)

We now have a program which the minister has instituted which lacks any sense of reason at all. It is more effective and efficient to insulate a home that is being built than to insulate one built before 1941, yet this new program does not even apply to new homes being built in eight provinces of Canada. It is not going to apply to new homes built after September, 1977. It makes no sense. It almost makes one weep and gnash one's teeth that the Government of Canada thinks it can use the security blanket of national unity to hide the fact from people who live in eight provinces of Canada that they are being discriminated against because they do not have a Liberal provincial government.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I ask the parliamentary secretary who is going to reply to show some pangs of conscience and to repudiate his minister. I ask him to tell us that his minister has made a bad mistake and that he is recommending the same program for the rest of Canada that now applies in Nova Scotia and P.E.I. I ask that the program apply to new homes in particular; that it will be applied first in areas of high unemployment. Money does not appear to be a problem—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Order. I regret to interrupt the hon. member but his allotted time has expired. I should also like to say to the hon. member that the temperature in the House at the present time is 76 degrees.

Mr. Maurice Dupras (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, I am glad to hear the information that the temperature is only 76 degrees; I feel better now. The minister has answered this question a few times and I am wondering why the hon. member for St. John's West (Mr. Crosbie) did not pay attention to those answers which the minister has already given on this subject.

Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island are heavily dependent on imported oil for electrical generation, to the extent of 63 per cent in the one case and in the other case 100 per cent. In all other provinces except New Brunswick oil is used to generate less than 7 per cent of the electricity consumed in those provinces. Accordingly, electricity prices in these two provinces are much more directly tied to oil price increases than is the case in other provinces, and in the last two years electricity prices have escalated at a dramatic rate. In order to minimize the impact of the higher prices the federal government decided to institute an insulation assistance program which would result in a reduction in the over-all energy bill of householders in the two provinces. This approach was adopted rather than instituting a subsidy to maintain artificially low

electricity prices because of the need to provide a continuing benefit to householders.

Other provinces, while also faced with higher oil prices, have not experienced the same increase in electricity prices. Accordingly a somewhat lower, but still substantial, level of subsidy will be made available to those provinces.

While there are differences between the national program and that available in Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island, the minister has explained why these differences exist. The Canadian home insulation program, with its major benefits to all Canadians, will be delivered as it was announced. The hon. member can bank on this.

The government of the province of Newfoundland and Labrador has agreed to adopt energy conserving standards for all new residences, and will set up an enforcement mechanism as quickly as possible.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Order, please. The motion to adjourn the House is deemed to have been adopted. Accordingly, this House stands adjourned until tomorrow at 2 p.m.

Motion agreed to and the House adjourned at 10.26 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Wednesday, July 20, 1977

The House met at 2 p.m.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

FOREIGN INVESTMENT

PROPOSED INQUIRY INTO TAKEOVER OF PONY SPORTING GOODS—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Tom Cossitt (Leeds): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a matter of pressing necessity concerning recent cabinet approval of the sale of Pony Sporting Goods of Canada, of which Senator Davey is a director and shareholder, and in particular concerning the fact that the cabinet apparently hid the purchaser's identity behind subsidiaries of the real purchaser, Mitsubishi International of Japan, already 50 per cent associated with Senator Davey and associates in Pony Sporting Goods of the United States. I move, seconded by the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre (Mr. McKenzie):

That the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce make a statement answering the following specific points: Was the cabinet aware that Pony Sporting Goods Limited was suspended by the Ontario Securities Commission in January of 1977 for delinquency in filing financial information and that Gordon Dryden, Treasurer of the Liberal Party of Canada and director/officer of the Unity Bank, filed an insider's trading report dated September 11, 1973 with the Ontario Securities Commission, as did the Unity Bank itself, declaring that each controlled or owned in excess of 10 per cent of Pony Sporting Goods Canada Limited; and finally, what representations were made to cabinet or the Foreign Investment Review Agency on behalf of this sale and have Senator Davey and Gordon Dryden as a result of the sale been bailed out financially?

Mr. Speaker: The presentation of such a motion for debate requires unanimous consent. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

* * *

ANTI-INFLATION BOARD

REQUEST FOR ACTION ON SALARIES OF EXECUTIVES AND PROFESSIONALS—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, without the necessity of a preamble I move, seconded by the hon. member for Sault Ste. Marie (Mr. Symes):

That this House, noting that the Anti-Inflation Board has called on Bell Canada to roll back to not more than $2,400 a year the increases granted to its executives, asks the government why penalties were not also imposed as has been done several times in the cases of groups of ordinary workers, calls on the government to press the Anti-Inflation Board to roll back the excessive salary increases of all executives and professionals, and insists that the salary of Mr. Ian Sinclair be made public in Canada, rather than waiting for this to be done by the Securities Exchange Commission of the United States, and that his income as president of Canadian Pacific be made subject to the same guidelines that are supposed to apply to all other Canadians.

Mr. Speaker: The presentation of such a motion for debate pursuant to the Standing Order requires unanimous consent. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

* * *

[*Translation*]

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

COMMITTEE STUDY OF ALLEGED ERRORS WHICH RESULTED IN DISADVANTAGE TO BENEFICIARIES—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Gilbert Rondeau (Shefford): Mr. Speaker, under the provisions of Standing Order 43, I ask for the unanimous consent of the House to move a motion dealing with a very important matter, especially for senior citizens.

In view of the fact that thousands of 65 year-old persons who were drawing unemployment insurance on January 1, 1976 and whose benefits were cancelled as a result of decisions taken by officials who advised them to apply for an old age security pension or for a Quebec pension have lost all their rights to those benefits as a result of a decision made by Justice Jean-Eudes Dubé, former minister of public works, because they followed the advice of federal officials, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Abitibi (Mr. Laprise):

That a committee of the House consider all circumstances surrounding those profitable mistakes for the government which have been made by its officials thus depriving thousands of claimants of unemployment insurance benefits.

Mr. Speaker: Order. The House has heard the motion of the hon. member. Under the provisions of Standing Order 43, this motion requires the unanimous consent of the House. Is there such consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

[*English*]

ELECTIONS

REQUEST FOR CLARIFICATION OF SOLICITOR GENERAL'S STATEMENT ON NEED FOR ELECTION—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Walter Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I rise under the provisions of Standing Order 43 on a matter of urgent and pressing necessity about which I hope there will be no debate and no question about consent. It concerns the press statement made on Monday by the hon. member for Vaudreuil (Mr. Herbert) which was both interesting and thoughtful. In it he criticized the Solicitor General's (Mr. Fox) statement to the effect that there should be an early election. That statement had been made by the Solicitor General under obvious pressure—pressure so great we thought his head would blow up and cover us all with sawdust.

● (1410)

Mr. Poulin: Why don't you put your motion?

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Accordingly I move, seconded by the hon. member for York-Simcoe (Mr. Stevens):

That the Solicitor General be given the opportunity to make a statement on motions answering the questions raised by the hon. member for Vaudreuil, and in particular to explain the government's planned action on Bill 101, their proposals for rule changes in the House of Commons, and the reason why action could only be taken on these matters after an election.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Is there unanimous consent for the putting of the motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Paproski: The Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) said no.

* * *

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

REQUEST THAT AID TO CUBA BE DISCONTINUED—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Otto Jelinek (High Park-Humber Valley): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the provisions of Standing Order 43, I rise on a matter of urgent and pressing necessity. Since Communist Cuba is reported as having increased its military and civilian presence in Angola by as much as one third, I move—

Mr. Rodriguez: No.

Mr. Jelinek: —seconded by the hon. member for South Shore (Mr. Crouse):

That all financial and other aid to Cuba by Canada be discontinued until such time as all Cuban military aggression in Africa is withdrawn.

Mr. Rodriguez: No.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Such motion requires unanimous consent, and it is apparent there is not unanimous consent for it.

[Mr. Speaker.]

THE CANADIAN ECONOMY

PROPOSED COMMITTEE STUDY OF DOCUMENT ENTITLED "THE WAY AHEAD"—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Sinclair Stevens (York-Simcoe): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a matter of urgent and pressing necessity under the terms of Standing Order 43. As the House will likely adjourn in the near future, yet motion No. 13 under government business standing in the name of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Macdonald) which appeared on the order paper last February and which called for the establishment of a special joint committee of the Senate and the House of Commons to be appointed to consider and report on the document entitled "The Way Ahead" has not been called to date—

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): That's the way this government goes ahead.

Mr. Stevens: —and as we all know our economy has declined still further with higher inflation, higher unemployment, and less real growth than there was even last spring, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Stanfield):

That this House urge the government to call motion No 13 forthwith as an item of government business so that the special jont committee contemplated by the Minister of Finance may be formed and carry out its terms of reference during the forthcoming parliamentary recess.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Such motion can be presented for debate only with the unanimous consent of the House pursuant to Standing Order 43. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Paproski: Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) said no.

* * *

MANPOWER

SUGGESTED FUNDING OF TORONTO RAPE CRISIS CENTRE UNDER CANADA WORKS PROGRAM—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. John Rodriguez (Nickel Belt): Mr. Speaker, I rise under the provisions of Standing Order 43 to ask the unanimous consent of the House to deal with a matter of urgent and pressing necessity. As the Toronto rape crisis centre has provided an extremely necessary service to that community; as the centre was funded under the local initiatives program and such funding has come to an end; and as the Ontario ministry of community and social services has refused to fund the centre, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Sault Ste. Marie (Mr. Symes):

That the Minister of Manpower and Immigration be instructed to reconsider funding of this program under the Canada Works program.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Is there unanimous consent for the presentation of such motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[*English*]

CENTRAL MORTGAGE AND HOUSING CORPORATION

ALLEGATION POLICE REMOVED DOCUMENTS PERTAINING TO YORK PLACE FROM HAMILTON OFFICE—REQUEST FOR REPORT

Mr. Dean Whiteway (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of State for Urban Affairs who assured us he would be in the House this afternoon—

Mr. Paproski: Where's chicken Ouellet?

Mr. Whiteway: —and the absence of the Minister of Justice and the Solicitor General, I direct my question to the Prime Minister. In today's city edition of the Hamilton *Spectator* it is reported that RCMP officers on Friday, July 15, served a search warrant on the Hamilton offices of Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation and removed all documents pertaining to York Place. Can the Prime Minister say if that report is correct and, if it is, if this raid was initiated or directed by himself or any other minister of the Crown?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I have not been informed of this seizure of documents. I think that should deal with part of the last question.

YORK PLACE, HAMILTON—POSITION OF CORPORATION AS MORTGAGE HOLDER

Mr. Dean Whiteway (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a supplementary question to the Prime Minister? As the Prime Minister is no doubt aware, this matter having been raised yesterday during the question period, the answer to order paper question No. 812 paragraph 12, asking whether CMHC ranked as first mortgage holder at all times with respect to York Place was evasive. When this matter was brought to the attention of the Minister of State for Urban Affairs, did he or his office inquire of Mr. Stanley Dudzic, the lawyer for CMHC, if CMHC at any time did not rank as a first mortgage holder? What was the reply of the solicitor for CMHC? If the minister did not ask him that critical question, why did he not?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Jean-Robert Gauthier (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of State for Urban Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I have no comments to make about the RCMP inquiry. If necessary, the minister will make a statement in the House and I think the matter can be referred to the Solicitor General.

With regard to the second question, I take it as notice.

[*English*]

YORK PLACE, HAMILTON—PROPOSED PUBLIC INQUIRY

Mr. Dean Whiteway (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, it is now eight months since the opposition first brought this matter to the attention of the minister and some eight months since the hon. member for St. John's East asked for an inquiry. In view of the move by the RCMP and the confusion, allegations, charges, countercharges, and a host of unanswered or inadequately answered questions, does the Prime Minister not think it reasonable to call for a full public inquiry?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, yet again I will give the answer. I believe the police are investigating, as the hon. member has obviously indicated. We will wait for the report. We believe in due process, not inquisitorial justice.

YORK PLACE, HAMILTON—ALLEGED INADEQUACY OF ANSWERS BY MINISTER

Mr. Walter Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, certainly there is some matter the Prime Minister can answer directly today. It is with respect to the absence of the Minister of State for Urban Affairs who, after assuring me last evening across the floor of the House he would be here today, is again absent from his place to answer very important questions with respect to this matter. The first question I have for the Prime Minister is where is his minister? Has the Prime Minister, as the head of the government, looked into the matter dealing with improper and indeed, I regret to say, false answers to questions made on July 15, 1977 by the Minister of State for Urban Affairs which also was compounded by the statement made yesterday by the parliamentary secretary in the absence of the minister? Has the Prime Minister looked into this? Is the Prime Minister prepared to state a position on the obvious inadequacies and indeed inaccuracies with regard to the York Place matter?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is making a very serious charge of falsehoods. Of course, I will want to look into that allegation. I hope the hon. member will be prepared to support his assertions in a less flimsy way than he has done thus far in his questions.

YORK PLACE, HAMILTON—ALLEGATIONS AGAINST MINISTER OF LABOUR—REQUEST FOR REPORT ON INQUIRY

Mr. Walter Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, it would be very interesting if the Minister of State for Urban Affairs were here to answer the questions rather than put the Prime Minister in the invidious position in which he finds himself today. On October 27, 1976 the former Minister of Urban Affairs told the House that he would check into allegations that the Minister of Labour had played a role in securing the $1.5 million loan increase to Morgenti. I simply want to ask the Prime Minister whether he in fact followed up

the former minister's inquiry and, if so, what conclusions did he reach?

Mr. Munro (Hamilton East): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I will hear the question of privilege at three o'clock.

* * *

INDUSTRY

INCREASE IN PRICE OF AUTOMOBILES—CONSULTATION WITH INDUSTRY

Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce. It arises out of an announcement this week by General Motors of a 6 per cent increase in the price of 1978 cars. This will be in addition to the 6 per cent increase implemented last year. This will result in an increase in the price of new cars of 12 per cent in one year. Will the minister consider discussing with the auto industry the necessity of this added price increase?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, it is not an increase of 12 per cent a year, but an increase of 5.5 per cent last year and 6 per cent this year. I shall look into this to get more details and, if necessary, I shall get in touch with the industry representatives but an increase of 6 per cent seems rather normal considering the present inflation rate.

[*English*]

SUGGESTED ELIMINATION OF DIFFERENTIAL BETWEEN UNITED STATES AND CANADIAN PRICES FOR AUTOMOBILES

Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North): Mr. Speaker, my information is that this will be the second increase in one year. Since there is at present a differential amounting to between $150 and $600 or more in the price of cars made and sold in Canada as compared with the price of a Canadian car sold in the United States, even after allowance has been made for all taxes paid in both countries, and since one of the main purposes of the auto pact was the elimination of the gap in prices, would the minister direct his department to study again the price differential with a view to its elimination?

● (1420)

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, this is one of the problems I raised when I met the presidents of the automobile industry of Canada two weeks ago.

[*English*]

Mr. Orlikow: That is the answer we have been getting ever since the first year of the agreement. Since the auto pact creates, in effect, a free trade situation for the auto manufacturing industry whereas no such situation exists in favour of individual Canadians purchasing cars, while the price of Canadian automobiles continues to be significantly higher than in the United States, would the minister discuss with his colleagues, especially the Minister of Finance, the possibility of removing the tariff on autos produced in the U.S.A. so that the benefits of the free trade in autos resulting from the pact would be made available to Canadians wishing to purchase new cars, not just to the manufacturers?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Chrétien: Mr. Speaker, I am quite willing to consider the idea the hon. member has put forward, but I am not sure it will solve the problem he has raised.

* * *

ENVIRONMENTAL AFFAIRS

ROLE OF UNITED STATES IN REINTRODUCTION OF DICKEY-LINCOLN DAM PROJECT ON BORDER OF MAINE

Mr. Adrien Lambert (Bellechasse): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the hon. Minister of the Environment.

In view of the fact that the American government set up a project a few years ago for the construction of a dam, which was to be called the Dickey-Lincoln Dam, on the Saint John River, on the borderline between the State of Maine and the Province of Quebec, that the people living in the area have again quite recently made their opposition to this project known, and that the American project is apparently being reintroduced, could the minister advise the House whether he has been informed by the American government of the reactivation of this project? If so, could the Minister tell the House what the position of the Canadian government will be in this respect?

Hon. Roméo LeBlanc (Minister of Fisheries and the Environment): Mr. Speaker, I am told that discussions have been going on for several months and even years regarding the objections raised by some groups in the United States. I will have to check in order to determine what will be the implications, if any, for the Canadian territory. This river borders on the U.S. and Canada. Of course, there are organizations such as the International Joint Commission which could intervene. But I will check and inform the hon. member.

* * *

[*English*]

FOREIGN INVESTMENT

TAKEOVER OF PONY SPORTING GOODS—KNOWLEDGE OF MINISTER OF NAMES OF SHAREHOLDERS OF PONY SPORTING GOODS

Mr. Tom Cossitt (Leeds): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce and it arises from the cabinet decision on June 30 to permit the sale to

foreign interests of Pony Sporting Goods (Canada) Limited. Will the minister tell us whether the cabinet was aware that Unity Bank and Gordon Dryden, Treasurer of the Liberal Party of Canada and a director of the Unity Bank, each controlled or owned together in excess of 20 per cent of the shares of Pony Sporting Goods (Canada) Limited, as indicated in insiders trading reports to the Ontario Securities Commission? Would he also tell us why it permitted this sale following what he has already indicated was little scrutiny, and whether the same procedure as applies to ordinary individuals was followed?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, I checked and all the procedures have been normally followed in this transaction whereby an American group tried to take over this business called Pony Sporting Goods. At no time were the officers of the Foreign Investment Review Agency, myself and the Minister of State (Small Business), who also worked on this matter, aware that Mr. Davey or Mr. Dryden were directors or shareholders of this company.

[*English*]

Mr. Cossitt: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Since the minister last spoke or answered a question in the House on this matter, when he said he was totally unaware of the situation at the time he made the decision, has he consulted any of his colleagues to see whether they were aware that Senator Davey and Gordon Dryden were involved with Pony Sporting Goods, and was the cabinet aware at the time of the decision that in effect it could possibly take steps to bail out financially these two prominent Liberals?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Chrétien: Mr. Speaker, at no time and I checked with my colleagues, and I do not intend to do so. My colleague, the Minister of State (Small Business) and myself, as well as the director and the officers of the agency concerned, were not aware of this, and if we had been, we would have treated them in the same manner as we treat any other Canadian citizen.

* * *

[*English*]

ROYAL CANADIAN MOUNTED POLICE

POSSIBILITY INVESTIGATION OF UNITY BANK INCLUDED INTEREST IN PONY SPORTING GOODS

Mr. Tom Cossitt (Leeds): A final supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In the absence of the Minister of Justice, who in reply to a question I asked him a week or so ago said he would look into the matter, I direct my supplementary to the Solicitor General. When I raised the matter with the Minister of Justice, the minister said he would look into it. Would the Solicitor General tell me whether or not the RCMP investigation into the affairs of Unity Bank also involved investigations into interests in Pony Sporting Goods Limited held by two prominent Liberals, Senator Davey and Gordon Dryden?

Hon. Francis Fox (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, I do not have an immediate answer to the hon. member's question. I will take it as notice and look into the matter.

* * *

CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

CANADIAN OPEN GOLF CHAMPIONSHIPS—REPRESENTATIONS CONCERNING SITE

Mr. Robert McCleave (Halifax-East Hants): Mr. Speaker, I direct my question, through you as our first Commoner and leading golfer, to the Secretary of State who speaks to us for the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. Since something to be called the Canadian Open is to start Thursday on reconverted meadowland near Toronto and is supposed to be permanently based there, would the Secretary of State advise the CBC that the golf world in confederation has its own coast to coast rights too and good golf courses, and that no one area should be allowed to claim this event as its own? Hopefully the CBC could state that the Canadian Open is only a claim and not a fact, or call it the Canadian closed.

Hon. John Roberts (Secretary of State): Mr. Speaker, unfortunately the last time I played golf was 25 years ago so I am not sure that I understood the full purport of the hon. member's question. But I take it that there is an important issue here which he wishes to communicate to the CBC and I shall be happy to do that.

* * *

AGRICULTURE

REQUEST FOR STATEMENT ON PROSPECTS FOR RETURNS TO PRODUCERS DURING COMING YEAR

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Prince Albert): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Agriculture; I know he has been waiting for a question for quite a long while. Knowing his interest in farmers and farm prices, and of course realizing that there is considerable discontent among the farmers because of the prices they are receiving for their products as compared with the prices ultimately paid by consumers, in order to give the farmers the fullest information as to the prospect of prices over the next few months, and within the next year in general, would the minister make a statement in the House setting out the projections of the Department of Agriculture regarding farm prices in general?

Hon. E. F. Whelan (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, as I am sure the right hon. gentleman knows, the Canadian Department of Agriculture has one of the best information services of any department in the Canadian government or any provincial government so far as agriculture and agricultural costs are concerned. In our recently announced food strategy paper my colleague the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs and I have agreed to work together—

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Whelan: —on publicizing these facts so that public and consumers will know just where their dollars are going.

* * *

● (1430)

GRAIN

REQUEST FOR ARRANGEMENTS TO PERMIT PRODUCERS TO DELIVER BALANCE OF LAST YEAR'S CROP

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Prince Albert): Mr. Speaker, I am glad to learn of the rapprochement between him and the minister he mentioned. Also, I hope there will be a similar rapprochement between him and the Minister of Transport.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Diefenbaker: That causes me to ask this question: knowing his undoubted interest in the farmer and his income, would he do something even though it is not under his department, although I often think the Wheat Board should be under him, in order to get some of the action he has just spoken of? Would he put in a word to the government, if not to the Minister of Transport, that the western farmers should have an opportunity between now and the end of the month to dispose, as far as possible, of the large surplus of wheat they have on hand? Unless it is taken up in the market by that date, when the new grain year opens up, they will find themselves with their quotas reduced to the extent of the wheat production which has not yet been marketed.

Hon. E. F. Whelan (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, I am sure the right hon. member is not aware. He should get the latest report from the United States Department of Agriculture which shows that Canada is outselling the United States by tenfold, and I will turn the rest over to the hon. Minister of Transport in charge of the Wheat Board.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, I am not interested in all that fiction which the minister has just reported on. Because of his tremendous interest, could he pass on a word to the Minister of Transport to the end that the western farmer will have a fair deal, instead of being crucified as a result of the rules the Minister of Transport has imposed on the western farmers?

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the right hon. gentleman giving me a chance to point out to him that the Canadian Wheat Board has announced quotas for wheat, an additional three bushels in eight blocks, as the right hon. gentleman probably knows. They have now called an initial three bushel quota starting August 1 in the remaining blocks throughout the region. Thus, unlike the time when the right hon. gentleman's government was around, when all elevators were plugged at all the wrong times, farmers are going to be able to deliver grain straight off the combine and into the elevators once again.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

* * *

AGRICULTURE

STUDY OF IMPORTATION OF ARTIFICIAL CHEESE—REQUEST FOR A REPORT

Mr. Lorne Nystrom (Yorkton-Melville): Mr. Speaker, my question is also to the Minister of Agriculture. Some months ago I asked a question of the Minister of Agriculture concerning dairy farmers in Canada and the possible importation from the United States of artificial cheese into our country. In March he undertook to make a study of its impact on the incomes of dairy farmers in this country. I should like to ask him now whether he has had a chance to complete that study. If he has what are the results of it, because dairy farmers are quite concerned?

Hon. E. F. Whelan (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, this was discussed with the dairy farmers and also with the Agricultural Stabilization Advisory Board of the Department of National Health and Welfare. I am working together with that minister on this problem. They are concerned also about the health standards and the type of food this would be. As far as we know, none of this has come into Canada. There have been no real laws or regulations passed against it, at this present time. It is within our criteria, and it has not received the go ahead.

Mr. Nystrom: Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the minister whether it is his intention to amend the regulations governing the importation of substitute food such as artificial cheese from the United States. When he is conducting his investigation, will he take into consideration the whole question of substitute foods from its nutritional value, as more and more medical doctors are concerned about that field?

Mr. Whelan: Mr. Speaker, I am sure the hon. member is familiar with those issues which read: "Notes for an address by the Minister of Agriculture". He has probably come across at least a half a dozen which point out that we can eat a very wholesome and very nutritional diet without eating any imported foods, just by eating Canadian produced foods. If the nutritional experts advise us that this is an unnecessary product, and perhaps not as nutritious as it could be if it were produced solely in Canada, I would be in a better position to recommend, along with my colleague, the Minister of National Health and Welfare, that it not be allowed to be imported into Canada.

AIR TRANSPORT

POSSIBILITY OF INQUIRY INTO CONDITIONS UNDER WHICH AIRCRAFT OPERATE IN NORTHWESTERN ONTARIO

Mr. John M. Reid (Kenora-Rainy River): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Transport. It is in regard to a series of crashes which have taken place in northwestern Ontario and the fact that pilots have now circulated a petition calling for an inquiry into the conditions under which private aircraft and public aircraft are operated in northwestern Ontario. I wonder if the minister could indicate to the House whether he has changed his mind as to whether an inquiry is necessary under these new circumstances?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I am very conscious of the concern in northern Ontario regarding air safety and the reports arising out of recent incidents. After a similar situation some time ago, I conducted an investigation and determined that the parallels, in terms of their safety and precautions, were about the same in that region as in other parts of the country and that the highest Canadian standards were indeed in place. However, the recent incidents and the concern have led me to ask for a further investigation into the situation. That is now going on. I am willing to say that if that investigation reveals the need for a more formal inquiry, I will be happy to see that that is undertaken as well. The present fact appears to be that the standards and rules are adequate. The question is whether there are reasons, including economic pressures, for them being contravened. Of course, we would want to come to grips with that very important question.

* * *

TRANSPORT

DATE OF DECISION ON NEW EQUIPMENT FOR SHIPMENT OF POTATOES—ADEQUACY OF EQUIPMENT FOR THIS YEAR

Mr. David MacDonald (Egmont): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Transport and it relates to a series of questions familiar to the minister concerning the transport of potatoes. In light of the fact that today Mr. Nick Alder has indicated that his report is completed and that it will be circulated within the next few days to some of the provincial interests in New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island, can the minister indicate how soon a decision will be taken by the government particularly with respect to new vehicles, realizing the importance of having adequate equipment for the next shipping season in light of the large crop expected this year?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, the working group was given until August 1 for its report. It has now an effective draft report available. It will be discussing this with the interested groups in the region. Within a week or so I would expect to have a final report from the group. At that point the government will look at the matter immediately, and we will take such actions and make such decisions as seem to arise out of it.

Mr. MacDonald (Egmont): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the minister has investigated with the local potato marketing board or with the supplier of the vehicles to ascertain whether there will be enough equipment available for the next shipping season, realizing the rapid decline and deterioration of the present equipment which has been rented primarily from the United States and the length of time it would take to place an order for new equipment to be available this coming shipping season?

Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, that is one of the subjects which has been examined by this working group. I know they have some preliminary conclusions on it and will have final conclusions to put before us within a week or ten days.

* * *

CENTRAL MORTGAGE AND HOUSING CORPORATION

YORK PLACE, HAMILTON—RESPONSIBILITY OF CORPORATION FOR ASCERTAINING HOW MORTGAGE MONEY SPENT

Mr. Stan Darling (Parry Sound-Muskoka): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of State for Urban Affairs.

An hon. Member: He has arrived.

Mr. Darling: Yesterday the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of State for Urban Affairs told this House that neither his department nor CMHC has any responsibility to ensure that mortgage funds allocated to a particular project are actually spent on that project. Last year the Auditor General reported that the government did not always know how taxpayers' money is spent. Now we are told that they do not even care. Will the minister tell the House whether it is the government's view that it is irrelevant where the $5.9 million advanced by CMHC for the construction of York Place was actually spent?

• (1440)

[*Translation*]

Hon. André Ouellet (Minister of State for Urban Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I do not think the parliamentary secretary ever said yesterday that the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation did not take any further interest in the loans it guaranteed. In fact, the Corporation follows the current practice in this area; it grants the loan in the form of a progressive advance payment during construction, which is a way of controlling gradually the progress of the work.

[*English*]

Mr. Darling: I have another supplementary question for the minister. The question on the order paper was whether the money was used in York Place. The minister's answer was, no. It is irrelevant whether the contractors were paid, how they were paid or who paid them. We want to know if the money went for the purpose for which it was borrowed. In light of the allegations that substantial amounts were diverted and that we

have now waited for eight months without proper answers, would the minister tell the House exactly where the money went and who got it?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Ouellet: Mr. Speaker, I think I should remind the hon. member that all advance payments are made through a lawyer who has the responsibility to see to it that each payment is used to search for title deeds, in order to ensure that the advance payment has priority over any other prior claim. On the other hand, the Corporation acts under the existing legislation in each province, and in this case, the Ontario legislature does not give any priority to the creditor unless he has registered either a lien or a judgment.

[*English*]

YORK PLACE, HAMILTON—SUGGESTED INDEPENDENT ASSESSMENT OF VALUE

Mr. Stan Darling (Parry Sound-Muskoka): Five point nine million dollars have gone into this project—a portion of which may have departed for destinations unknown. Will the minister now undertake to obtain an independent assessment of what York Place is actually worth before he begins putting the additional $1.2 million needed to complete the place?

[*Translation*]

Hon. André Ouellet (Minister of State for Urban Affairs): There is no doubt, Mr. Speaker, that we will look into the matter very carefully before allotting any other funds.

On the other hand, I can assure the hon. member that with regard to what has happened in the past, the officials of my department supervised that case very closely and I can tell the House that, in their opinion, there were no irregularities except for a former employee of the company concerned which tells us that he is no longer working for it.

* * *

[*English*]

FORESTS

SPRUCE BUDWORM IN NOVA SCOTIA—REQUEST FOR FEDERAL ASSISTANCE

Mr. Lloyd R. Crouse (South Shore): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct my question to the Minister of Fisheries and the Environment who is also responsible for the federal forestry policy. In view of the fact that in Nova Scotia some two million acres of forest land are under some form of spruce budworm attack which will result in an eventual loss of some six million cords of spruce and balsam fir, causing a major catastrophe throughout our province, the economy of which is based on our forest industries, will the minister indicate, either today or when convenient, whether his department plans to assist contractors in harvesting the devastated areas and whether he has any ongoing plans of a long term nature to assist Nova Scotia during this difficult period?

[Mr. Darling.]

Hon. Roméo LeBlanc (Minister of Fisheries and the Environment): Mr. Speaker, the decision to spray or not to spray in the case of the spruce budworm attack is one that rests with the provincial authorities which, under our constitution, are responsible for the management of forests. The federal government is obviously involved in research on spruce budworm. In fact, over $30 million have been spent and a further increase in that amount will be made by a co-ordinated effort between Canada and the United States into the research aspect of the problem. Management practices, such as early harvesting, can in fact solve certain problems, and that appears to have been Nova Scotia's decision. We had not become involved in this part of their activities, nor do we intend to at the moment.

* * *

FISHERIES

LOBSTERS—COMPENSATION FOR STORM DAMAGE TO GEAR—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Jack Marshall (Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe): Mr. Speaker, my question is also for the Minister of the Environment in his capacity as Minister of Fisheries, and it has to do with severe losses by lobster fishermen as a result of storm damage to their lobster gear. On May 6 the minister indicated he was taking steps to temporarily overcome the situation. Now that the lobster season is over and that help has not come forward, I wonder what steps are being taken to compensate the fishermen for their losses?

Hon. Roméo LeBlanc (Minister of Fisheries and the Environment): Mr. Speaker, I will have to check *Hansard* to see the exact words I used. Certainly, when I said that all steps would be taken to help fishermen find other gear it was then the lobster season. I noticed some efforts were made to get fishing gear from some other provinces. As to the compensation matter, I have made it clear in the House in relation to Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island, New Brunswick and Newfoundland, that a disaster formula has to be used and triggered by the provincial authorities. It is employed by the federal government if the province decides to use the disaster formula. I have no requests from the province of Newfoundland in front of me at the moment.

PROPOSAL FOR INSURANCE AGAINST GEAR LOSS—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Jack Marshall (Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe): I do not want to contradict the minister but it was brought to my attention that the minister of fisheries in the province of Newfoundland submitted a proposal about two months ago about gear loss insurance, requesting comments from the minister and asking for financial participation. Would the minister look at that and reply, probably later in the week, as to the answer from his officials?

Hon. Roméo LeBlanc (Minister of Fisheries and the Environment): Mr. Speaker, I know that the minister did write to

me about a possible gear insurance plan. Discussions have taken place for some three years since I have had this responsibility. We have tried to find a way to get a plan which would be acceptable to fishermen. This has not turned out to be possible. There are coercive conditions in the plan suggested by our colleague from the Newfoundland government which I personally do not accept. The fishermen themselves will have to be volunteers in this type of plan.

* * *

[*Translation*]

BILINGUALISM

POSSIBILITY OF GRANTING BONUS TO PUBLIC SERVANTS IN QUEBEC

Mr. Roch La Salle (Joliette): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the President of the Treasury Board, I should like to put my question to the Prime Minister as he is well acquainted with the matter.

As the civil servants working in Montreal have refused to serve the public in both languages in the last few days; as the President of the Treasury Board has admitted publicly that as far as he is concerned the bilingualism premium should be paid retroactively to 1976; as it seems that the minister intends to impose sanctions because those services were refused, and before everyone involved becomes bitter, which is likely to happen, I ask the Prime Minister whether he intends to ask his minister to meet the civil servants concerned immediately with a view to finding a solution and avoid another bilingualism crisis?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the President of the Treasury Board already has the required authorization from the cabinet to discuss the matter with the authorized representatives of the civil servants, Mr. Speaker. I am convinced that those meetings have already started, perhaps not with the Montreal dissidents, but surely with the Union and Alliance people.

For further details, the hon. member will have to wait till the minister answers the question himself, since he is expected later in the House. He will surely be here some time today.

* * *

AGRICULTURE

RESULTS OF MEETING WITH PROVINCES CONCERNING INDUSTRIAL MILK QUOTAS

Mr. Claude Tessier (Compton): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Agriculture.

Following his meeting with his provincial counterparts, can the minister tell this House whether any agreement has been reached regarding the terms of payment of this controversial 25 cent levy dairy producers are supposed to pay in keeping with the 1977-1978 dairy policy? Also, is the minister prepared to assert that the distribution of quotas among all dairy producers has been equitable in 1977, considering all the unfair cuts that have been made against the interest of industrial milk producers over the last two milk years?

[*English*]

Hon. E. F. Whelan (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, discussion took place in Victoria at the provincial ministers meeting concerning this topic. At that time I made a proposal to them that they collect 25 cents a hundred in any fair and equitable way they saw fit and submit it to the federal government. There was some discussion at the meeting that it was our responsibility to collect it, but I reminded them that they already collected now $1.20 a hundred for export costs, and submitted it to the federal government. It is their duty to run quotas under this program which is totally within provincial jurisdiction. If they give me no other recourse, I will have to collect the 25 cents a hundred or its equivalent by subtracting that from the federal subsidy payment that we make to them.

* * *

● (1450)

INDIAN AFFAIRS

PROPOSED INQUIRY INTO CONSTRUCTION AND OPERATION OF ABENAKI MOTOR INN

Mr. Robert C. Coates (Cumberland-Colchester North): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development. Now that the minister has received requests from the chief of the Millbrook Band Council and the president of the Union of Nova Scotia Indians that a public inquiry into all aspects of the construction and operation of the Abenaki Motor Inn immediately be established—and I made a request to him on February 1 of this year—will a public inquiry be established?

Hon. Warren Allmand (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): Mr. Speaker, we have no intention of establishing a public inquiry at this time.

Mr. Coates: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that statements have been made that the motel in question is losing money day in and day out and that the taxpayers of this country have now put up over $2 million for the operation of this facility, how does the minister intend to get some answers which will clear the names of Indians in Nova Scotia with regard to the terrible, reprehensible way this operation has been run?

The Indians are taking the blame for this when the minister's officials should rightfully be taking it.

Mr. Allmand: The band council has asked that it be given an opportunity to take over this motel and run it directly. We are looking at that possibility and also a restructuring of the economic and financial aspects. That is now being explored. That has been made known to the band, and we have had several meetings with them about it.

[*Translation*]

ELECTION EXPENSES

REQUEST FOR COPIES OF REPORT ON FINANCIAL ACTIVITIES OF PARTIES

Mr. C. A. Gauthier (Roberval): Mr. Speaker, I would like to put a question to the hon. President of the Privy Council. I was beginning to fear I would not be able to see him today, with all the work pressure we are under.

In view of the fact that taxpayers must have access to the report on the financial activities of political parties in every possible way, could the President of the Privy Council advise the House whether a free copy could be made available to every member of this House, without a $70 charge for each?

[*English*]

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, I shall make inquiries of the Chief Electoral Officer to see whether arrangements can be made to have copies made available.

* * *

PENITENTIARIES

SITE FOR NEW INSTITUTION—REQUEST THAT RIDING OF VICTORIA-HALIBURTON BE CONSIDERED

Mr. W. C. Scott (Victoria-Haliburton): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Solicitor General. In view of the fact that there is growing opposition to the proposed new federal penitentiary in the area of London East and Kent Essex, will the minister reassess submissions made to him in the past and give further consideration to the riding of Victoria-Haliburton as a possible location for such an institution?

Mr. Speaker: That seems to be a representation. The hon. member for Medicine Hat.

* * *

AGRICULTURE

CATTLE—MEASURES TO SAFEGUARD TRADE WITH UNITED STATES

Mr. Bert Hargrave (Medicine Hat): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Agriculture, and it deals with last Monday's United States announcement of new import restrictions against certain Canadian cattle as a result of a new round of non-tariff barrier trade irritants and with particular regard to the recent brucellosis issue which could involve Canadian cattle. Can the minister assure the Canadian beef and dairy industries that his recent personal discussions with Mr. Bergland will preserve and hopefully safeguard Canadian cattle trading interests in our two-way cattle trade with the United States?

Hon. E. F. Whelan (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, I think I can reassure at least those producers of purebred cattle who have followed good health practices that the negotiations which took place between Mr. Bergland and myself were based on a realization of the importance of the two-way trade between our nations. For those people who have had their herds tested within the last 12 months and who have had any additional cattle they have added to their herds in the last three months tested, there will be no impediment in the export of their cattle.

We realize, and I am sure the hon. member realizes, that we need to tighten up our procedures for trying to eradicate brucellosis. I am sure the hon. member is aware that our rate of brucellosis is lower than the rate in the United States. The United States has some areas which are called brucellosis-free, and we have some as well. When these are published, we will be negotiating with the United States on this contract. I see some loss of export trade at the present time, but I do not look on that as a trade barrier. I look on it as strictly a health move, and contrary to what some people have suggested, I emphatically deny that it is a trade barrier the United States has imposed. It is a health measure.

BLUE TONGUE—POSSIBILITY OF REDUCTION IN TESTING

Mr. Bert Hargrave (Medicine Hat): Mr. Speaker, I suggest that up until now the discussions seem to indicate that Canada is the loser. In the minister's discussions with the Secretary of Agriculture and his staff, was the possibility of a reduction of our Canadian requirement for a double test for blue tongue to a single test during the nonfly season discussed? This would lessen the probability of yet another beef and cattle trade war between our two countries.

Hon. E. F. Whelan (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, we touched on that. They had no reservations about the programs we have because they recognize that our nation is practically free of blue tongue, and they are satisfied that the blue tongue outbreak we had in British Columbia was as a result of our cattle being infected by cattle from the United States. They commend the program we have. I disagree with what some people from the Canadian Cattlemen's Association are reported in press reports to have said. They have said that it is a trade retaliation move. I emphatically deny that because Mr. Bergland has no intention of doing that. I have a harmonious relationship with the American Department of Agriculture, and the relationship I have with the present Secretary of Agriculture is the best there has been for years.

* * *

MANPOWER

MEASURES TO CREATE JOBS IN CONSTRUCTION INDUSTRY

Mr. John Rodriguez (Nickel Belt): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Manpower and Immigration. In view of the fact that the most recent figures from Statistics Canada indicate a crisis in Canadian construction which is best indicated by the fact that there are over 8,000 unemployed

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

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

* * *

FINANCE

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

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

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

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

* * *

ENVIRONMENTAL AFFAIRS

LOG BOOMS IN NANAIMO RIVER ESTUARY—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Hugh A. Anderson (Comox-Alberni): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Fisheries and the Environment. Would the minister advise the House if he is aware of the controversy surrounding the proposed development of Dukes Point, Nanaimo, British Columbia by the B.C. Development Corporation? Can he also state whether additional log booms will be allowed in the Nanaimo River estuary, or is it still government policy to phase out existing log booms in this estuary for ecological reasons?

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

* * *

● (1500)

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

PLACE OF SITTING DURING PIPELINE DEBATE

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Alexander: To heck with Stanley.

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

the Senate; but the Senators will not be there at the same time. They will probably be observing the rapid pace of our business.

Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Could the government House leader confirm reports to the effect that when the other place was considered as a place in which this House might sit, the House leader of the New Democratic Party objected to sitting in that chamber, and it was therefore thought we might sit in the museum. Will the minister answer?

* * *

PRIVILEGE—MR. MUNRO (HAMILTON EAST)

YORK PLACE—STATEMENT BY HON. MEMBER FOR GRENVILLE-CARLETON

Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, I rise with reference to the statement the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton (Mr. Baker) made in his question, a statement implying that the Minister of Labour was involved in matters concerning York Place, and involved improperly. Clearly, that implication was contained in the hon. member's statement. I rise seriously on a question of privilege because I think such a remark constitutes most inappropriate behaviour on the part of the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton.

Let me refer to what happened when this matter was raised in the House of Commons, back on October 27. A copy of the *Spectator* was flown in from Hamilton for the hon. member for St. John's East (Mr. McGrath). The hon. member had that copy in his possession almost contemporaneously with the appearance of the edition on the street in Hamilton on that day. He rose and quoted a story alleging some political interference on my part. I immediately got in touch with my solicitors and launched a libel suit against the *Spectator*. The matter is now before the courts.

I believe the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton is well aware of that activity on my part. He must also be aware that my making statements now about those allegations in the *Spectator* would not be the wisest course for me to follow. Now that the matter is in the hands of my solicitors it is up to them to pursue it in the courts to its normal conclusion. Therefore freedom of expression on my part is limited at this time.

The *Spectator* printed an apology, an apology which, in the opinion of my solicitors, was not sufficient, and we are continuing the law suit.

What has the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton done? Using the excuse of his unhappiness with certain written answers provided to questions yesterday, the hon. member rose in his place and tried to "muddy up" a political personality who happens to be on the side opposite to him.

Mr. Chrétien: Hit and run.

[Mr. MacEachen.]

Mr. Munro (Hamilton East): He used that flimsy excuse to launch another McCarthy-type smear against another member.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Oh, no, not at all.

Mr. Munro (Hamilton East): Mr. Speaker, I ask this paragon of parliamentary virtue from Grenville-Carleton to stand up now in the House and show some moral fortitude, if he is going to continue in that course of conduct, make a charge, and back it with something specific.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Munro (Hamilton East): If he does not have the guts, or is too cowardly to do that, let him at least have the fundamental decency to retract, and let him stop resorting to such obnoxious behaviour.

Of course, if the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton were possessed of any sort of courage he could resort to another course of conduct. He could go outside this House and make any statements he wishes, make any innuendoes about improprieties—

Mr. Epp: Order, order.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. In the circumstances I should like to ask the minister to confine his remarks strictly to the question of privilege.

Mr. Trudeau: He has no guts.

Mr. Munro (Hamilton East): I will conclude shortly, Mr. Speaker. The hon. member has open to him that other course of conduct, after which I would have recourse against him, as would be my right. Why does the hon. member not show enough courage to do even that?

Mr. Trudeau: He has no guts.

Mr. Munro (Hamilton East): Mr. Speaker, this type of conduct to which the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton has resorted, involving innuendo, smears, and McCarthy-like tactics, makes me wonder about the appropriateness of parliamentary immunity as an institution of this House. If it is to be so abused by political opportunists with little sense of fair play and decency, opportunists who will hide behind this institution, I think the day will come when those in political life in this country, in this parliament, will want to re-examine that institution, to determine its appropriateness in this day and age.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Walter Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I would have thought that the Minister of Labour (Mr. Munro), who was a member of the Bar, knows histrionics will not replace substance. I also thought he knew the rules of the House. I note that although he said this was a question of

privilege, he did not move a motion at the conclusion of his remarks.

Mr. Trudeau: But he did say you were a coward.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Let me refer hon. members to what took place yesterday. Yesterday, as reported on page 7780 of *Hansard*, I directed a question to the President of the Privy Council (Mr. MacEachen), part of which reads as follows:

Now, on October 27, 1976, the former minister of state for urban affairs told the House that he would check into allegations that the Minister of Labour had played a role in securing a $1.5 million loan increase to Morgenti. That is on the record for October of 1976. In the absence of the Minister of State for Urban Affairs, I ask the government House leader whether he has followed up that inquiry. If the answer is no, why not, and if the answer is yes, what were the results and would he be prepared to table that report in the House? I am not asking the parliamentary secretary. I am asking the government House leader for this information.

The parliamentary secretary rose—

Mr. Munro (Hamilton East): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

Some hon. Members: Sit down, sit down!

Mr. Munro (Hamilton East): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is not accurate even in what he has just said.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I did not obtain an answer to a legitimate question I asked in this House.

Mr. Munro (Hamilton East): Make a charge, Walter, and show some guts.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I did not ask that question idly. So that the House will know it was not asked idly, this matter rose on October 27, and I thank the hon. member for his tribute to the hon. member for St. John's East (Mr. McGrath),—

● (1510)

Mr. Munro (Hamilton East): Show some guts, Walter.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): At that time the then minister of state for urban affairs in answer to a question reported on page 501 of *Hansard* said, and I quote:

If there are any irregularities, certainly I want to be the first to know about them, and I will check into this. However I can give the hon. member no assurances at this time, particularly as the matter is before the courts.

The government itself on a matter that was before the courts decided to answer the written questions on the order paper through the Minister of State for Urban Affairs (Mr. Ouellet) on July 15, 1977, last Friday. If a member of the House is prohibited from asking questions arising out of questions on the order paper that the government has answered, we indeed have to look at the rules of this House, and the Minister of Labour has no question of privilege whatsoever.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): If answers to questions by the government on their face raise further questions and the opposition does not pursue the earlier line of inquiry made by the hon. member for St. John's East, then the opposition is not doing its duty.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Only some compassion for the Minister of Labour would prohibit me from reading into the record today the article with appeared on September 16, 1976, in the Hamilton *Spectator*. I have had some checks made, and I can be corrected on this—

Mr. Trudeau: Go read it outside the House.

Mr. Paproski: He will read it.

Mr. Trudeau: He hasn't got the courage to read it.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. In addition to other considerations, there may be some limits to procedure which would interfere with the hon. member reading the entire newspaper article at this time. I would be grateful if the hon. member would develop his argument.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I am not going to read the entire article, as I said, out of compassion for the minister for what it contains.

Mr. Trudeau: That is not compassion, that is cowardice.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): The government has answered the question and again put the matter back into the public record. That is what it has done.

I have been advised that an action was commenced by the minister in October, 1976. He said it was, and I accept that. However, the matter has not been prosecuted by the minister.

The Hamilton *Spectator* stands by the substance of the story, and the situation involves the headline which in a subsequent edition the Hamilton *Spectator*—

Mr. Trudeau: Fine, then make a charge.

Mr. Paproski: If you want to get up on a question of privilege, you can make a speech.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): If a member of this House has to take this kind of abuse from a minister of the government who, by answering questions last Friday, laid open for questioning the original matters raised by the hon. member for St. John's East, then this is a very sorry House of Commons indeed.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, if the minister really has a question of privilege, he does not have it today. He would have had it yesterday when the matter was raised. That is when he could have chosen to raise it, but he did not choose to do so.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Dean Whiteway (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, I rise on the same question of privilege. The only thing that is becoming increasingly clear is that there is increasing confusion. In light of the action last Friday by the RCMP and by the unanswered questions, the responsibility is on this government to lauch a full public inquiry.

Mr. Munro (Hamilton East): Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. There is no procedural machinery whereby I can hear the minister a second time on the same question of privilege.

[*Translation*]

Hon. André Ouellet (Minister of State for Urban Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege. I have never seen in the House such a distortion of facts made by an hon. member in his remarks following some answers. I realize, Mr. Speaker, that opposition members are not interested in getting answers to the questions they raise. As a matter of fact, this is entirely in the line of thinking of the hon. member who has just spoken and who Mr. Speaker, has made a complete and unacceptable distortion of the answers given earlier this week to a series of written questions. If you read these answers to the questions, in no way can you end up by incriminating my colleague, the Minister of Labour (Mr. Munro), as the hon. member has just done. I find this attitude very mean, unacceptable and quite improper from a responsible member. I think that the answers given simply answer the questions on the order paper and have nothing to do with the alleged misconduct of my colleague, the Minister of Labour. Trying to conclude from those answers that there was improper and irregular conduct on the part of my colleague, the Minister of Labour, is altogether unacceptable.

I want to inform the House that according to reports I have received—following the undertaking made by my colleague the former minister of state for urban affairs—the procedures followed and the amount of work done to ascertain whether or not there had been any improper action, I can only conclude that this was not the case. And if the hon. member has enough guts, as my colleague the Minister of Labour said, let him go outside the House, make direct charges and repeat what he said.

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker: The question of privilege raised by the Minister of Labour (Mr. Munro) concerns itself with an inference contained in questions put during the question period with regard to his activities. The complaint is that that ought to take the form of another course of action. It seems to be a matter of entire disagreement between the parties. In any event, I do not have to decide whether it is the substance of a question of privilege. It is not accompanied by a motion which requires action by the Chair. Therefore no further action is required.

[Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton).]

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*Translation*]

BROADCASTING

TABLING OF REPORT ON BROADCASTING SERVICE

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the provisions of Standing Order 41(2), I would like to table in both official languages the report of the inquiry committee on the national broadcasting system set up on March 14, 1977.

* * *

[*English*]

CANADA ELECTIONS ACT

MEASURE TO AMEND

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (President of the Privy Council) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-62, to amend the Canada Elections Act.

Motion agreed to, bill read the first time and ordered to be printed.

* * *

● (1520)

PETITIONS

REPRESENTATION SEEKING STRICT ENFORCEMENT OF ANTI-PORNOGRAPHY LAWS

Mrs. Simma Holt (Vancouver-Kingsway): Mr. Speaker, I have a petition to present on behalf of 1,947 residents of Kelowna, British Columbia, and surrounding communities who want the laws against pornography to be strictly enforced under section 159 of the Criminal Code because of the dangerous impact on children and on the fabric of our society.

* * *

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, the following questions will be answered today: Nos. 2,183, 2,410, 2,766, 2,775 and 2,778.

[*Text*]

EMPLOYEES AT PRIME MINISTER'S RESIDENCE

Question No. 2,183—**Mr. Cossitt:**

What are the (a) names (b) job descriptions (c) annual salaries (d) dates of appointment (e) details of any previous government employment of all persons, paid in whole or in part from public funds, who are employed in connection with the operation of the Prime Minister's (i) official residence at 24 Sussex Drive,

Ottawa, Ontario (ii) summer residence at Harrington Lake, Quebec up to the date the answer to this question is prepared?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): In so far as the Prime Minister's Office is concerned:

NAME	CLASSIFICATION	POSITION	ANNUAL SALARY	DATE OF APPOINTMENT	PREVIOUS GOVERNMENT EMPLOYMENT
Mullally, M. (Mrs.)	GS-MPS 10	Household Co-ordinator	Hourly: $6.31 Annually: $13,000-14,000	25.11.76	Prime Minister's Residence: 20.9.72-12.7.74 1.10.76-24.11.76
West, H. (Mrs.)	GS-MPS 4	Senior Maid	Hourly: $4.80 Annually: $10,000-11,000	1.1.73	Prime Minister's Residence: 9.7.64-8.9.72 Governor General's Residence: 1.12.72-31.12.72
Vincent, Y. (Mr.)	GS-FOS 9	Chef	Hourly: $7.93 Annually: $16,000-17,000	1.10.75	National Arts Centre 16.4.69-4.7.75
Chénier, R. (Miss)	GS-FOS 6	Cook	Hourly: $5.80 Annually: $12,000-13,000	16.9.63	nil
Clément, N. (Miss)	GS-MPS 2	Kitchen Maid	Hourly: $4.06 Annually: $8,000-9,000	14.4.75	nil
Virgo, S. M. (Miss)	GS-MPS 2	Maid	Hourly: $4.06 Annually: $8,000-9,000	26.11.73	nil
Kimberley, L. E. (Miss)	GS-MPS 2	Maid	Hourly: $4.06 Annually: 8,000-9,000	7.2.77	nil
*Desjardins, A. (Mrs.)	GS-MPS 2	Maid	Hourly: $4.06 Annually: $4,000-4,500	28.10.76	nil
Mallon, M. C. (Miss)	GS-MPS 2	Maid	Hourly: $4.06 Annually: $8,000-9,000	21.2.77	nil
*Daviault, C. M. (Mrs.)	GS-MPS 2	Cleaner	Hourly: $4.06 Annually: $4,000-4,500	1.2.77	nil

*Working half days only

In so far as the Department of Public Works is concerned: (i) 24 Sussex Drive; (a) Mrs. Gertrude Lepage; (b) Cleaning Service Woman (GS-BUS-2); (c) Hourly-$4.13 Annually $8,000-$9,000; (d) 27/11/61; (e) No previous government experience. (a) Mrs. Anita Urquhart; (b) Cleaning Service Woman (GS-BUS-2) (c) Hourly-$4.13 Annually $8,000-$9,000; (d) 7/3/77; (e) Employed as Cleaning Service Woman at ND HQ. (ii) Harrington Lake: (a) Mr. Lionel Desjardins; (b) Supervising Caretaker (GS-BUS-5); (c) Hourly-$5.06 Annually $10,000-$11,000; (d) 1/3/76; (e) No previous government experience.

NOTE: Mr. Desjardins is also the Supervising Caretaker for O'Brien House and farm at Kingsmere.

In so far as the National Capital Commission is concerned: (i) At 24 Sussex Drive, official residence: Mr. J. Markus, Park Foreman, GL MANO 7B3 Hourly $6.82, annually $14,000-$15,000 of which $4,699 are applicable to the official residence. Employed with NCC since May 1971; at residence since September 1975. No previous government service. Mr. Z. Monette Junior Park Foreman, GL MANO 5A1 hourly $5.92, annually $12,000-$13,000 of which $9,270 are applicable to official residence. Employed with NCC since 1965; at residence since 1966. No previous government service. In addition, summer seasonal casual labour employed at an estimated labour cost of $3,000. Mr. M. Gascon, Caretaker, GL MANO 5XX Hourly $5.69, annually $11,000-$12,000 all applicable to summer residence. Employed with NCC at Har-

rington Lake since November 1976. No previous government service. Mr. S. Stevenson, Summer Gardener, SL MDOO 4XX Hourly $4.96, annually $10,000-$11,000 of which $5,491 are applicable to summer residence. Employed with NCC since 1966; at summer residence since 1973. No previous government service. In addition summer and winter seasonal casual labour cost of $1,500.

INCENTIVES AVAILABLE FOR DEVELOPMENT OF RENEWABLE ENERGY SOURCES

Question No. 2,410—**Mr. Howie:**

Are tax incentives, grants, or other industrial research incentives available to the private sector of the economy for research and development of renewable energy sources and, if so, what are they?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): In so far as the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce is concerned: The federal government has a number of initiatives to encourage the use of renewable energy sources. These include: (a) The 1976 budget measures which increased the Capital Cost Allowance for certain types of equipment which produce energy from waste and the elimination of federal sales tax on solar energy equipment and heat pumps. (b) Current and operating expenses for research and development conducted by the private sector into renewable energy sources are eligible for an investment tax credit of 5 percent, 7½ percent or 10 percent depending on where the activity is undertaken. (c) Under the Enterprise Development Programme grants are available to private industry to encourage research and development in commercial activities including renewable energy sources. (d) The National Research Council has a research, development and demonstration program in cooperation with the private sector respecting the use of solar energy in heating applications for buildings.

In so far as the Department of Finance is concerned: Research and development for renewable energy sources falls within the general incentives of the Income Tax Act. Thus section 37 of the Act provides that a taxpayer may deduct in the year incurred any expenditures on scientific research, including those of a capital nature, to the extent that the scientific research is related to a business carried on by the taxpayer. It should also be noted that certain types of equipment which contribute to the efficient use of certain energy resources can be written-off for tax purposes over two years. The equipment which qualifies for this favourable treatment is described in class 34 of Schedule B to the Act.

IMPORT PERMITS—EGGS

Question No. 2,766—**Mr. Beatty:**

What are the names and addresses of all individuals or organizations issued import permits to bring eggs into Canada from January 1, 1976 to May 31, 1977 and, in each case, by month, what was the total number the individual or organization was authorized to import?

Mr. Hugh Poulin (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): In so far as the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce is concerned: In view of the commercial confidentiality attached to permits issued to import goods listed on the Import Control List, it is the Departmental policy not to divulge the names and addresses of individuals or organizations to whom such permits were issued. During the period January 1, 1976 to May 31, 1977, a total of 188 companies or organizations were issued permits to import eggs into Canada. Details as to the number of permits issued and quantity authorized to be imported for each month of that period are provided in the following schedule.

SCHEDULE

Number of Permits Issued to Import Eggs
(During Period January 1 to December 31, 1976)

Month	Number of Companies	Number of Permits	Quantity (15 doz. boxes)
January	9	16	24000
February	12	43	73000
March	11	11	31500
April	6	9	28500
May	14	16	45060
June	9	14	28500
July	16	36	60000
August	11	16	35000
September	16	35	58500
October	10	14	25500
November	16	40	75000
December	22	38	78000
TOTAL (for year)	152	288	562560

Number of Permits Issued to Import Eggs
(During Period January 1 to May 31, 1977)

Month	Number of Companies	Number of Permits	Quantity (15 doz. boxes)
January	2	2	3000
February	8	12	25500
March	8	8	21000
April	14	16	31500
May	4	4	12000
TOTAL (January—May)	36	42	93000

MR. JIM MURPHY

Question No. 2,775—**Mr. Whiteway:**

1. Is Mr. Jim Murphy, Head of the Regional Penitentiaries in British Columbia, a brother to Mr. Murphy in the Solicitor General's Office in Ottawa?

2. Are both of them nephews, or nephews by marriage, of Mr. Douglas Hogarth, former Member of Parliament for New Westminster?

Hon. Francis Fox (Solicitor General): 1. Mr. Jim Murphy is a brother to Mr. Ambrose Murphy, an employee in the Ministry Secretariat.

2. No.

SERVICES OF THE BUREAU OF MANAGEMENT CONSULTANTS

Question No. 2,778—**Mr. Bawden:**

1. Which departments or agencies utilized the Bureau of Management Consulting, Department of Supply and Services and received advice on financial and management controls?

2. How many persons are employed in the Bureau and, by category, what is the number of professional people?

Hon. Jean-Pierre Goyer (Minister of Supply and Services): 1. 1976-77, 22: Agriculture Canada; Canadian Dairy Commission; Canadian International Development Agency; Canadian Penitentiary Services; Canadian Radio-Television and Telecommunications Commission; Communications; Consumer and Corporate Affairs; Energy, Mines and Resources; External Affairs; Indian and Northern Affairs; Industry, Trade and Commerce; Manpower and Immigration; Regional and Economic Expansion; Revenue Canada—Customs and Excise; Secretary of State; Statistics Canada; Supply and Services Canada; Transport Canada; Treasury Board; Unemployment Insurance Commission; Urban Affairs; Veterans Affairs.

2. One hundred forty-two of which 114 are professional people.

Categories	Number of People
Executive	8
Administrative	79
Technical	10
Scientific and Professional	17

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker: Shall the remaining questions be allowed to stand?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

* * *

MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, notice of motion for the production of papers No. 78 is acceptable to the government. Notice of motion for the production of papers No. 27 is acceptable to the government subject to the usual reservations pertaining to the confidentiality of certain parts of the information. Notice of motion for the production of papers No. 88 is acceptable to the government subject to the usual reservations concerning confidential documents and to the authorization of the government authorities concerned.

Mr. Speaker: Motion No. 78 shall be deemed to have been adopted.

COPY OF UNDERTAKINGS OF CANADIAN APPLIANCE MANUFACTURING COMPANY

Motion No. 78—**Mr. Fairweather:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the undertakings of Canadian Appliance Manufacturing Company (CAMCO) to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce on the occasion of the takeover of the appliance divisions of Canadian General Electric Limited and G.S.W. Limited which takeover was not referred to the Foreign Investment Review Agency.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House that motions 27 and 28 be deemed to have been adopted subject to the conditions expressed by the parliamentary secretary?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

COPIES OF CORRESPONDENCE RELATING TO ESTABLISHMENT OF SAUNDERS AIRCRAFT CORPORATION, GIMLI, MANITOBA

Motion No. 27—**Mr. Whiteway:**

That an humble Address be presented to His Excellency praying that he will cause to be laid before this House copies of all correspondence, minutes of meetings, letters, telegrams, contracts and/or agreements between the government and the Province of Manitoba having to do with the establishment of Saunders Aircraft Corporation at Gimli, Manitoba.

Motion agreed to.

COPIES OF ALL MEETINGS AND CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN FEDERAL AND PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENT RELATING TO LABRADOR LINERBOARD MILL

Motion No. 88—**Mr. Marshall:**

That an humble Address be presented to His Excellency praying that he will cause to be laid before this House copies of all minutes of meetings, telegrams, letters, and pertinent material between the government and the Province of Newfoundland relating to Labrador Linerboard Mill Limited.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Speaker: Shall the remaining notices of motions for the production of papers be allowed to stand?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

* * *

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, would the government House leader be in a position to confirm the business of the House for today and tomorrow and tell us what are his intentions with respect to the balance of the legislative program?

Mr. MacEachen: The business today is Bill C-60 in the name of the President of the Treasury Board. Tomorrow we shall begin the report stage of the immigration bill—I gather this will take some days and I will therefore not go further, except to say I have two bills I should like to clear up after

that—the report stage of the Air Canada bill, and the third reading of the metric conversion bill.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): In the course of the adjournment motion set down by the President of the Privy Council contemplating an adjournment on July 15, an intention was expressed to bring the House back on August 2. My understanding is that there may be some change with respect to this plan, and if the hon. gentleman is in a position to announce his intentions I would appreciate any further information in terms of the days on which we shall be coming back in August if, indeed, we do have to come back in August. Perhaps he is in a position to make an announcement today or, possibly, he may wish to consult with the other parties in respect to the matter.

Mr. MacEachen: I have stated several times that it was the intention to debate the pipeline situation on August 4 and 5 following receipt of the final reports on the pipeline situation. The reason the date, August 2, was included on the motion which appears on the order paper was to provide for the contingency which might have arisen had there been agreement to come back to deal with the immigration bill in August. I make no complaint about the lack of agreement, but the date was there as a contingency against that possibility. When it comes to putting down a further adjournment motion, or amending the one already on the order paper, I shall be happy to consult with other members.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): When the government House leader says he is prepared to consult further with respect to this matter, does his offer include consultation as to the length of time to be spent on the pipeline debate? The minister is talking today as though we would be spending only two days on that debate. Can this be the subject of further consultation?

While I am on my feet, may I ask the minister whether it does not become clear, considering the additional time during which we must be here before we can get out at all, that the hon. member for Esquimalt-Saanich need not worry about having to sit in the Senate Chamber after all?

Mr. Epp: I should like to ask the President of the Privy Council whether it is the intention that Bill C-24, the immigration bill, should be completed at all stages before we rise for the summer, regardless of the amount of time taken on it?

Mr. MacEachen: It is my personal intention and, I believe, the view of many members on this side of the House that we ought to conclude the immigration bill in all its stages before we rise. I shall be discussing the matter further with my colleagues in cabinet, but that is the situation at present. As to the other part of the question, whether this would be done regardless of the amount of time taken, I might endeavour to ensure that there would be a limit on the time spent on this bill. It might be that members of the other parties would agree that a definite period be allowed, and an order of the House could then be made.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: My hon. friend from Esquimalt-Saanich raised the question of the locale of our deliberations. Could the President of the Privy Council let us know whether we are expected to be out of this Chamber by any particular time, so that we can arrange to get good seats in some other locale?

Mr. MacEachen: I believe there have been informal consultations on this question; the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton can probably fill the hon. member in with regard to that.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): I would be delighted to do so but I did not wish to breach the undertaking which exists between the President of the Privy Council and myself.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Since we are discussing the length of the session, and since the Standing Order which provides for holidays to be taken by this House does not include the holiday of the first weekend in August, could there be an understanding that we should have at least that long week end off?

Some hon. Members: No holidays!

Mr. MacFarlane: We shall work on Saturdays and Sundays.

Mr. McKenzie: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order concerning answers to questions on the order paper—

Mr. Speaker: Order. The hon. member seeks the floor on a point of order with regard to questions, but we are now on Orders of the Day and I do not think the Chair can accept a point of order having to do with questions at this time.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

REPRESENTATION AND ELECTORAL DISTRICTS READJUSTMENT ACT (ONTARIO)

MEASURE RESPECTING READJUSTMENT OF ONTARIO ELECTORAL DISTRICTS

Hon. Robert K. Andras (President of the Treasury Board) moved that Bill C-60, to readjust the representation of Ontario in the House of Commons and to readjust the electoral districts in Ontario, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. Speaker: Order. I think I should keep the record straight. Some time ago the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) raised a point of order with respect to the introduction of this bill, a point of order which was reiterated at a later date by the hon. member for Timiskaming (Mr. Peters). It was argued that there appeared, on the face of it, to be a departure from our accepted practice and precedents in relation to administrative responsibility inasmuch as the

President of the Treasury Board (Mr. Andras) introduced legislation relating to electoral boundaries instead of the President of the Privy Council within whose administrative responsibility this matter lies. In fact, this proposition is well founded. However, I am not able, in examining the precedents or rules of the House, to find any prohibition against this practice. The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre I think understood that in raising his point and introduced a caveat that may be used in some argument with respect to some other administrative restrictions in the future.

● (1530)

That seems to be the extent of it to this point. However, I did want to give note to the point of order which gave us some cause for study, but I can find no basis on which to interrupt this practice at the present time.

Mr. Andras: Mr. Speaker, parliament is probably at its best when it moves to act to redress a grievance. That grievance must, of course, be one of significance, and the issue on which it is based must be one of principle and not of expediency.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

An hon. Member: You are gerrymandering.

Mr. Andras: I am very interested to see the reaction of the New Democratic Party to the comments I am making on this very significant bill for northern Ontario. I want to make clear that the reason I believe this is based on principle is this—the purpose is to allow the region of northern Ontario to retain in this House the same level of representation which it has. More than three quarters of a million citizens in northern Ontario, which has a population roughly equivalent to the province of Saskatchewan, feel aggrieved because of the effect upon this region—

[*Translation*]

Mr. Lambert (Bellechasse): On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Bellechasse on a point of order.

Mr. Lambert (Bellechasse): Mr. Speaker, I would not want the minister to think that I want to interfere with what he is saying, on the contrary. The matter is that interpretation is not working very well. I wish I could hear what the minister is saying with regard to Bill C-60. If we are to understand what he is saying, we need interpretation, at least as far as I am concerned. That is my point of order.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Chair will check the situation, with the hope that it might be improved. Meanwhile, if the hon. member has any problem, he might perhaps sit in the next seat. In the meantime, we will see that the situation is set right.

Mr. Lambert (Bellechasse): We all have the same problem.

[*English*]

Mr. Andras: Mr. Speaker, I will also be most interested in the reactions of the Progressive Conservative party. The people of northern Ontario will have been observing with very great interest whether there is an intent to support this grievance which is felt very strongly in that region because of the effect of the decision of the Electoral Boundaries Commission of Ontario on the number of seats.

Northern Ontario is a vast region representing about 80 per cent of the land mass of the province of Ontario, and in that sense it is now having, by that decision, its level of representation reduced by one seat at a time when the House of Commons is about to be enlarged in its membership, and also at a time when the region feels it has not lost population but has increased it.

Mr. Stevens: Sit down, Bob, and we will pass it.

Mr. Andras: I would if I thought that would be the case, but I do want to share the reasons for our argument. I think I know one or two members of this House who, over the last few years, have thought about this, but if the region had been a province this could not have happened. In fact the region would have had more members, not fewer, in the next parliament.

We do find ourselves in an anomalous situation, Mr. Speaker. The Chair, in a sound and reasoned judgment in April, 1977, stated that it had no jurisdiction to deal with the legal issue raised by the hon. member for Thunder Bay (Mr. Penner) and supported by other members regarding the validity of the report of the commission in Ontario. Subsequently the Federal Court, trial division, and the Federal Court of Appeal, for different reasons, stated that they had no jurisdiction to upset the report of the commission. The Federal Court Act states that no provincial court would have jurisdiction to deal with this issue. Therefore we are left with an act of parliament, The Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act, duly passed by parliament and proclaimed, over which no one seemingly has any jurisdiction.

Mr. Stevens: You are chewing up time, Bob. Let us pass it.

Mr. Andras: In the meantime, Mr. Speaker, this House, the highest court of the land, particularly as it relates to legislation by which members come to the House, must not only have jurisdiction but must also enforce it when justly called upon to do so. But it is not only this anomalous situation or the need to meet the just demands of the citizens of northern Ontario that have led the government to assume the responsibility for redressing this grievance.

Mr. Stevens: Don't talk out your own bill, Bob. We are winning, so sit down.

Mr. Andras: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member may be party to information which I do not have, but I really do not think he is. As strong, perhaps as overwhelming, as those reasons are for doing so, the comments contained in the minority report of

the Electoral Boundaries Commission for Ontario I think defy any other course of action but one of support for this bill.

Mr. Paproski: So you are talking it out, Bob?

Mr. Andras: Mr. Speaker, may I prevall upon the House to listen more carefully to what I have to say. The hon. member may share the argument, but he must recognize that that is not the case throughout the House.

Mr. Stevens: Now, now, let's pass it.

Mr. Andras: It has to be said that this minority report to which I refer, submitted by Mr. Gratton and Mr. Tarnopolsky, represented the views of two of the four commissioners. Members from other regions—and this is my real point—I fully understand may also be less than satisfied with the redistribution process and the decisions of their electoral boundaries commissions. But in no other case and in no other province have members of independently appointed boundaries commissions, specifically members appointed to a commission by the Speaker of this House, filed a minority report recommending redress by parliament.

That is why this case is different from any other grievance filed, and understandably filed, by members in different parts of this country. The commissioners Gratton and Tarnopolsky, referring to a disagreement within the commission with respect to the interpretation to be given to section 13 of the Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act, and with specific reference to the problem of determining whether the region of northern Ontario should have assigned to it 12 or 11 electoral districts, said:

> The function to be exercised is the proper distribution of electoral districts on a representation by population basis, qualified by the necessity or desirability of giving effect to such human consideration as "community or diversity of interest" and by practical elements such as geographic considerations including in particular the sparsity, density of population of various regions of the province, the accessibility of such regions, etc.

They went on to say this, and it is the official comment of the minority report of the commission:

> There has been overwhelming evidence that the region of northern Ontario comes within these qualifying provisions. The desirability if not the necessity of allocating as many seats as possible to that region has been manifestly demonstrated.

And later, referring to the stricture imposed by parliament with reference to the 25 per cent variable above or below the provincial quota, they said:

> We believe that the fundamental question is: should the commission, where special consideration seems necessary, deal with a "region" of Ontario, or should its fundamental basis of consideration be all electoral districts in relation to the electoral quota?
>
> We feel that the former could have been done within the terms of section 13, without violating its intent.

● (1540)

Notwithstanding the very clear and strong suggestion contained in these words, it was clearly the position of the commission that this House of Commons has a responsibility to act in this situation.

May I refer Your Honour's attention to the words of the Representation Commissioner, Mr. Castonguay, spoken at the public hearing held in Thunder Bay on October 9, 1975, when he referred to the issue of maintaining 12 seats in northern Ontario. He said:

> I maintain it should be done by legislation. Parliament should specifically instruct this commission as other legislatures have done. They should be the ones judging this, not us.

Later the Honourable Mr. Justice Grant, Chairman of the Commission, at page 55, said on the issue of 12 seats in northern Ontario:

> Your remedy lies in parliament, does it not, not with us?

Finally, Professor Tarnopolsky later in the same hearing on the issue of the recognition of northern Ontario as a region, speaking to the hon. member for Thunder Bay (Mr. Penner), stated at page 89 the following:

> If I may, I disagree with whoever advised you or parliament on how much you could have done. And I am sure you can find people who could write a pretty good legal brief for you that there is more parliament could have done in order to ensure a region within a province got special consideration. I don't think it was impossible. Either you were misled or could have countered better. But I think it is something parliament could have taken care of better if they had wanted to.

In increasing the number of constituencies in Ontario from 95 to 96, would Ontario representation in this House be disproportionate to that of other provinces? The average population per constituency in all other provinces is as follows: in Newfoundland with seven seats the quotient would be 74,586; in Prince Edward Island with four seats it would be 27,910; in Nova Scotia with 11 seats it would be 71,723; in New Brunswick with 10 seats it would be 63,455; in Quebec with 75 seats it would be 80,370; in Manitoba with 14 seats it would be 70,589; in Saskatchewan with 14 seats it would be 66,160; in Alberta with 21 seats it would be 77,518; and in British Columbia with 28 seats it would be 78,022. Ontario has the highest quotient with 95 seats and an average of 81,085. With 96 seats its quotient will be, based on the 1971 census, 80,240.

With the exception of Quebec, which will be only marginally higher by 130 people, Ontario's quotient will still be 2,000 people greater per constituency than the next highest province, which is British Columbia. Therefore there would seem to be no validity to the argument that Ontario, by the operation of this proposed legislation, would receive a disproportionate degree of representation and be favoured over any other province.

In concluding, I should ask all members to consider this seriously. We in this party, and particularly the northern Ontario members, consider that this is not gerrymandering. This is based on a principle which has been recognized by the Electoral Boundaries Commission. The only redress available to us is by the action of this House. There has been overwhelming evidence that the region of northern Ontario comes within the qualifying provisions of the act at 12 seats. The desirability, if not the necessity, of allocating as many seats as possible to that region, has been manifestly demonstrated. I ask for the support of the House in passing this bill.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Arnold Peters (Timiskaming): Mr. Speaker, I am in favour of this bill.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Peters: I had the opportunity of going to the hearings and making a case on behalf of my constituents, in conjunction with most of the other northern members. They were of the opinion that we should have a floor in northern Ontario of 12 seats. We should not be penalized by the rest of the province of Ontario which gained six seats, plus one from northern Ontario, in this redistribution. The people in northern Ontario are going to be poorly represented because of the boundaries. This is not necessarily saving a seat for a Liberal. That particular seat is held by the New Democratic Party with a very large majority in the provincial field. Therefore that is not really a reason to make a decision.

If a riding is so large that it is difficult for a representative to get around and see people in order to conduct his business satisfactorily on their behalf, then they should be protected by a floor. It happened in Saskatchewan, Manitoba, and Alberta. We come from a very unfortunate part of the country, and that is the north. In northern Ontario and Quebec our distances are very large and our lines of communication are very bad.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Peters: The hon. member for Villeneuve (Mr. Caouette) gave an example of distances between towns being 1,400 miles. That is the length of the entire maritime provinces. It would probably take in Newfoundland as well. In one case it would be necessary to travel 1,400 miles to reach a community where there are 4,500 people. What will happen to those people? We are talking about an electoral district of well over 100,000 people. Nobody will bother about those people. No political candidate will go there. The Liberal government may drive in a new fire truck for them, but they will not see a candidate. Thus, they are really isolated. Money has never been provided to make that kind of representation possible in northern Ontario.

We belong to 12 districts that are totally different than southern Ontario which is organized by counties. In northern Ontario we are organized in a different way mainly because of communications. Many of these communities can only be serviced by air. Some of them can only be serviced by train, and some by boat. Many of the communities are very remote and very difficult to service.

The minister has said that the Speaker appointed the commissioners. I argue that point. They were appointed by the provincial government. One of the problems we had was that the people the provincial government supplied, the judge and one of the commissioners, represented the provincial government rather than the interests of federal representation.

Perhaps we are only paying lip service to the idea of representation, but I suggest the minister should be willing to include Quebec. Northern Quebec is included in that whole northern area. The new parts of Quebec which the federal government turned over to that province not long ago, and a great deal of the rest of Quebec, are now in two ridings, not three. The area in one riding is bigger than the whole area of the prairie provinces.

• (1550)

An hon. Member: What about Wally Firth's riding?

Mr. Peters: Yes, certainly, the riding of the hon. member for the Northwest Territories (Mr. Firth) is huge. At one time a third of this country was in one riding, but the House saw fit to divide it into two ridings, not because of the population but because if someone is to be elected to represent that area, it should not only be in name but in fact, and it was impossible at that time to cross the Arctic from east to west. It is hard enough to travel in that area from north to south. We saw fit to give the area two representatives to serve the population there. They are not considered second class citizens. We tried to make them first class citizens like everyone else.

If this bill is approved, it should have attached to it a commitment from the government that we will also give northern Quebec one extra seat, because if we want to provide proper representation for the people, it should be a two-way street.

It might be said that if you cannot get to the people and they cannot get to you, then perhaps they should communicate with you by mail. But the fact of the matter is that it takes five days for a letter from Kirkland Lake—or wherever the place may be—to get to Ottawa, so how long would it take for a letter from Port George to arrive in Ottawa? It would take weeks. Sometimes an airplane has to stay there for two or three weeks because it cannot get back. I suppose it carries mail.

There can be no representation unless you are able to communicate with the people. It seems to me that if the government wanted to get away from charges of gerrymandering being made by some, there must be a commitment that a seat will be given to northern Quebec as well.

This legislation affects my riding. In fact it affects all the ridings in northern Ontario. I am quite prepared to run there as the riding is now, and also as it will be. I can speak personally because now I will have a community with about 5,000 people which can only be reached by train. Since I know that trains operate in our country like our mail, I know it is not going to be easy. Whenever there is an opening ceremony in that community which I am asked to attend, they will have to make the date coincide with the train schedule. Government officials might be able to fly, but if I have to travel by train the date will have to suit my convenience, not theirs.

It seems to me that representation by population will not be affected by the allocation of this additional seat in northern Ontario. I am one of those who believe that the districts in northern Ontario are totally different from the counties in southern Ontario, and therefore I think that representation by population will not be affected because we can still meet the

requirements of population. I also believe that for the sake of justice we should be generous and commit ourselves to allocating an additional seat to northern Quebec so that the communities in that area might also benefit from a service which we are trying to provide to northern Ontario.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gilles Caouette (Témiscamingue): Mr. Speaker, the minister stated a while ago that it was essential to grant an adequate representation to northern Ontario. When the readjustment was made in northern Ontario, it was thought advisable to reduce the number of constituencies from twelve to eleven and in northwestern Quebec from three to two.

Today, on the basis of a specific issue, that is the report on which the commissioners were divided, the same argument comes up again, that northern Ontario should be given an additional constituency since the northern Ontario area covers 80 per cent of the Ontario territory. I readily accept these arguments and I think that it would be useful to have an increased representation that would not alter the Electoral Act.

But I feel that the minister made a mistake when he refused to recognize the fact that north western Quebec, with an area covering almost 60 per cent of the Province of Quebec has only two constituencies, as a result of redistribution. One is the Villeneuve riding, which occupies nearly half the area of the Province of Quebec, where, as the hon. member who spoke before me indicated, there are communities 1,400 or 1,500 mile away from one another. In sparsely populated areas, distance is a main factor in a constituency. But I feel we should also consider the importance of communications between individuals. When an hon. member has to fly over an area of such dimensions, because roads are few and far between, he certainly needs more time than is required to cover an urban riding in downtown Montreal.

When we made representations to the commissioners during hearings in northwestern Quebec and requested that this third major constituency be maintained, our request was turned down on the basis of statistical data of the 1971 census. I understand that their ruling had to be based on these data, but they failed to recognize the fact that some 6,000 people have moved into this region since 1971 to work on the James Bay project, and that there will be some 15,000 workers there one year from now, which means an increase of 15,000 people. Unfortunately, the commissioners refused to consider this. They unanimously ruled that these 15,000 new residents are not important for Quebec.

It is important that Ontario should have adequate representation, but Quebec, no, we must abide strictly and legally by the figures provided by the 1971 census. To be logical and reasonable, the minister should immediately add a third electoral district in the province of Quebec, if the arguments he raised for Ontario are to be consistent. I see absolutely no difference between the two situations. It is true that these are large electoral districts. It is true that the constituents must be served. It is true that people must be provided with the best of services. There again, the minister contends that by establishing an additional electoral district in northern Ontario, this would not significantly lower the average representation but would allow for a better balance and Ontario would have an average population of 80,200 people per riding while Quebec has an average of 80,300 inhabitants per riding.

A fair provincial average would be achieved by adding one electoral district in northwestern Quebec. This would probably reduce the average per riding in the province of Quebec by about a hundred votes. However, this would resolve the geographical and physical problem one has to face. The Minister said a while ago that at a given point, we must consider, when accepting or adding a new constituency, the geographical aspects as well as the access to such places.

I think that if the Minister were to ask the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Gillespie) for maps of the provinces of both Quebec and Ontario, he would have an idea of the territory to be covered by only one or two members in northwestern Quebec. Finally it is unfortunate that the province of Quebec should be discriminated against in this matter. According to the figures, I am willing to admit that the report was incomplete and that it was not unanimous while the one concerning Quebec was unanimous. On the other hand, one thing is certain: in Ontario, or in northern Ontario, constituencies are much more flexible politically-speaking. While in northwestern Quebec, in the last 15 years, the people have voted exclusively for the Social Credit Party of Canada, and have never given any votes to the Liberal Party. And the commissioners were not appointed by the Social Crediters either. However, when we happened to discuss the matter with them, we felt that political implication.

I feel the minister would meet with approval if he included in his bill specific recognition that a new riding is required in northern Ontario, as well as the clear and specific addition of a new riding in northwestern Quebec. Thus, justice would really be done to the people of both areas. The addition of one riding in Quebec would certainly not upset the national representation profile nor the representativeness of each hon. member. But it would really solve the problem of the area to be covered and the capacity of representation of the hon. members. One does not have to wonder about the shape of the road in that part of the country. They have dirt roads and, in the case of the hon. member for Timiskaming (Mr. Peters), he will have to go around by train, while in northwestern Quebec there is not even a train, and air service is still inoperative. It must be that in the mind of the minister the hon. member elected in that part of the country would probably have to go around for a while riding a deer or a moose to visit the people. But that is not taken into consideration.

In closing, I ask the minister to take our requests into consideration and to combine with his bill, Bill C-421 introduced by the hon. member for Villeneuve (Mr. Caouette); then I feel the intentions or pronouncements of the minister will really mean something when he speaks of serving the people. And then only when the two bills are grouped, or at least when the minister has assured us that Bill C-421 introduced by the

hon. member for Villeneuve will also be accepted, then only will northwestern Quebec be adequately represented.

● (1600)

[*English*]

Hon. Robert Stanbury (York-Scarborough): Mr. Speaker, I am a city dweller, and too rarely in this House do we hear the point of view of urbanites expressed.

I think there is a great consciousness among Canadians wherever they live, that concessions must be made; that we must not insist absolutely on representation by population in a country as diverse and widespread as Canada. However, what has been said here today so far raises questions about the equity of our system of parliamentary representation, and about the trend represented by this bill and the one just referred to by the hon. member for Témiscamingue (Mr. Caouette). That trend seems to be away from recognition that Canada is increasingly an urban society. Whether we like it or not, that is the Canada of today and of the future. While all of us want to make every concession for the preservation of a feeling of identity by all Canadians with their country and with their national government, we must surely take care that in making these concessions to alleviate the disparities in Canada we do not ignore the strains which can be placed on our society by increasing disparity of political representation in our national institutions.

In introducing this bill the minister said that it is based on principle, and I hope that my remarks will be taken as being similarly based on principle. The minister made reference to the populations of various provinces and argued very cogently that Ontario is not over-represented, from the standpoint of population, under the present distribution of seats in this parliament or the proposed one. But he did not make a comparison between the populations of southern Ontario and northern Ontario, as he might have done, and I think it would assist hon. members if the minister were able to show that his bill would not increase the disparity of per capita representation which already exists between the more densely populated part of Ontario and the less densely populated part.

The minister made reference to the distances involved. I want to remind hon. members that, in the modern society in which we live, density can be as serious a factor as distance in alienating the population from its institutions. As those of us who live in the great cities of Canada know, there is such a thing as high-rise isolation. We know that it is often difficult for people in a densely populated part of a large city to feel close to their elected representative and to communicate with him, and it is hard for their representative, in turn, to communicate with his constituents.

The hon. member for Timiskaming (Mr. Peters) mentioned that there are distances of 1,000 or 1,400 miles between some small communities and the minister referred to the huge land mass of northern Ontario. We all recognize that is true of northern Ontario, northern Quebec, and other parts of Canada. The present law recognizes the difficulties in transportation, communication, and representation in such large land masses. However, I want to remind hon. members that we represent not land, but people. We are not called upon here to speak for acres—or perhaps hectares, after the metric system is in force—we are called upon to speak for our constituents who are people, and I ask hon. members to remember the constant whittling away of the principle of representation by population which we have seen in this House in recent times.

The system of redistribution is already biased against urban areas. One only has to look at the riding which I have had the honour to represent since I was first elected in 1965. Between 1965 and 1968, when a redistribution occurred my riding had in it the largest number of people of any riding in Canda. Since 1968, after a redistribution of seats, my riding has continued to have the largest number of people in it. Even after the redistribution, which is to take place at the next general election, the three ridings which will be created mainly from my present riding will still be among the largest of Canada's federal constituencies.

● (1610)

Not only does the present formula militate against the people of my area receiving adequate representation by population, but the law has been interpreted by the Electoral Boundaries Commission in Ontario in such a way as to prevent it from taking into account any projection of population. Given even the fairest of formulas, even if you accept the formula now in the law, there will occur some distortion in the representation of urban dwellers in a rapidly growing area, because the projection of population between periodic redistributions is not taken into account.

I did not rise to oppose this bill. I would not argue strenuously against the present bill or the one the hon. member for Villeneuve proposed. I think I speak for my constituents, the people of Toronto at large and urban dwellers of Canada generally, when I say we are prepared to make any concession which will keep this country united and allow people to identify strongly with Canada and its national government.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Stanbury: However, we are an urban society and becoming increasingly urbanized. Not even urban dwellers are entirely in favour of this trend. Personally, I wish it were otherwise. But when we speak in this House of representation, we are surely not speaking of spaces, of cities, or of distances in this country. Surely we speak of the people we represent. We must be conscious of this country's realities.

City dwellers do not insist on perfect justice, but they ask members of the House, when considering changes to electoral law to remember that we represent people and nothing else. If we remember this and do this, we shall avoid arousing in city dwellers the sense of isolation which is evident, in a political sense, in some of those living in the far reaches of our country, and we shall preserve in all our citizens their sense of identification with Canada, which is an objective we surely all share.

Ontario Representation

[*Translation*]

Mr. Adrien Lambert (Bellechasse): Mr. Speaker, we are considering an extremely important matter, not only for the residents of the province of Ontario, but also for the whole country, because until 1965 the distribution of electoral districts was the responsibility of Parliament and all governments in our history have tried to ensure fair representation for rural areas, accepting the fact that these areas had a lower density of population than urban centres.

We must still endeavour to maintain harmony in our country so that in all provinces, including the province of Quebec, Canadian citizens will be satisfied to have an equitable number of people representing them in the Canadian Parliament. Because Parliament has surrendered this responsibility through legislation, the task of establishing and redistributing electoral districts has been turned over to commissions. Today the government feels it should not have done that, as the minister mentioned in his speech, and should have kept its right to have the final word after the reports of these commissions have been submitted to the minister responsible for this issue.

And today the government feels obliged to intervene through a very special bill to give one more representative to the province of Ontario, on the basis of very logical arguments. However, if these arguments are logical in the case of Ontario, they are just as logical for the province of Quebec with regards to the Canadian northwest. Hon. members have had discussions about this issue long before today.

● (1620)

I had the opportunity myself to take part in discussions and there seemed to be an agreement on the fact that this should be done under the same bill for Ontario and Quebec. Today, we hear only rumours. As there was no official statement, we try to read the minds of hon. members from other provinces: if we allow Quebec another hon. member, an additional electoral district, other provinces will demand the same thing. I for one would like to hear evidence on this in Parliament and not behind the scene.

In any case, we should always apply good horse sense. The minister responsible for the Electoral Boundaries Act who sponsors the bill should perhaps give further consideration to this, and add provisions to ensure that Parliament regains control, that it has the last say in the distribution of electoral districts. I suggest this, in all fairness, concerning the Electoral Boundaries Act of our country.

Mr. Speaker, we have already dealt with the matter of area and population. In Quebec, the quota is roughly 80,000. As I said in this House on April 6, twelfth-graders could have done the same work as our distinguished judges. They simply had to add up the population according to the census and to distribute the population and then draw up boundaries. Indeed, this is how it was done in our province even though we made representations in all sincerity and even though ten members of Parliament signed a joint letter. We were unanimous; it was not a question of partisanship, but of justice and common sense. In my area, ten members signed a joint letter which was forwarded to the Quebec Commission but was not even acknowledged. I cannot understand this. The Commission was so engrossed in its powers that it did not even acknowledge the letter. They do their job and then, whether you like it or not, they submit their report. If you are not satisfied, that is too bad! I finally understood that this is what the commission meant.

Mr. Speaker, I heard the comments of the previous speaker a while ago and I thought that they did show real good sense; he said that people living in high-rise apartment buildings do not have as many chances of coming into contact with their representatives. They do not have as many opportunities as the people living in rural constituencies, but there is another side to the story. In rural constituencies, people in general know their representatives and arrange to meet them, and when we look at the map of any constituency, be it Abitibi, Villeneuve and Témiscamingue, which I know somehow better, or Bellechasse, which I know very well, we realize that the member of Parliament has to travel far and wide in order to meet his people. Whatever may be the number of inhabitants in a town or a municipal community, these people live there and they are entitled to the same consideration from their member as if the population were 2,000. This is how I understand my role as a member of Parliament. In the constituency of Bellechasse, there are 83,000 people. It is a rural constituency. There is only the city of Montmagny and the balance is made up of rural communities.

So under the act the commissioners had the authority to increase by up to 25 per cent the population in a rural riding, 25 per cent of the ratio set for the province, or to decrease that population by up to 25 per cent in rural ridings. So I wonder how they have considered the riding of Bellechasse, since rather than decrease its population, because it is a rural riding, they increased it. I understand that there again there is something to change in the Elections Act in order to adjust it better to the circumstances and needs of our country.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I would like to address particularly the Liberal members of the province of Quebec who now ensure the government majority. But I am not addressing those members as Liberal members but as representatives of Quebec ridings to ask them to support the claims we are now making for the province of Quebec, in northwest Quebec, so that an additional riding be provided in the same manner as it is done now with Bill C-60.

Miss Bégin: What about the Gaspé area?

Mr. Lambert (Bellechasse): Well, I think that the Gaspé area would want the same thing but you cannot have it everywhere. My colleague the hon. member for Rivière-du-Loup-Témiscouata (Mr. Gendron) knows quite well how I worked with him and all the others, all the efforts we made to try and preserve at least the riding of Rivière-du-Loup-Témiscouata, and my colleague is indicating that what I am telling you is the truth. So that is the way I would want things to be but I would not want to fight against an impossibility.

I would want to fight, I want to fight for a possibility, even if it means coming back a little later if the circumstances permit, but for the time being, what we are demanding, what we are asking is that the rights of the province of Quebec be protected and that this not become a matter of division in this country but a matter of union and harmony. And I consider that if in 1977 we really want to talk with assurance to the people of Quebec about harmony in Canada, we should start by ensuring that harmony through an act of Parliament which will give us authority to talk to our fellow-citizens in our own province. So I strongly urge the President of the Treasury Board (Mr. Andras), who is sponsoring Bill C-60 on the readjustment of the electoral districts in Ontario today, to show as much enthusiasm about a readjustment for the province of Quebec.

Mr. Rosaire Gendron (Rivière-du-Loup-Témiscouata): Mr. Speaker, I cannot remain silent on the occasion of the introduction of this bill since I represent one of the ridings that will disappear in the province of Quebec. And as the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Lambert) pointed out, it is a fact that all members from Lévis to Gaspé, irrespective of their political affiliation, signed a letter at the time of the debate in April asking that the riding of Rivière-du-Loup-Témiscouata be reinstated.

Obviously, one cannot remain silent in the face of this bill since it contains an important anomaly, namely that the whole readjustment of the electoral map was based on the premise that the province of Quebec was to be the standard on which the number of members in all other provinces would be determined. I think that nobody objects to the riding of Thunder Bay being reinstated but we would want the agreement to be maintained, that the province of Quebec should be the basis on which the number of seats in others provinces should be determined.

Then, consequently, it must definitely be accepted that there should be an additional riding in the province of Quebec. I would not want at this stage to put forth all the arguments that have been raised on this subject. I would like to tell my colleague for York-Scarborough (Mr. Stanbury) that members of this House definitely do not represent mere acres of land. They represent the people living on these acres of land and when people are widely scattered around there are bound to be enormous problems. When the last redistribution occured, the province of Quebec registered an increase of one riding but the Abitibi area lost one and the lower St. Lawrence area one, while the Montreal area gained two and the Quebec City area one.

However, one cannot ignore these regional disparities. One cannot ignore the wide diversity and the tremendous needs of these sparsely populated and underprivileged areas. I think that all the members representing urban areas will agree with me that when you cut 26 ridings out of one single municipality, things are indeed a lot easier, and a member needs half a day to walk through his whole riding, something we can hardly do in a year's time. In our case, the issues we have to deal with are much more diversified, and complex, ranging from sea port projects, to customs, forest problems, resource development and countless difficulties which are increasingly making the task of the member more difficult. Accordingly, we are not actually against the rebirth of the Thunder Bay constituency, I believe it is, but we want the redistribution to remain on the same equitable basis that had been used for the province of Quebec. And I think that if, this afternoon, all political parties can agree, we can do something about it although I do not know which particular procedure we should use.

Perhaps it would be wise to adjourn the debate so that there be some kind of an agreement, or some discussion? But I think that it would be easy to reach an agreement for a general consensus in order that Ontario may get an additional riding as well as Quebec. It might also be appropriate, since the member for Témiscamingue (Mr. Caouette) and the member for Bellechasse (Mr. Lambert) are far removed, especially in north western Quebec, if that riding were to be restored in the lower St. Lawrence area or in the Abitibi area, to reach an agreement between ourselves, in order to find a quick solution to this problem.

So, Mr. Speaker, I am taking the liberty of making this suggestion to the minister and to the leaders of the different parties in this House to the effect that we try and reach a concensus in order to solve this problem.

● (1630)

[*English*]

Mr. Cyril Symes (Sault Ste. Marie): Mr. Speaker, I want to express my support for this bill to restore 12 seats to northern Ontario. It should be pointed out that a minority report of the Electoral Boundaries Commission argued that because of the size of these northern constituencies and the difficulty encountered by members of parliament in serving constituents in these vast areas, larger constituencies should not be created in northern Ontario but that the number of seats remain as it was prior to the most recent redistribution, that is, 12.

I know it is the unanimous feeling of people in northern Ontario that the regions should not lose seats. Incidentally, the distribution proposal affects the people in my constituency of Sault Ste. Marie by drawing a line arbitrarily across the northern part of the city and putting part of the riding into the riding of Algoma. This proposition met with great objection from the electors of Sault Ste. Marie who argued, quite properly, that they had nothing in common with Algoma and wished to keep the riding of Sault Ste. Marie intact.

I have listened intently to the representations made by hon. members in the Creditiste party. I believe they have a valid point. They, like us, have vast areas to cover, and the current distribution has prejudiced their ability to serve their constituents adequately.

I sometimes hear from people who are somewhat suspicious about what the government is doing. They wonder whether the Liberal government would have gone to the trouble of restoring this one seat to northern Ontario if that seat had not been held by a Liberal. The fact that a similar measure was not made available to the people of northern Quebec will, no

doubt, strengthen the suspicions to which I have referred. However, the bill before us now concerns only the situation in northern Ontario. I fully support it and I hope it is passed, recognizing at the same time the legitimate grievances of the Creditiste members from northern Quebec. I hope the government will give us some kind of commitment that their representation will be restored. They, too, have lost a seat in northern Quebec. I know our party would be in favour of such a commitment, though I have yet to hear from the Conservative party what their reaction would be to a commitment to restore the number of seats in our neighbouring province. I hope my colleagues who understand the difficulty of serving vast northern ridings will look favourably upon this bill and, likewise, on the arguments raised by the members of the Creditiste party.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Armand Caouette (Villeneuve): Mr. Speaker, first I do not want to blame the President of the Treasury Board for having introduced today Bill C-60 in order that the House of Commons may give Ontario a better representation for its northern population, because they stand to lose an electoral district just as we did in northwestern Quebec. As the minister said, I know that he wants the population of northern Ontario to be fairly represented by a man who will give good service to the people in that area. Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to note today that the New Democratic Party supports our position as well as some Liberal members.

I also hope, as was already mentioned, that the minister will manage somehow to include Bill C-421 that I sponsor and thus grant northwestern Quebec the same privilege he is asking for people from northern Ontario, namely that the people from northwestern Quebec may be represented adequately in this House. Mr. Speaker, I would like to give the reasons which prompt us to ask the minister to include in his legislation Bill C-421. It is for the simple reason that at present I have a very large area to cover. Someone quoted earlier the words spoken by the Prime Minister at the time of the death of our leader, Mr. André Fortin, when he came to extend his sympathy to Mr. Fortin's family.

● (1640)

Last week I had to go not even to the limit of my riding, I could say three quarters of the way to the limit. When I left from here, from Ottawa, I had 250 miles to drive before reaching my riding and from my home I still had 275 miles to go to meet people who needed my services and, during the same weekend, I had to come back home and go to the other end of my riding which is 100 miles farther. The new readjustment of electoral boundaries, if I am lucky enough to be reelected at the next election as member for Villeneuve, puts me in a situation where only in car mileage from my home to the farthest limit of my riding there are 1,400 miles. I explained that to many hon. members on both sides of the House and they understood the claims I was making.

As I was saying a moment ago, maybe the Prime Minister thought about it, and it is perhaps the best reason for asking the House to adopt this bill with maybe an amendment which would also provide for another riding in northwest Quebec.

When we met the Prime Minister in the funeral home, he told us that ridings of that size were ridiculous. They too have large ridings in their party and they also have to travel through them. When we leave here we are not exhausted but very tired and we still have to drive hundreds of miles to go back to our ridings and then there are yet enormous distances to cover.

When I will be in my new riding—which will be called Abitibi—I will want to give my constituents what they expect from their representative, and I must consider going from my home to a locality which is not the most remote but where there are 4,500 people. I believe those 4,500 people have the right to be fairly represented, they are entitled to receiving the service they can expect from their member, from Val-d'Or to Fort George, the municipality which presently has the largest population and which is over 700 miles away from my home. As my colleague from Bellechasse (Mr. Lambert) and the hon. member for Témiscamingue (Mr. Caouette) said earlier, how can one man adequately serve the people in such circumstances without exhausting himself?

Of course, we have also had a commission referred to earlier by the minister. A great number of people and organizations appeared before that commission to show the judge how ridiculous it was to bring the number of northwestern Quebec constituencies down to two. As an illustration, the CERDAT made tremendous representations, but the commission ignored them. Boards of trade, municipalities, mayors, town councils all appeared. I myself and the hon. member for Abitibi (Mr. Laprise) repeatedly urged the commissioners to try and give the people in north western Quebec an opportunity as allowed by statute to have their own elected representatives while meeting the criteria. Admittedly the commission relied on the 1971 census. At that time, with the redistribution of electoral boundaries, the 1971 census gave Témiscamingue an 83,667 population, and Abitibi an 88,164 population.

And here, I would like to ask hon. members to listen carefully to the remarks I want to make. The riding of Abitibi will have 88,164 constituents under the new electoral redistribution. There was a mistake because during the 1971 census, as the hon. member for Témiscamingue (Mr. Caouette) said so eloquently, James Bay did not exist. And before taking part in the debate on the bill before us, I got some information from Statistics Canada—and everybody could get it—about the number of people there were in the ridings of Témiscamingue and of Abitibi according to the last census which was recorded in June last. One must also include the riding of Villeneuve.

According to Statistics Canada, Mr. Speaker, in the last 1976 census there was a population of 57,739 in Abitibi, 52,810 in Témiscamingue and 61,897 in Villeneuve. James Bay had 4,500 residents, and according to Statistics Canada, there can be a rate of error, considering the time in which the survey took place—that is during the holidays—the number of people who did not answer, of about 1½ per cent to 2 per cent. Therefore, I have taken this 2 per cent error rate into account

which means that some 3,500 people would not have been declared during this census, and therefore we would have about 182,526 people to represent in northwestern Quebec.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we had a population of 171,831 in 1971. If you divide this number by three, you get exactly 57,265 people to be represented by three members. If you add those who were not included in the 1971 census and who are still there today, it amounts to between 7,000 and 10,000 people more. And if you refer to the end of this Parliament's mandate we will have a population of 15,000 for James Bay alone. I believe those people, even though they were not accounted for in the 1971 census, are also entitled to be represented by a member of parliament who is efficient in the House of Commons. Of course, the new electoral redistribution does not satisfy them, but I know with some goodwill—and at least several members have demonstrated theirs this afternoon—the government will adopt Bill C-421 to give a new riding to northwestern Quebec.

Mr. Speaker, I could also be mean to the government, but this is not my intention. We could have mentioned ridings like Matane, which has 63,000 people, Mercier which covers about one square mile and has 67,000 people, Lac-Saint-Jean, represented by the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion (Mr. Lessard), with a population of 67,200, Gaspé, with 60,481 people, and ourselves, according to the 1971 statistics, as I said earlier, we have 57,265 people for three members of parliament, or three ridings in northwestern Quebec. Now, Mr. Speaker, what more do we need? If we want to give some representation to James Bay, as I said earlier, we even have enough people to have three ridings.

● (1650)

But if we compare with 1971, there are about 2,500 to 3,000 fewer people in each constituency. Earlier, I heard the hon. member for Témiscamingue (Mr. Caouette) say how long a letter can take to go from the far end of the future Abitibi riding to Ottawa to make representations to the government for a new constituency. For my part, last winter, I went to James Bay and, unfortunately, I had to remain two days more than I had planned because of a storm, since the planes could not take off. As the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Lambert) said, I would like to give more to other areas because some have very large populations and I would like us to pass a measure in order to help these people who represent large populations and must travel great distances from one end of large ridings to another.

Mr. Speaker, my colleague who now represents the Abitibi riding also has one of the largest constituencies in the country. It may not be the largest, but it is one of the largest in the country. His riding nearly reaches up to the North Pole. This member has done fantastic work to represent his constituents, but if this same man also had to represent in addition to his own riding part of mine, that is Val d'Or, Lebel-sur Quévillon, Senneterre and Chibougamau, he would have to travel even more than at the present time since his home is even further than mine. In conclusion, I want to say that I have great confidence in the President of the Treasury Board (Mr. Andras), who wants to give fair representation to northern Ontario. He will certainly do everything he can, as said the hon. member for Rivière-du-Loup-Témiscouata (Mr. Gendron), to try to negotiate with all the other House leaders, so that he and his constituents can be well represented and also that north western Quebec can be fairly represented in the House of Commons.

Mr. C. A. Gauthier (Roberval): Mr. Speaker, I would like to add a few comments to what has already been said concerning the representation suggested in this bill. I believe that the whole problem now caused by these redistributions came about when Parliament decided that it would no longer be responsible for the redistribution of electoral boundaries and handed over the work it had always done to a commission. Since then, and especially in the last ten years, we have suffered somewhat from the sickness of bureaucracy.

I do not know whether this is because we are lazy and do not want to take on extra work or because we do not wish to accept responsibility for our many mistakes, and this legislation is a mistake. But if we keep going this way, we will soon realize that we are referring to committees important parts of our work which, as members of Parliament, we should feel responsible for. As I said on other occasions, we are creating a politically irresponsible government, because those who do our work are not responsible to the people, they have not been elected by them to do that work. This does not mean by any stretch of imagination that those people are not competent. All I say is that we are entrusting them with powers and an authority that we should be exercising right here in this Parliament.

When the government set up that commission, they should have at least retained some control, and this is the objection I have to that commission. At least the government should have allowed members of parliament to make representations to the commissioners. I myself had problems with them, but I was told there was no way, I was 10 days late. Can you imagine that, when a member of parliament comes to discuss serious problems in his area, when subdivisions are made contrary to the constituency interests. It is an easy matter for a technician to sit down at his desk, pick up a map, draw a line here, another there, and so on, and the hell with the rest! But there is something more to it. The economic structure, the economic nerve center in each riding must be considered. With the last subdivision hon. members will have to cover constituencies whose nerve center is in another riding. This is beyond the imagination. Who could have thought this would ever happen?

A constituency with all unemployment insurance offices and other agencies, in someone else's area, this is what I have been given without regard for my constituents needs. An area which I used to cover, was thrown into another riding, but the people still go on dealing in my own constituency. So I have to serve them just the same, because I will not force them to drive 50 or 75 miles to the constituency where they were put by the commissioners. This is not their fault, so I serve more than 10 or 12 communities outside my own area. What else can we do

if we want to remain human in an unhuman set up? This is what I have always been blaming the commission for, like all other commissions. They do not see beyond the Act. This is what they were appointed for. For them, members of Parliament are nothing but numbers. I suggest that the minister will finally put a stop to that and give the responsibility back to members of Parliament, who will be able to draw lines that will be fair to all the people in our constituencies.

● (1700)

Quite often, they even went as far as to tell me: Well, if we had included those municipalities, the boundary line would not have been straight. Just imagine, Mr. Speaker, there would have been a curve on the electoral map. Well, Mr. Speaker, we hear arguments as stupid as that! That is why I say this legislation must be recalled so that we can stop being the laughing stock of our riding.

People say: How come you have no authority in this regard? Because we have delegated our authority. We have given it to three people who are in charge of administration on a national scale. Whether you like it or not, we have done it and there is nothing we can do about it. Well, I disagree. I had undertaken—and this is the best opportunity I have had to do it—to denounce not the commissioners but the procedure that was followed and the mistake that was made of leaving a job we should have performed in the hands of people who are not concerned with the responsibilities of our ridings. If we go back to the old system, should the constituents have someone to blame, they will know who is to blame. They say: Who is responsible? We tell them to write to the commissioner, that we have no responsibility in this regard. They ask: Why have you been elected? I must answer: We have been elected to delegate our responsibilities. Because with the government's proposals things are not easy and you know that opposing a bill when the majority is in favour of it is a loss of time. In the past, I thought that the government would at least keep some control. Things would not have been so bad, if the government had kept some final control, a right of veto so to speak, but they did not, they gave up everything. And today, I think that we could be held responsible when confronted with such a problem in several ridings, because we did not think the matter over enough.

Now, as far as this bill is concerned, I, of course, am not opposing it. Far from opposing it, I want two similar bills if we are to finally do justice and rectify the mistake that was made. The government has finally decided to put a bill forward in an attempt to do justice to northern Ontario, but let us do the same for another region in which the same or even worse conditions prevail as in northern Ontario, when you think that there is such a riding as the one of the hon. member for Villeneuve (Mr. Caouette) who spoke earlier, and that to cover it he will have to drive 1200 to 1400 miles. Now, with the new district there will be 89,000 people in that riding; try to cover 14,000 miles with 89,000 constituents, you will see. Try to serve a population such as this. This is nonsense. It was one in Ontario, they proved it to us but it is even more nonsensical in Quebec.

[Mr. Gauthier (Roberval).]

Do you think that people know this, that they are aware of this. They tell us—and I would not like to be told this myself—that in Ontario, those after the riding are all Liberals, and we have three Creditist ridings. Well, be careful. If the people are aware this could turn into political quibbling, and I would not like it. What we want is justice, we want everyone to be treated equally, to the best of our knowledge, by correcting most of the errors. What else can you do? It is done. By correcting most of our errors, and I think that if we are intelligent, if we accept at least these two large territories, I think that I would not be ashamed to speak tomorrow in my riding about Canadian unity, but I would be rather ashamed to speak against it. It is all very well to make speeches on Canadian unity, but when we do otherwise we try to destroy Canada.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the minister to think twice about this matter because, as the hon. member for Rivière-du Loup-Témiscouata (Mr. Gendron) said a while ago, if Quebec has been taken as a reference to determine the average riding population, it should be adhered to in a bill such as the one now before us. We want the first agreements to be complied with as well as the 20 or 25 per cent variation between remote and urban areas.

Mr. Speaker, there are basic and humanitarian matters which cannot be ignored. To whatever party we may belong, there are humanitarian matters which cannot be disregarded and which are non-negotiable. And the matter which concerns us is one of these; it is a humanitarian matter.

Even if these constituents live 1,500 miles away from here, there are entitled to the same rights, the same services as those in larger cities, such as Ottawa, Montreal, Quebec, Toronto and others. Indeed, they are entitled to the same rights and their representatives are entitled to have the same opportunities to provide them with the same services. I express once again my concern about the redistribution of electoral seats across Canada. The minister just said that very few people seem satisfied. It is an understatement, because everybody is dissatisfied. Nobody is satisfied with this solution.

A while ago, I listened to the hon. member for Matane, and he was absolutely right when he spoke about Rivière-du-Loup. But, as in a number of other areas, we have been able to negotiate somewhat, because they wanted to take a riding away from the Saguenay-Lac-St-Jean district. We finally made our point after many discussions, the four members involved working together, so that we were spared a certain redistribution. But I repeat that the territories are badly delineated. If with the same population, an average of some 62,000, 63,000 or 67,000 people, they had allowed us to show them where the lines should be drawn to maintain the economic entities of concern to the people, nothing would have been changed and everybody would have been satisfied. But no! They finally allowed us to keep our constituencies, but they are the ones who drew the lines, and abominable ones at that. Everybody says that they are ridiculous; yet, the commissioners said: Draw the lines, now is the time. But one cannot even draw a line on the paper.

Mr. Speaker, I ask again the minister and all party leaders to put politics aside, use their common sense and, I should add, take up the challenge today, so that we may prove to the Canadian people that, even if there are four parties in the House, we can act sincerely and humanely and recognize the needs of all regions and, moreover, in spite of all the mistakes which have been made, that we can still correct at least most of them. Finally, I hope that in the future this Electoral Boundaries Commission will be made up of members of parliament, if you please, Mr. Speaker. I want us take our responsibilities.

● (1710)

Mr. Gérard Laprise (Abitibi): Mr. Speaker, as I am quite concerned by the discussion now going on about Bill C-60, although this bill does not meet the purpose of this discussion in the true sense of the word, I want to speak for a moment or two to give my opinion on Bill C-60.

I listened to the speeches of most members, and I heard the hon. member for York-Scarborough (Mr. Stanbury) say that members do not represent regions or territories, but people. Mr. Speaker, I agree on that. But if we consider how the population moved in a number of years in Canada, we realize that in a few years, the rural area will be underrepresented in the Canadian Parliament.

I read recently a report saying that in the year 2000, Canada will have a population of about 30 million inhabitants, of which 20 million will live in about 15 cities. That means that 10 million people, that is only one third, will live in rural or semi-rural areas. But, the way things are shaping, it is quite obvious that people living in rural areas are going to be under-represented in the House of Commons. I think Parliament should take steps to protect these rural people who are taxpayers and deserve to be represented at the same level as anybody else in Canada.

When we look at the difference between people living in areas such as Montreal, Quebec City, Toronto or Vancouver, and people living in rural areas, there is no possible comparison. In urban areas, they all enjoy administrative services. They only have to go around the corner and they come face to face with federal as well as provincial and municipal administrative agencies, whereas in rural districts, people have to travel miles and miles to be provided with the same services. Let us consider, for instance, the situation which prevails in Matagami, a mining town in the northern section of my constituency. When people have to go to the UIC office, they must go to Val-d'or. And that is over 200 miles away. So those people are disadvantaged compared to urban residents when they want to go and discuss their problems with executive officers of the federal government.

As for Canada manpower centres, it is again about the same thing, 115 miles from Matagami to Amos to go to a manpower office. No comparison is possible with urban residents. The riding I now represent, Abitibi, is the second largest riding in Canada. The largest is the riding of the Northwest Territories, and the second largest is Abitibi, which is larger than the Yukon, larger than the four Maritime provinces combined, larger than France as well as many other European countries besides France: that is how large is Abitibi. Between Noranda North and Sugluk, there is a distance of 985 miles. Of course, we cannot get there by car, there is no road suitable for motor vehicles to go up there. We have to go by plane: you know when you go there but you never know when you come back.

My colleague for Villeneuve (Mr. Caouette) said before that he once was stranded there for two days before he could come back, and this has been my personal experience at Grande Baleine, when I had to wait until the temperature got somewhat better so I could come back. However, Mr. Speaker, distances are a factor in rural ridings; I mentioned mine but there are many others which, while not quite so large and so spread out are still nevertheless huge ridings. This should be taken into account and the residents of those rural ridings have the same right as urban dwellers. I insist that such circumstances must be taken into account. And when the commissioner travelled through these regions to get the opinion of these people, when the study for electoral redistribution was carried out, I wonder if these trips were made seriously or if they were only a face saving device, because proposals made by such organizations as CERDAT in northwestern Quebec and by the Union of County Councils, had been highly spoken of, but in any event their recommendations have not been taken into account, it all sounded beautiful but nothing positive came out of it.

Then, Mr. Speaker, we were all led to wonder what they were trying to get at with this. What CERDAT was indeed asking for was representation for three ridings in northwestern Quebec. The present situation, Mr. Speaker, is that Bill C-60 recommends that we maintain those 12 ridings which already existed in northwestern Ontario. My colleague for Villeneuve (M. Caouette) tabled a bill to maintain the three ridings in northwestern Quebec, and I think that to be fair minded, the minister who introduced Bill C-60 should agree to grant the same privilege to northern Quebec so that it gets the same representation it had before the last redistribution.

Mr. Speaker, if one cannot but agree that the present representation was calculated according to the average population shown from the 1971 census, it is a fact that within the Abitibi riding things have changed since. There has been the James Bay hydroelectric development and there must be at least an extra 6,000 persons who now live in that area, either as residents or as workers. It is likely that they do not want to take this fact into account now, but in 1981 they will probably say that they are going to add a riding in northwestern Quebec because the population increased. And by 1981 they will realize that the construction will end within the decade. Then chances are we will come back in 1991 and scratch that riding from northwestern Quebec because the population will have decreased and we will play this way with representation of an area. Mr. Speaker, other members made representations, not only Social Credit members in this House, but members from other parties, urging the minister to reconsider his bill and

extend the same privilege to the ridings in northwestern Quebec.

Mr. Gilbert Rondeau (Shefford): Mr. Speaker, when the new electoral map was tabled in this House, several of my colleagues and I took part in this important debate and we blamed the commission for many things. Today, the bill under study, Bill C-60, gives evidence that we were right at least for Ontario, because the government itself recognizes that the work of the commission maybe did not take into account all valid considerations concerning northern Ontario. Now, the government would want to have a bill adopted to correct a bad distribution.

● (1720)

We, Social Crediters, agree in this respect with the government as far as northern Ontario is concerned, because the government recognizes today that perhaps the readjustments made by the commission were wrong mainly and especially—I believe it is the main argument made by the government—because of a bad redistribution, taking into account the geography of northern Ontario. I personally know this area fairly well and I can imagine and I admit it is extremely difficult to have an equitable representation in northern Ontario, a representation that would be as flexible as in some other ridings in other areas of the country.

That is why the President of the Treasury Board (Mr. Andras) wants us to pass this bill. On the other hand, the same situation occurs in the province of Quebec, and this is the point we want to make during this debate. If the government forces this bill down our throats to make us accept a bad situation in Ontario, it will be very ill advised, I think, if it does not take into consideration a similar situation due to geographical reasons in northern Quebec, or more specially in the area better known as Abitibi.

The President of the Treasury Board said at the outset that he was making this statement in the House today not for purposes of expediency but rather for the sake of principle. I agree that at the time of redistribution of electoral ridings in Canada we were motivated by principles rather than by political expediency. But the very principles that are worthwhile in Ontario are also valid in Quebec, particularly at a time when we, Social Crediters, think that national harmony, or as the government would rather call it, national unity, is in great danger.

I think this bill would seem to grant Ontario privileges which are not considered for Quebec when normally it should not be a privilege for either Quebec or Ontario. It would be correcting a situation because the Commission, as the hon. member for Roberval (Mr. Gauthier) suggested, acted very badly in many cases. It is disconcerting to see that—and the readjustment of federal districts is not the only instance—the bureaucracy always has the last word and today we are losing part of the day intended for the business of the House in an effort to rectify a situation pertaining to a riding or a province that was improperly treated, or if you want, whose electoral boundaries were badly distributed.

It is always the same thing, Mr. Speaker; bills come to this House, decisions come to this House, which have not—or almost never, we are not here to shoot the breeze—been discussed and approved by the members of this House. Unfortunately, in financial matters and then in all other fields, bureaucrats take the initiative, write the bills, make the decisions, introduce the bills in this House and the majority vote for what the bureaucrats decide. We all know it by experience, we pass a piece of legislation in good faith and with good intentions but later on when we look at it and we look at the regulations that public servants enacted, thought out, came up with and which were accepted by the Cabinet and the minister concerned, we no longer recognize the original legislation. Unfortunately, we are trying to make believe that our Canadian government is still a democratic government when, admittedly, our democracy has nearly become a monumental farce. The only redeeming thing is that the people are not aware of it.

The population still believes that its elected representatives make nearly all the decisions, when they actually decide next to nothing either in the economic field or in the field of finance. We are now faced with a small problem, that of delineating the boundaries of our own ridings. This work is left to the bureaucracy. A city five miles from the largest city in my riding, with a population of 45,000 people, has been added to the neighbouring constituency. On the other hand, a city 75 miles away has been added to mine. This is completely nonsensical. They want to get rid of the lakes to go to another place when the village that used to belong to my constituency is serviced by the eastern townships highway which goes through my constituency, and we now have to make a long detour or to go by canoe if we want to take more time and take a more direct route.

Mr. Speaker, these are the completely ridiculous aspects of bureaucracy, as was said earlier by the hon. member for Roberval (Mr. Gauthier), the hon. member for Abitibi (Mr. Laprise) and the hon. member for Villeneuve (Mr. Caouette). Once again, we have relinquished our authority. Not only have we relinquished our authority as members of parliament, but the federal government has also taken over the authority of provinces in another field. It does not concern the bill now before the House, Bill C-60, but in all areas, we have mixed up apples with oranges, we have mixed up the provincial, municipal and federal levels, and now we are ready to interfere with provincial rights in the field of education.

Mr. Speaker, with such confusion in the federal administration and the redistribution of constituencies, there are people who in the past two elections have believed themselves to be in one riding while they were in another. They wonder for whom to vote. Why? Because advertising is badly coordinated in this area. Some people come to the Longueuil office about unemployment insurance problems when they should go to the Sherbrooke office.

There are people in Saint-Césaire who go to the Montreal office for their tax returns, instead of going to Sherbrooke. And in my riding it is no worse than in others, the situation is

quite the same everywhere. In those parishes located on the boundary of ridings, like in Saint-Hyacinthe for instance, people keep coming to see me because they got used to going to Shefford to get services provided by the federal government.

Well, this riding was removed, it was included in the county of Chambly during an election, it was moved to Shefford during another election, it was taken from Shefford in the course of another electoral redistribution and was returned to the riding of Saint-Hyacinthe. They are making fun of the people, because they think in terms of percentage. There is no problem in Canada, there is no unemployment problem, they think in terms of percentage.

They only rely on the figures of the manpower centres as regards percentages, when everyone knows perfectly well that all unemployed are not necessarily registered in the manpower centre and that they are not included either in the percentages of the unemployed, as the federal government tries to have us believe every time new statistics are released.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that in the particular context of Quebec, of Ontario and of Canada as a whole, the present argument is as follows: One wonders what will become of our country. We should not take too many steps at the present time to back up separatists, following an electoral redistribution which may be wrong, I admit, which may involve big mistakes, that is true, because there is a mistake in some area and they want to correct it in Ontario and are not prepared to do the same for Quebec. If they are not prepared to do the same in the province of Quebec, they can bloody well leave us in peace with national unity. This will be a sham! Why? Because the exact opposite will have been done of the words that were spoken. Unfortunately, that happens too often in this House. We are told one thing while the opposite is done. But to readjust ridings after an electoral redistribution has barely been completed—it became official just a few months ago—is to take advantage of a disorganized situation, I would say under the circumstances, to favour Ontario. Why? Because both the province of Ontario and the province of Quebec are poorly redistributed.

● (1730)

If readjustments are made in Ontario and not in Quebec, Ontario is enjoying a privilege, and national harmony then becomes but an empty word. If the same cannot be done for Quebec, then let us forget the whole thing and have elections according to the electoral map decided upon by the commissioners. As for us, Social Crediters, I inform the minister responsible for this bill that we are willing to pass it so that it can be referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections, provided the minister gives prime consideration to national harmony over electoral redistribution, especially as we are on the eve of a federal election the theme of which will be national unity.

It seems to me to be quite normal for the minister to accept that, not as a concession but as a logical fact since Quebec, in the process of the new electoral redistribution, lost one riding; it goes without saying that northern Ontario also loses one because northwestern Quebec has lost one. Under those circumstances, the minister should accept Bill C-421 and readjust the respresentation for Quebec while doing justice to Ontario as he should, as he explained very well in this House; while doing at the same time what we preach, that is advocating national harmony for the Crediters and national unity for the Liberals.

So, Mr. Speaker, we agree on this bill being referred to the committee provided the minister assures us that Bill C-421 will also be taken into consideration by the committee with a view to making a correction and readjustment in Quebec as well as in Ontario.

I think that with these arguments we could perhaps for once say that bureaucrats have been corrected, the bureaucrats did not tell us to do everything and that if they make mistakes we are here to correct them.

Mr. Speaker, since I know northern Ontario very well, I would like to see an additional district in Ontario because of the geographical situation. Considering also that I know very well the situation in northwestern Quebec, I would like the minister and particularly the government to consider the situation of northwestern Quebec on the same footing, not in a privileged way, not out of opportunism, but as a matter of principle for both Quebec and Ontario. I would like the minister to give us this guarantee so that we can be sure that both bills will be duly considered by the Committee on Privileges and Elections so that when the bill comes back to the House we could consider both ridings or both areas and give justice to Ontario and Quebec.

Mr. Claude Tessier (Compton): Mr. Speaker, I will speak briefly, but I wish to take this opportunity to endorse some principles, from whatever side of the House they may originate. I would like to say that when it is said that service to the people goes beyond statistics, I endorse that principle and I will gladly work to that end every time I can possibly do so. I would like also, when reference is made to the readjustment of electoral boundaries, that the work of a member of Parliament be clearly understood. I think that the death of the leader of the Social Credit Party of Canada a few weeks ago is a case in point. We should not merely take this opportunity to mention it, but I hope that actually it will be a lesson for all hon. members and that they will act accordingly. I also wish now to speak for the members from rural areas.

I should like the Commission to know that campaigning is not an impossible art, but that it should take place under normal conditions, and this applies also and especially to rural ridings. The Commission should also take special circumstances into consideration, because it tried to establish a statistical rule to the effect that rural ridings are not high density areas. A fact remains: the costs involved in election campaigns in rural ridings are causing us extreme difficulties. I should like also to support those who say that civil servants or the bureaucracy should not depolarize our ridings. Such a bureaucratic procedure I feel should be corrected, because ridings are social entities which should be respected.

I would also like to sound the alarm against statistics and the bureaucracy. Some people predict the disappearance of the rural ridings. As far as I am concerned, I think that the future lies in the rural ridings and that one day they will put statistics to rest. I think that this is another matter of government responsibility to leave people where they are in conditions that they accept and which are acceptable. I agree with the adjustments proposed by the minister and I think that if such adjustments apply outside Ontario, they should hold in the province of Quebec or in any other province.

On the other hand, I would like to warn hon. members opposite. I would like them to know that when they give the impression that we, on the government side, are inveterate public persecutors, that we are always against the little man, I have to disagree because, in my opinion, I can easily be a Liberal member while respecting all the basic liberties and even low density areas.

I would like to add that it is not enough to say that we must not play politics but we must act accordingly. I listened earlier to the charges made by the hon. member for Villeneuve (Mr. Caouette) about this or that riding, the riding of this or that minister or member who may have a different image, and I think that is playing politics, and as long as I am in this House, I say to hon. members that I will oppose vigorously that kind of allegation.

For once, I fully agree with the hon. member for Shefford (Mr. Rondeau) who says that some things can and must be held against the Commission. I think this is true and this debate is a glaring proof of it. I hope also that the new adjustments will give us concrete evidence that it is possible to correct if not the mistakes of the bureaucracy at least the adjustments which appear to be necessary. Therefore, let us recondition our bureaucracy, and I say it again, I am ready to work at it. In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I accept the adjustments proposed by the minister, but let all hon. members—and I think that is the purport of the proposal submitted by members opposite—let all members for the same good reasons, provided they are voiced and known, I say, let them decide.

However, and I repeat it, I am against those who say that we on the government side are always persecuting small underprivileged areas. If genuine and positive solutions are provided for the actual problems, I personally, will be ready to give my support. I will vote for the motion moved by the hon. minister. And I will even say to the hon. member for Villeneuve and his immediate neighbours that I am ready for it, and that if the vote were taken here and now, I would willingly support their proposal, because it is a common sense proposal, and I for one, as a member even on the government side, I am ready to vote for common sense. I also want people to know that honesty and sincerity are not to be found in only one party, but for as long as I sit in this House, if something has to be done with honesty and sincerity, I will always be on that side.

[*English*]

Mr. Howard Johnston (Okanagan-Kootenay): Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of astonishment, amazement, and regret that I participate in this debate this afternoon. It is utterly incredible for an institution that purports to be managing a country as civilized and developed as Canada not to have settled for the next ten years or so, in a decision made in the last session of this parliament, the number of seats of which the next parliament is to be composed.

There was a great deal of debate on the issue at that time. We moved to a different method and a new approach to looking at the whole business of dividing up the pie that is Canada according to its provinces and territories. After all that debate, rhetoric, battling in committee, and the efforts of members opposite from British Columbia in particular to obtain justice for that province with regard to this distribution, we now have this bill before this parliament at this time. I find it absolutely incredible.

● (1740)

I find it incredible that the Solicitor General (Mr. Fox) could go on television and berate the opposition for causing delay in getting government legislation through and then find, in the last days of this parliament, time being devoted to such a bill as this. It only shows the extent to which the government cares for the reputation of the Solicitor General as one who makes any sense at all when he talks to the Canadian people.

Last session we decided, after all the effort I have outlined, that the size of parliament should be increased from 264 to 282. It should be remembered that under the old rules British Columbia was going to get 26 members out of 264. When I came back here I was astonished to find that a formula had been presented which would increase the size of parliament to 280 and that British Columbia, which has grown faster than any other province in this country, was going to have just 26 members in the larger House. It was at that point I joined battle in an effort to do something about redistribution, aided by my hon. friend from Calgary Centre who also came from a rapidly growing province and was concerned about what was happening under the formula. After discussion, we set out finally a schedule which gave Ontario 95 seats and Quebec 75 seats. I have every sympathy with the argument which has been made by the—

[*Translation*]

—members from La Belle Province de Québec today because I know that the redistribution formula for the province of Ontario and the province of Quebec is exactly the same as for the great provinces of Canada. If you want to change the situation in Ontario, you must absolutely change it in Quebec.

[*English*]

Nova Scotia, 11; New Brunswick, 10; Manitoba, 14; British Columbia, 28; Northwest Territories, 2. I do not think anybody in the House denies the need for an extra seat for the Northwest Territories bearing in mind the inhuman task which is given to the member who represents that region. Yukon Territory, 1; Prince Edward Island, 4. We know we can never have a one man one vote situation in Canada as long as we abide by the rules which establish a base below which provinces cannot fall in terms of representation. I am not quarrel-

ling with that situation. Saskatchewan, 14; Alberta, 21; Newfoundland, 7, making a grand total of 282.

There were many in this House who had serious reservations about increasing the number of members to 282 bearing in mind all the extra costs and all the adjustments which would have to be made. Yet here we have a bill bringing the number to 283, and we know that if this is done it will be necessary to add one more from Quebec and another from the West, one here and another there. Mr. Speaker, members opposite have opened the box, they have taken the lid off a can of worms by bringing such a bill before parliament at this time.

I can understand the despair of Ontario members from any party which represents the north of the province. One has only to pick up the parliamentary guide and look at the figures from the 1974 election. I am not concerned about who was elected. It is simply a matter of record that in 1974, for instance, it took only 9,362 votes to elect a friend of mine, the peerless member for Broadview (Mr. Gilbert). In Spadina, it took 9,273 to elect its member, and in Trinity it took 10,683 to elect a member. I am casting no aspersions on any of these members. Then one goes into the north of Ontario where the problems of transportation and the severity of the winter must all be taken into consideration, and we find that in Sudbury it took over 23,000 votes to elect a member there, that in Parry Sound-Muskoka it took 14,030 votes, in Nickel Belt it took over 17,000, and in Lanark-Renfrew-Carleton it took 18,000 votes to elect a member. Mr. Speaker, why should it take almost twice as many votes to elect a member in northern Ontario as it does in the heart of Toronto? This is a quarrel many members of parliament have always had with the formula. But it is one which should be taken up with the commission. One can only assume that the commission was composed solely of hacks and flunkeys appointed by the government—

Some hon. Members: Oh!

Mr. Johnston: Members opposite cannot argue against that description, otherwise they would not have brought in this bill. The bill before us is a most damning criticism of the commission and of the redistribution. I have every sympathy with members of the New Democratic Party who favoured non-political commissions. Whatever some members thought about it, the decision was made by this parliament long ago. The first commission in British Columbia gave us Okanagan-Kootenay—I have not had too much regard personally for them ever since. But if we are going to change the principle and go back to the old business of gerrymandering, if we are going to revert to the practice of people in back rooms dividing up a province, let us at least be honest about it and bring in a bill which does that. But do not damn the commission, and do not damn the system by bringing a bill such as this before parliament.

I will read a few more statistics. in Sudbury the person who came second received 13,200 votes. In Parry Sound-Muskoka the person who came second polled 11,000 votes. In Nickel Belt the person who came second polled 13,000 votes, and in Lanark-Renfrew-Carleton the person who came second polled 13,000 votes. So there is a situation in which you can come in second in Northern Ontario and still have thousands more votes than it takes to win in downtown Toronto. That is where the scandal lies and that is the problem the commission should have rectified. But it did not.

One can only assume that the members of the commission are the type of people who, once they have climbed to the top of the CN Tower and looked around, think they have not only seen all of Canada, but all of Ontario too. That is our problem today, but it should not be. I did not hear any member from northern Ontario picketting the commission for what it did. Borrowing a tactic from British Columbia, did anyone strip in front of the commission, or, taking a tactic from Viet Nam, did anyone immolate himself in front of the commission? Drastic action was required at the time. Someone should have been prepared to say, "This is wrong."

Mr. Andras: It was taken to court twice.

Mr. Johnston: An hon. member has mentioned that it was taken to court. And, of course, the case was lost in court. Again we are on a most dangerous course where the Parliament of Canada undoes the work of the courts of the land.

We in this country are in a situation where people are raising serious questions about whether the checks and balances that we have are sufficient. Certainly one thing we do not want to do is to turn this institution of parliament, which is the final court, into one which spends its time eliminating the work and effort of the lower courts. There is no excuse for the bill. I cannot accept that the solution lies with members from Quebec who suggested that if Ontario gets one more member they should have one more.

Mr. Peters: That is not the argument.

Mr. Johnston: There is logic there. But it should be remembered that the Parliament of Canada sits on the boundaries of those two provinces and that none of the 170 representatives from those two provinces have the problems of distance which we British Columbians have, we who are still under represented here.

I speak today as a representative from my province which did not obtain justice in that previous bill. We held our own—26 out of 264, 28 out of 282. A formula was put forward which would add one more seat to British Columbia, but even that was not just. The formula had three categories, or four really: the ones that are set by statute, the small provinces, the intermediates, and the large.

I suggested that the solution to the problem was to treat Alberta and British Columbia as intermediate provinces, a category which they fitted. When I did my arithmetic it worked out to 29 seats for British Columbia, using the arithmetical average. It was at that point that the representative on that side told me one evening that the government would be prepared to accept 28. We had held our own, and at that point

there was not much use fighting any longer because I could see that we were not going to get the 29 seats.

This is not a private member's bill; the President of the Treasury Board (Mr. Andras) is responsible for this mess, and if I had known that the government was going to bring in a bill to upset what had been decided on and passed by parliament, then I can tell the House that I would have fought much harder and longer to sustain the demand for 29, which would have been a little closer to justice for British Columbia.

Let hon. members not forget—and this may be an argument for the NDP—that we have only six seats in the Senate. So my province is under-represented in this institution in every way.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Do not expect us to cry over that.

Mr. Johnston: I am amazed—and here I come to the most crucial point of all—how the President of the Treasury Board can bring this bill into parliament at a time when the government pretends to be exercised over national unity.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Johnston: That is the mark of shame, of disgrace, of folly and downright silliness so far as this bill is concerned. We set up extra parliamentary commissions, celebrate Dominion Day by another name at the cost of millions of dollars, and are doing any number of things for the sake of national unity. Yet the government brings in a bill which strikes at the core of national unity and endeavours to separate in representation in this Chamber the province of Ontario and the province of Quebec As a British Columbian who believes passionately in a country from sea to sea, I find that utterly unacceptable. The government is engaging in this paltry exercise when only a few days of this session are left, and pretends it wants to get the immigration bill through the House, along with several others.

An hon. Member: And we will.

Mr. Paproski: They are cowards and traitors.

Mr. Johnston: I cannot understand why we have not heard from the members of la belle province over there.

[*Translation*]

Where is the hon. member for Maisonneuve-Rosemont (Mr. Joyal) and where is the hon. member for Montmorency (Mr. Duclos)? How can hon. members from Quebec vote for that bill? They cannot.

[*English*]

They can't go home and say that they let the cause of national unity down. Because this bill will be a symbol of what this government, the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau), and the President of the Treasury Board care about national unity. Better to have brought in a bill on the national anthem, which I would have supported. I was on that committee in the Twenty-Seventh Parliament which reported unanimously, but the bill has never been presented to the House. It will not be necessary for the government to bring in a bill on the national anthem because this bill will be the symbol, will be the sign, will be the word indicating how much this government really cares about national unity.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Johnston: May I call it six o'clock?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Order. It being six o'clock p.m. this House stands adjourned until two o'clock p.m. tomorrow, pursuant to Standing Order 2(1).

At 6 p.m. the House adjourned, without question put, pursuant to Standing Order.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Thursday, July 21, 1977

The House met at 2 p.m.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

THE CANADIAN ECONOMY

PROPOSED FIRST MINISTERS' CONFERENCE TO DEAL WITH ECONOMIC PROBLEMS—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Lincoln M. Alexander (Hamilton West): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a matter of urgent and pressing necessity under Standing Order 43. In view of the recent report of the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development which predicts gloomy economic prospects until at least mid-June 1978, and more specifically, in view of its forecast saying that business investment will remain weak, the gross national product will rise about 3 per cent, unemployment will remain high and heavy inflation will continue, and in view of the OECD's prediction that economic recovery could accelerate in the first quarter of 1978 if there is an upturn in real disposable income and personal consumption, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Hamilton-Wentworth (Mr. O'Sullivan):

That the Prime Minister immediately convene a first ministers' conference to specifically deal with the problems of real growth, inflation, and high unemployment and as soon as possible thereafter cause a new budget to be introduced which provides for at least tax cuts for low and middle income wage earners.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Standing Order 43 requires the unanimous consent of the House for the presentation of such motion. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Paproski: Jungle Jim Trudeau said no.

* * *

HOUSE OF COMMONS

PROPOSED SITE FOR DEBATE ON NORTHERN PIPELINE—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Paul Yewchuk (Athabasca): Mr. Speaker, I rise, under Standing Order 43, to present a motion of urgent and pressing necessity. Given the direct effects of the Mackenzie Valley pipeline on northern Alberta, the fact that it will cross a portion of my constituency and that this Chamber will not be available for the debate planned in August, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Brandon-Souris (Mr. Dinsdale):

That the debate which parliament plans to hold be held in a suitable place in northern Alberta, preferably in the town of Lac-la-Biche.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The presentation of such motion requires unanimous consent. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Paproski: Mr. Speaker, MacEachen said no.

* * *

CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

SUGGESTED APOLOGY BY CABINET MINISTERS FOR ALLEGATIONS OF BIAS—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Cyril Symes (Sault Ste. Marie): Mr. Speaker, I rise under the provisions of Standing Order 43 to move a motion which I hope hon. members opposite will accept, they being honourable men and women. In view of the CRTC finding that the CBC is not guilty of pro-separatist bias, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands (Mr. Douglas):

That this House instruct the Cabinet ministers who accused the CBC of such bias to apologize publicly to the CBC for their unfounded charges.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Such motion can be presented for debate pursuant to the Standing Order only with the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Paproski: Ouellet said no.

* * *

[*Translation*]

NATIONAL DEFENCE

REQUEST FOR INQUIRY TO DETERMINE PROMOTIONAL OPPORTUNITIES FOR UNILINGUAL FRENCH-SPEAKING PERSONNEL—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. René Matte (Champlain): Mr. Speaker, under the provisions of Standing Order 43, I ask for the unanimous consent of the House to move a motion dealing with an important matter of pressing necessity.

Considering that the government was supposed to establish French units within the federal administration; that difficulties

were experienced in carrying out the project; that the defence department, especially the air force, systematically refuses to provide training in French for its recruits; and that as a result of frustration some Quebecers intend to leave the forces or have already done so, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Lambert):

That the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Danson) immediately direct that an investigation be launched to determine whether it is possible for a Francophone to obtain a deserved promotion in the Canadian army even if he is unilingual.

Mr. Speaker: Order. The House has heard the motion of the hon. member. Under the provisions of Standing Order 43, this motion requires the unanimous consent of the House. Is there such consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

* * *

[*English*]

CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

SUGGESTED APOLOGY FOR ALLEGATIONS OF BIAS—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Ray Hnatyshyn (Saskatoon-Biggar): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a motion under the provisions of Standing Order 43. My motion concerns the fact that, while the Liberal Party think the CBC is biased in favour of separatism, the Boyle report reveals that the Canadian people feel, if anything, that there is pro-Liberal bias. In view of these disturbing findings about the paranoia of those who lead our government, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Joliette (Mr. La Salle):

That this House direct the government to apologize to those CBC employees whose integrity is impugned and in addition directs the government to take immediate steps to end political bias in the CBC by bringing to an end its interminable tactics of pressuring the state broadcasting system to toe the government line.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Is there unanimous consent for the presentation of such motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

* * *

● (1410)

THE CANADIAN ECONOMY

PROPOSED COMMITTEE STUDY OF REASONS FOR EXODUS OF CAPITAL TO UNITED STATES—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Dan McKenzie (Winnipeg South Centre): Mr. Speaker, I rise under the provisions of Standing Order 43 on a matter of urgent and pressing necessity. My motion is prompted by continuing alarming reports of the mass exodus of individual and corporate investment money from Canada to the United States, such as the millions of dollars Canadians are investing in Florida real estate, manufacturing, banking, etc. and the fact that a large Canadian trust company recently bought a large banking firm, and since there are countless other examples of Canadian capital leaving for the United States due to a lack of confidence in the Trudeau Liberal government along with reports that United States business is openly encouraging business in Montreal and Toronto to move to the United States, I should like to move, seconded by the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Cossitt):

That this House instruct the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs to conduct an immediate inquiry into Canadian capital going to the United States with witnesses from the business community to discuss this mass exodus of investment money and why they have no confidence in Canada and the Liberal government.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

* * *

FOREIGN INVESTMENT

ALLEGED CABINET MEETING ON TAKEOVER OF PONY SPORTING GOODS—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Tom Cossitt (Leeds): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a matter of pressing necessity concerning information I have received that a special committee of cabinet will meet tomorrow, scheduled to include the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce (Mr. Chrétien), the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Gillespie), the Minister of Finance (Mr. Macdonald) and the President of the Treasury Board (Mr. Andras) to consider the Foreign Investment Review Act and possible amendments thereto along with the recent effectiveness of this legislation. I therefore move, seconded by the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre (Mr. McKenzie):

That the Prime Minister and the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce acknowledge the fact that the principal reason for the sudden calling of this special meeting concerns recent cabinet approval of the sale of Pony Sporting Goods of Canada Limited to foreign interests in a transaction involving Senator Keith Davey, Liberal campaign manager and Gordon Dryden, Liberal party treasurer, and finally that it be made known to this House whether or not the cabinet will, on the basis of obvious facts immediately rescind permission granted for the sale and will in future properly review all foreign takeovers instead of leaving them in unopened folders—

Some hon. Members: No, no!

Mr. Cossitt: Mr. Speaker, it is very difficult to read a motion when the trained seals keep barking.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member will realize that he has been given considerable leniency when putting his motion under Standing Order 43.

Mr. Cossitt: There are only five more words.

—instead of leaving them in unopened folders to bale out financially prominent Liberals.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[*English*]

CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

SUGGESTION INQUIRY REPORT DOES NOT SUPPORT ALLEGATIONS OF SEPARATIST BIAS—GOVERNMENT ACTION

Mr. R. Gordon L. Fairweather (Fundy-Royal): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Prime Minister arising out of the CRTC report which the right hon. gentleman tabled yesterday. In view of the fact the Minister of State for Urban Affairs was quoted in *La Presse* of February 24 to the effect that he had a list of names of Radio Canada employees whose ambition it was "to destroy the country" and as the CRTC report does not substantiate these allegations of any separatist bias in Radio Canada, what action does the right hon. member, as leader of the government, contemplate to dissuade or discourage ministers from making unsubstantiated charges of this kind, not supported by evidence?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): The hon. member has the advantage of me. He says he has read every word of it. I must confess I have not yet read a single word of it, though I propose to do so. I am told by my ministers who have read the report that they are very satisfied with its conclusions.

An hon. Member: That doesn't say anything.

Mr. Trudeau: I am just saying they are very satisfied with the conclusions and that they bear out some of the suspicions they had.

Mr. Fairweather: I am in no position to make any charges, of course, and would not attempt to do so whether the Prime Minister has read the report or not.

Mr. Trudeau: I have just admitted I have not.

Mr. Fairweather: The fact is that those who commented to the right hon. gentleman must agree that charges made by various ministers about separatist bias on the part of Radio Canada are in no way substantiated in the 70 pages of the report. I would hope that as leader of the government the Prime Minister might discourage that type of loose and irresponsible comment.

Some hon. Members: Question!

Mr. Trudeau: I confessed to the hon. member that I had not read the report and therefore he does not need to feel he must make a charge about it. I am simply saying—and this is just hearsay, I know—that the report concluded that the media in general and that the electronic media in particular, the CBC included, had not fulfilled their duty to promote national unity.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Trudeau: It seems to me that this was the essence of the charge made by the ministers.

Some hon. Members: Oh!

Mr. Trudeau: Hon. members opposite seem to be in doubt about that. If the word "subversion" is used in the report, as I am told it is, surely this is a fairly slight condemnation in line with what members on this side of the House and other people across the country have been saying.

PROPOSAL FOR COMMISSION OF INQUIRY

Mr. R. Gordon L. Fairweather (Fundy-Royal): As the Prime Minister has said, he has not read the report and perhaps when he does the use of the word "subversive" will become clear. I should like to move to another part of the report because the Secretary of State and the President of the CBC, my own leader and others have called for a royal commission into communications and into the national broadcasting systems.

Mr. Ouellet: Where is your leader, anyway? You were complaining the other day because I was not here. Where is your leader?

Mr. Chrétien: He is in Cape Cod. He is reading the report in Cape Cod.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Fairweather: The heat is obviously getting to ministers as well as to the rest of us. I wonder what the Prime Minister's reaction was to the recommendation made by various people that a royal commission into the whole area of communications and broadcasting is urgently needed.

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): It is my understanding that the recommendation of the CRTC is not to the effect that a royal commission be set up. However, as the hon. gentleman says, a number of people are of a contrary opinion, including his own leader, he says.

Miss MacDonald: And one of your ministers.

Mr. Trudeau: And one of my ministers, she says. I have asked the minister responsible for the CBC, the Secretary of State, to come to cabinet within a month or so with a recommendation on this issue.

SUGGESTED APOLOGY BY PRIME MINISTER FOR ALLEGATIONS OF BIAS

Mr. Walter Baker (Grenville-Carleton): May I refresh the Prime Minister's memory? On February 25 he had this to say in the House of Commons with respect to the matter alluded to by the hon. member for Fundy-Royal.

> I am telling them with all the candour I can command that almost everyone, including the high officials of the CBC, would be prepared to state that the overwhelming majority of the employees in the CBC are of separatist leaning . . . They are just asking: What can we do about it without infringing freedom of speech.

It is clear that the view expressed by the Prime Minister has been declared to be false. Does the Prime Minister intend to apologize to the employees of the CBC, and would he ask his Minister of State for Urban Affairs to produce this list, which is supposed to number in the thousands according to statements attributed to him, so as to provide the House of Commons with the evidence which seems to have alluded Mr. Boyle and which for some reason or other the minister forgot to give to Mr. Boyle?

● (1420)

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member was kind enough to quote me, and then he said that the report of the CRTC has contradicted me. I should ask him to be good enough to quote where the report of the CRTC contradicts me.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Just answer the question.

Mr. Trudeau: I am answering the hon. member's question. He is making a false and phony assertion, but there is nothing new about that; we have those every day from the House leader of the opposition.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Trudeau: The hon. member is giving an interpretation of the CRTC report and I am asking him to substantiate that interpretation. He is incapable of doing it because the report uses words to prove the contrary, that the conduct of many people—

An hon. Member: You said you had not read it.

Mr. Trudeau: I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, the right hon. member for Prince Albert has a supplementary; I will bow to him.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Grenville-Carleton on a supplementary.

Mr. Diefenbaker: If I may ask a supplementary, Mr. Speaker, I should like to know—

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Grenville-Carleton.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, if I needed any help at evasion I could look to no better mentor than the Prime Minister.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

ALLEGATION NEWS SERVICE BIASED IN FAVOUR OF CENTRAL CANADA—GOVERNMENT ACTION

Mr. Walter Baker (Grenville-Carleton): I want to ask the Secretary of State a question with respect to the report. I hope that we will not use the same kind of attempts at adroit footwork that we have seen from the pyjama-clad Prime Minister.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Trudeau: What is your leader wearing today, Stanfield underwear?

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): The CBC has no place in the bedrooms of the nation, Mr. Speaker. One conclusion of the report was that both CBC news services are heavily biased in favour of central Canada. Would the Secretary of State care to comment on that? Is he in a position to advise the House what he intends to do, if anything, with respect to that matter? Because if that is the case, and if that assertion is substantiated, then I think there is a question which the Secretary of State should address himself to respecting the mandate of the CBC.

Hon. John Roberts (Secretary of State): Mr. Speaker, I would not care to comment at very great length. I am sure the hon. member is aware that the CBC have brought forward a report called "The Touchstone Report" which gives some indication of how they feel the activities of the corporation should develop for the future. I have read the CRTC report but I should like to reflect on it considerably more than I have been able to in the short time that it has been available to me so far. I think the questions that it raises are both extremely serious and extremely complex, so I am reluctant to give spontaneously the initial impression which I have to the hon. gentleman. I would prefer a chance to study the report in much greater detail before I make further comment.

ALLEGATION CORPORATION FAILED TO CONTRIBUTE TO NATIONAL UNITY—GOVERNMENT ACTION

Mr. Cyril Symes (Sault Ste. Marie): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the right hon. Prime Minister. Does the Prime Minister agree with the CRTC report that the CBC, for a number of reasons has failed in its very important responsibility to contribute to the development of national unity; and, if so, bearing in mind the other conclusion of the report that the CBC has autonomy without true accountability, what measures does the government plan to take to ensure that there is accountability and that the CBC fulfils its mandate?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, these are very serious and substantial accusations which certainly indicate that the report contains a more severe criticism of the CBC than the hon. members of the Conservative Party have implied in their questions to us earlier.

The hon. member has asked me if I agree with these accusations. All I can say is that I have asked that the report be considered very seriously by my ministers and that whatever corrective action can be taken will be announced in due course to this House. The minister responsible for the CBC has been in contact with the president of the CBC. It is only fair that his views be heard also. My understanding is that the CBC is aware of some of these deficiencies and is doing its

best to correct them. Having received the report, this is a matter we will have to look into.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

SUGGESTION GOVERNMENT NOT WILLING TO MAKE FUNDAMENTAL CHANGES IN CORPORATION

Mr. Cyril Symes (Sault Ste. Marie): Mr. Speaker, the chairman of the CRTC in his letter of July 20 to the Prime Minister recommends against a royal commission into broadcasting at this time, not because it is unnecessary but because "the commission does not perceive that the will and the readiness exist to give priority to these problems nor to implement fundamental changes that might emerge from any major public inquiry". Does the Prime Minister accept that condemnation of his government, and if not, how does he justify the introduction of Bill C-43 which in essence maintains the status quo in broadcasting with the exception of emasculating the power of the CRTC?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I am afraid I would not be able to join issue with the hon. member on his interpretation of the CRTC report. My understanding of it is that the CRTC does not recommend a royal commission for a host of reasons, some of which have been quoted by the hon. member. There are other reasons of a different nature, and they have to do with the hopes that the CBC and other electronic media will take corrective action without waiting for the long process of a royal commission.

It is a very important report which Mr. Boyle has produced. I must thank them for doing it in such a short period of time. The question itself was extremely complex. At this stage all I can say is that our ministers are already seized with it. I have indicated that the Secretary of State responsible for the CBC will be recommending action to Cabinet in a very short period of time.

Mr. Symes: Mr. Speaker, I hope the Prime Minister will read the report very carefully because in that report he will see that the CRTC does not believe, because of Bill C-43, that this government is interested in any fundamental inquiry or report to the broadcasting system.

My final supplementary question is: the CRTC in its report on the national broadcasting service calls for an examination of the present administrative structure for broadcasting before a royal commission is instituted to examine the role of the electronic media in Canada. Is the government prepared to undertake such an examination prior to proceeding with its new communications Bill C-43?

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, before the hon. member recites all the recommendations contained in the report one after the other, could I refer to my earlier answer that we have been seized with the report yesterday, as every member of this House has been? We will take a little bit of time to answer each of its recommendations.

[*Translation*]

HOUSE OF COMMONS

SUGGESTION REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE TABLED ON MARCH, 1972, BE REVIEWED

Mr. Adrien Lambert (Bellechasse): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the right hon. Prime Minister.

As the current session is continuing under rather exceptional weather conditions, and as the report of the joint committee of the House of Commons and the Senate was tabled on March 16, 1972, can the Prime Minister tell the House whether he intends to recommend that Parliament reconsider the recommendations of that report, and among others that suggesting that the government be defeated only on a motion of no confidence passed by the majority and that, under other circumstances, the government continue to function despite the rejection of laws that are passed or suggested by the government. In other words, can the Prime Minister tell the House, in short, whether the recommendations of that committee could be studied anew by this Parliament so that they can be applied and so ensure Canada propose administration while allowing Parliament to perform its duties?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): The question is serious, Mr. Speaker, and I share the concern of the hon. member with regard to allowing both the Parliament and the government to perform their duties far more efficiently and, I hope a bit more quickly. At this point in the life of the current Parliament, I can say that it is very unlikely that substantial reforms can be made of the type suggested by the hon. member. I can give him no hope in that regard; that is the type of reform we would like to suggest early in the life of a new Parliament. We have, as the hon. member is aware, through the leader of the government in the House, suggested in the course of the last few years a series of possible changes. We have never managed to achieve unanimity among the parties in the House on those changes, including those who object to the report in question. Therefore, I feel we should continue to make efforts in that direction, but I cannot propose immediate changes. In that matter, the hon. member knows, the government cannot act alone. It must try to achieve consensus among all the parties.

● (1430)

[*English*]

PRESENCE IN GALLERY OF DELEGATION FROM UNITED KINGDOM PARLIAMENT

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Before continuing with the question period I know all members would want to join me in calling attention to the presence in our gallery of a very distinguished group of visitors in the form of a delegation. I am referring to the members of the Subcommittee on Social Services and Employment of the Expenditures Committee of the British parliament, headed by their very distinguished member of the Labour party, Mrs. Renee Short.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Oral Questions

THE CANADIAN ECONOMY

FORECAST FOR CANADA BY OECD—GOVERNMENT POSITION—POSSIBILITY OF NEW BUDGET

Mr. Lincoln M. Alexander (Hamilton West): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Finance dealing with the grim forecast of the OECD which indicates that this country will be facing gloomy economic prospects until at least mid-June 1978. In other words, our society is sick economically because of the higher rate of unemployment than anticipated and because of inflation. Considering that the OECD forecast is much more pessimistic than the forecast of the Minister of Finance, can he tell the House on what grounds he disagrees with the forecast of that respected national body, or has he now conceded that his own economic forecasts were wrong and the budget ill-conceived?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): As the hon. member knows, we do not attempt to make forecasts. We make a projection from the figures that are present at the time. The OECD report for Canada and for all other member countries is somewhat more pessimistic than projections earlier in the year would have indicated. As the report points out, the increase in the inflation rate in Canada has been temporary. We can look to a return to a gradual reduction in that. I have to say that unemployment does remain a matter of concern. My colleague, the Minister of Manpower and Immigration has recently announced additional measures for this coming winter which should be of some assistance in this regard. The position we take is that the considerable room we have made available for the private sector, both for private investment and for consumption, should cause, over the months to come, a gradual acceleration in the rate of economic recovery in Canada.

Mr. Alexander: We hope the minister will make this gloomy report available to all members. I would remind him that the Prime Minister has indicated—if I am wrong, I know he will correct me—that the private sector has not taken advantage of the budget nor does it intend to in the present circumstances. In other words, this government has too much business in the boardrooms of the nation and should get out. Given the fact that the minister indicated to me some time ago that just because I asked him for a budget he would not move in that regard but that there are other criteria which would allow him to bring in a new budget, does the minister think that the OECD report is sufficient for him to move, and if that is not the type of thing he is talking about, what will make the minister bring in a new budget inasmuch as the last one he introduced has been a disaster and a complete failure?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): I would point out to the hon. gentleman something which he should already know, that is that the OECD report is a public document and is available for him to read if he wishes. With regard to the comments on stimulation, either of consumer demand or indeed of business investment, I would remind the hon. gentleman that in excess of $1.2 billion stimulus was provided in the March 31, 1977 budget. In addition, a further stimulus of around $900 million was provided at the beginning of the year by indexation. The hon. member wonders if calls by him for a budget were not very persuasive. Since he voted against those stimulus measures, obviously I do not regard his further suggestions about stimulation as having great value.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Alexander: The minister does not worry me with this bombastic rhetoric regarding whether we vote for or against these measures. Thank goodness we did not because they are not good anyway.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Alexander: I asked the minister a question and I want an answer. I want to know what criteria must exist before the minister will realize this country is sick and needs an impetus in the form of a new budget. What are the criteria before the minister decides to move in that direction?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Alexander: Would you let the minister answer my question, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member's question is hypothetical in nature.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): That is bombastic rhetoric, Linc.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

* * *

ENERGY

NATURAL GAS—POSSIBILITY ONLY ONE YEAR'S SUPPLY AVAILABLE FOR NORTHERN PIPELINE

Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Calgary North): I would like to ask the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources a question. An article has appeared in the *Financial Post* with reference to the pipeline which states that the United States authorities say that $8 billion or $9 billion would be spent on the Alcan route or any other route for reserve of 23 trillion cubic feet of gas, which is only a year's supply to the United States. Has there been a discussion of that since the recommendation of the National Energy Board?

Hon. Alastair Gillespie (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): If the hon. member is asking whether cabinet has considered all the implications of that question, the answer is no. I have indicated in the past that we will be giving consideration to this and we will of course, consider the representations of hon. members opposite.

Mr. Woolliams: I am sure the minister will be getting our representations. Surely if there is a decision to be made between now and September 2, which is the date mentioned by

the Prime Minister with reference to questions put from this side, that is one of the considerations that should be under discussion by his department with officials of the United States in reference to the supply of natural gas.

Mr. Gillespie: That is a further representation, Mr. Speaker, and I have noted it.

* * *

● (1440)

AIR CANADA

SUSPENSION OF LIQUOR SALES ON FLIGHTS OVER ONTARIO—POSSIBILITY OF APPEAL TO SUPREME COURT

Mr. D. M. Collenette (York East): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Transport. In view of the Ontario liquor licence board decision to suspend liquor sales on Air Canada flights in Ontario next week as a penalty for infringement of provincial liquor laws and in view of the grave constitutional implications this action has for the argument that provinces have jurisdiction over air rights within provincial boundaries, will the Minister of Transport urge Air Canada to seek a clarification in the Supreme Court as to the constitutionality of the Ontario board's suspension?

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, I am in the process of consulting my law officers as to what advice might be given on that matter to the Minister of Transport and Air Canada.

* * *

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

REASON SOVIET ATTACHÉ SMIRNOV NOT DECLARED PERSONA NON GRATA IN VIEW OF ALLEGED IMPROPER ACTIVITIES

Mr. Otto Jelinek (High Park-Humber Valley): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Secretary of State for External Affairs. In view of the fact that Lieutenant-Commander Valeri Smirnov of the Soviet Embassy in Ottawa has been asked to cease activities incompatible with his status of a diplomat for illegally obtaining official non-classified industrial documentation and because Mr. Smirnov's name was on the list of 20 KGB trained agents posing as diplomats in Ottawa, made public last year—and at least two others have already been expelled from Canada—can the minister now explain why Smirnov, who obviously was acting in bad faith in improperly and illegally obtaining important industrial documentation, has not been declared persona non grata and asked to leave the country for good?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I do not accept the second of the two words used by the hon. member, "illegal". I should emphasize that RCMP comments on this matter did not suggest or claim that there was illegal activity. There was activity which was improper with regard to the Soviet representative's activities and his status as a diplomatic person in Canada. So it was in this respect that his embassy was asked to have him desist. There was nothing, however, in that conduct, as revealed by the RCMP, which would justify the kind of action the hon. member suggests.

Mr. Jelinek: In view of the fact—and this is more on a general basis—that on March 24 of last year the then solicitor general confirmed that the RCMP was well aware that a number of KGB agents were operating out of the Soviet Embassy in Ottawa and because in the past the government has declared diplomats whose activities were incompatible with their status as persona non grata, would the minister now be prepared to follow his own government's policy and request all diplomats known to the RCMP as KGB trained espionage agents—and I believe there are still 16 left at the embassy—to leave the country forthwith, in view of the very fact that their espionage training activities alone make them incompatible with their status as diplomats? This is the government's own policy, but it obviously is not following it.

Mr. Jamieson: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member knows that it is extremely difficult to discuss these matters openly in the House of Commons.

Mr. Jelinek: Do something about it.

Mr. Jamieson: The hon. member says, "Do something about it", but I will indicate to him that within the past several months we have asked a number of persons from the Soviet Union and from other embassies to leave the country. Whatever hon. members opposite may think, I am quite prepared to rely upon the activities and advice of the RCMP in these matters, and in each case when the RCMP has made recommendations, we have acted upon them.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

* * *

THE CANADIAN ECONOMY

NEW MEASURES TO PROVIDE STIMULUS—POSSIBILITY OF NEW BUDGET

Mr. Max Saltsman (Waterloo-Cambridge): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct my question to the Minister of Finance. Yesterday the Prime Minister indicated that the government's concern is that the private sector "has not taken up the slack which was provided for it in the budget". In addition, recent indications are that other aspects of the budget analysis are incorrect. Consumer spending and manufacturers' orders are down, and the U.S. economy is not recovering as fast as predicted. There are pretty gloomy prospects for that, and the OECD yesterday released a projection on the Canadian gross national product. Can the minister tell the House what new steps his government is taking to deal with the continuing economic slump and whether he is considering a fall budget?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I am not considering a fall budget. However, at the end of this month I will be having an analysis of the first quarter returns, and as much as is available on the second quarter returns, made to determine whether in the absence of private expenditure some additional public expenditure—additional to that announced by my colleague the other day—will be desirable for this coming winter.

POSSIBILITY OF OPPOSITION PARTIES ASSISTING IN DEVELOPMENT OF NATIONAL EMERGENCY BUDGET

Mr. Max Saltsman (Waterloo-Cambridge): Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question is to the Prime Minister. In view of the severe economic problems facing the country and the detrimental effect of simultaneous unemployment and stagnation and their consequences with regard to national unity and the future of confederation, it seems to many in Canada that a need exists to adopt the same kinds of attitudes and energies of a parliament facing a crisis comparable to fighting a war. Given the seriousness of the matter and the government's apparent inability to deal with the problems on its own, will the government consider inviting opposition parties to assist in the development of a national emergency budget?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance has been meeting with groups across the country and trying to get from them constructive views on the past budget, their reaction to it and their suggested remedies for the economy in the time to come. I was at a meeting yesterday along with the Minister of Finance and other ministers. We would be very happy to receive proposals from the opposition parties as to what remedies they see at this time. Opposition members have occasion every day to make suggestions when they write preambles to their questions. They have occasions during budget debates. However, we would be very happy to read any written memorandum that the opposition, including the NDP, would like to send to me or to the Minister of Finance showing how we can combat inflation and unemployment.

Mr. Saltsman: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the remarks of the Prime Minister, but he knows as well as I and every other hon. member in this House that unless the government indicates that it is prepared to take the opposition into its confidence, it is going to be business as usual in the House of Commons. The point I was trying to make is that the seriousness of the situation is such that I think the Prime Minister has to go beyond saying that he is prepared to listen to the opposition. That is what I wanted from the Prime Minister.

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, I do not know if I can safely go much beyond my previous answer. The hon. member seems to suggest that he wants his party, at least—since he cannot be a spokesman for the other opposition parties—to be part of the decision making processes which lead up to budgets. I am prepared to contemplate that. That would mean, of course, an organic alliance between the NDP and the Liberal Party.

[Mr. Saltsman.]

Mr. Beatty: What else is new?

Mr. Trudeau: Feelers were sent out a few years ago, and the idea was rejected, but if the hon. member is sending out a feeler now, my response is positive. I would gladly sit down with the Leader of the NDP and see if there is any way our party could swallow up the NDP.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

* * *

INDUSTRY

FOOTWEAR—GOVERNMENT ACTION TO PROTECT JOBS

Miss Aideen Nicholson (Trinity): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce. In view of the finding of the anti-dumping tribunal that foreign imports are adversely affecting the Canadian shoe industry, can the minister state whether further measures are intended to protect Canadian jobs in this industry?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance and I have received the interim report of the anti-dumping tribunal and we propose to have public comments on this in the next few days.

* * *

[*English*]

HUMAN RIGHTS

DATE COMMISSION WILL BE ESTABLISHED

Miss Flora MacDonald (Kingston and the Islands): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Prime Minister. Now that the human rights bill has received Royal Assent can the Prime Minister say when he anticipates setting up the Human Rights Commission so that the 4.5 million Canadian women who work in the home can have the Canada Pension Plan legislation reviewed by the commission to see if the injustice perpetrated by this government in refusing them the right to contribute voluntarily to the Canada Pension Plan can be remedied?

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, I hope to make recommendations to my colleagues as to the membership of the commission very shortly.

* * *

[*Translation*]

BILINGUALISM

POSSIBILITY OF GRANTING BONUS TO BILINGUAL EMPLOYEES IN QUEBEC

Mr. Roch La Salle (Joliette): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the right hon. Prime Minister.

Considering that the President of the Treasury Board came back yesterday after the oral question period and that penalties have already been applied to Montreal civil servants who refuse to speak the second language, and in view of the government refusal to give them the bilingualism bonus, does the Prime Minister intend to support the President of the Treasury Board who favours the implementation of penalties or instead does the Prime Minister intend to commit himself personally in the debate to invite the minister to deal with this matter before it is too late, again in order to prevent this bilingualism crisis which would be deplorable?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I have had time to check the answer I gave yesterday and I think that what I indicated is right: the President of the Treasury Board has already undertaken with the civil service union negotiations to implement proposals made a few years ago. If I remember correctly, the decision was to take effect around last November. These contacts have already been made; in this sense, I am convinced that the civil disobedience the hon. member seems to defend, is in no way justified. If there are people who refuse to serve the public—after all they are hired in the civil service to serve the public—then, they should be punished. In this sense, I absolutely support the suspension measures approved by the minister concerned. But, in the meantime, as I said, we do indeed intend to follow up the assurances that have been given a few years ago to the effect that bilingual service would warrant special treatment; in any event, for a certain period of time. And the minister has already taken the necessary steps to solve this problem.

Mr. La Salle: Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask a supplementary question. I understand from the answer of the Prime Minister that he agrees with the President of the Treasury Board, but such a promise was made about two years ago by his predecessor. Considering the lack of guarantees and the delay as regards the qualification of the positions, I ask, in order to prevent this unfortunate problem from arising again—it is getting more serious and I think the Prime Minister is aware of that—I ask once again whether the Prime Minister is prepared at least to guarantee to the House by tomorrow a short term settlement which would be in line with the just society which he was advocating 10 years ago.

Mr. Trudeau: I repeat the same answer with somewhat different words. It has been some time since the President of the Treasury Board was authorized by his cabinet colleagues to settle this matter on a just and reasonable basis. The negotiations are going on and we are confident that they will soon be successful. All I ask the hon. member is not to encourage those who, in the meantime, and it is just a small minority, decide to violate the law.

• (1450)

[*English*]

HARBOURS

HALIFAX—SUGGESTION AGREEMENT FOR SECOND CONTAINER PIER SIGNED—REQUEST FOR CLARIFICATION

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Halifax): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Transport, who will recall having told me recently in the House that in his judgment the time for a second container pier in the Port of Halifax-Dartmouth has not yet arrived. Has the minister any comment to make about the statement made by a minister of the government of Nova Scotia to the effect that the government of Nova Scotia has signed an agreement with the government of Canada for the construction of such a second container pier. Who is kidding whom? Has the minister's department been negotiating an agreement without the minister's knowledge?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, the more exact reply I gave the hon. member was that there was some question as to exactly when the container terminal would be needed. There is a difference of view involving a matter of months, rather than one year or more. The question therefore was, when should construction start. The government of Nova Scotia wanted to be sure that as much as possible could be done in advance, to be ready for earlier construction. Accordingly, it asked if we would object to their plans to go ahead with site preparation. That led us to discussions about the necessary lease arrangements. These are now in the final form, and matters are likely to proceed in accordance with the intentions of the government of Nova Scotia.

Mr. Stanfield: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Am I to understand from the minister, despite what he intimated a few weeks ago, that the government of Canada is now prepared to start construction at an early date of a second container pier in the port of Halifax-Dartmouth, and prepared to support this financially? Is the minister saying this now, despite what he said previously?

Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, in line with what I said before, the decision with respect to the actual construction of the container terminal has not yet been taken. The arrangement which is being reached, and is in its final stages, is for putting the province into the position of being able to invest significant amounts of money in site preparation. Since it is agreed between us that a container terminal will be required, and it is only a matter of judgment based on growth of traffic as to when construction should begin, the government of Nova Scotia is interested in making sure steps are taken so that when it decides to go ahead with construction of the container terminal, the shortest time will elapse before it can be put to use.

Mr. Stanfield: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Am I to understand from the Minister of Transport that the government of Canada is not yet committed to the construction of a second container pier at any particular time? Am I

entitled to assume, therefore, that the purpose of these manoeuvres is to put the government of Nova Scotia in the position of being able to indicate that it has an agreement with the government of Canada with respect to a second container pier, an agreement which does not bind the government of Canada to do anything specific?

Mr. Forrestall: An agreement for election purposes.

Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, I think the government of Nova Scotia can clearly rely on the fact that when a container terminal is required, this government will be playing its part in seeing it is built.

Mr. Stanfield: It's a fraud, then.

Mr. Lang: There is, as I said, full agreement between us that it will be needed. There is only the question of the actual date on which it should be opened. Of course, there has been no formal approval by Treasury Board of money for the container terminal, but work has been done which will allow the government of Nova Scotia to advance the work of construction when the time comes.

HALIFAX—PROPOSED SECOND CONTAINER PIER—REQUEST THAT HOURS OF WORK BE RESTRICTED

Mr. Robert McCleave (Halifax-East Hants): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a supplementary question to the Minister of Transport. Would the minister consider in the remaining negotiations that in the 1974 general election in Halifax-East Hants, very much affected by container expansion at Fairview Cove, the candidates for the three major parties opposed the containerization development at Fairview Cove; but, if the development is to take place there, as I gather it will, I ask that the operations be restricted to reasonable hours. On this point I ask the minister to negotiate with the province of Nova Scotia.

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, at this point I can only take note of that representation, but I shall see what can be done in the way of operations.

HALIFAX—ALLEGATION AGREEMENT SIGNED FOR SECOND CONTAINER PIER

Mr. J. M. Forrestall (Dartmouth-Halifax East): Mr. Speaker, I, too, rise to direct a supplementary question to the Minister of Transport with respect to the development of the container terminal. I ask the minister to comment on the fact that one hour ago in Nova Scotia the minister of industry indicated to the people of Nova Scotia and of Halifax that he had signed an agreement with Ottawa with respect to the construction of the second container terminal within the last week.

An hon. Member: Who is lying?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I have not seen the report of those remarks but presume they relate to the agreement connected with the site preparation work, which is being launched almost immediately.

* * *

ENERGY

NORTHERN PIPELINE—SUGGESTION UNITED STATES MAY DELAY CONSTRUCTION—REQUEST FOR REPORT

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, may I direct my question to the Prime Minister. The Washington correspondent of the *Financial Post* reports that the United States administration is seriously considering not moving any Prudhoe Bay natural gas at present. One of the government's energy experts is quoted as saying that not building a gas pipeline at all has now become a real option, and Mr. James Schlesinger, Mr. Carter's energy adviser, has been telling various agency experts, according to the report, "to think hard about no pipeline". Has the Prime Minister received either from Mr. Basil Robinson, the federal pipeline commissioner, or from any other sources any indication that the United States government is seriously thinking of either not proceeding with the pipeline, or considering as a real option the delay in the construction of the pipeline? What information can he give the House on the matter?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): No, Mr. Speaker, I have not received any intimation of that but, naturally, will inquire from the ministers directly involved and if I find any contrary information, I will report to the hon. member.

● (1500)

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): In view of the fact we anticipate having a House of Commons debate on the matter of the pipeline early in August, it would be extremely useful if members of the House knew whether the American administration is considering as a real option the matter of not proceeding or delaying it since this would open up the whole question of having more time to settle the native claims. I therefore ask the Prime Minister if he will undertake to get that information and give it to the House, if possible before the pipeline debate, or postpone the pipeline debate until that information is available.

Mr. Trudeau: Exactly, Mr. Speaker. I think the hon. member is making a good point. If his information is correct, maybe we do not have to come back at the beginning of August. Maybe we can finish this part of the session today or tomorrow hopefully. I indicated I had no knowledge of this particular piece of information. I do know that Mr. Basil Robinson, mentioned by the hon. member, is going to Washington to meet Mr. Schlesinger's counterpart next week. I will make sure that he looks into the matter raised by the hon. member.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

PETITIONS

ACCEPTANCE OF PETITION PRESENTED BY MRS. HOLT

Mr. Speaker: I have the honour to inform the House that the Clerk of the House has laid upon the table the sixteenth report of the Clerk of Petitions, stating that he has examined the petition presented by the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway (Mrs. Holt) and finds that it meets the requirements of the Standing Orders as to form.

* * *

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, the following questions will be answered today: 1,875 (supplementary), 1,961, 2,418, 2,480, 2,648, 2,723, 2,776, 2,822 and 2,834.

[*Text*]

NEW BANK OF CANADA BUILDING

Question No. 1,875—**Mr. Herbert:** (Supplementary)

With reference to the answer to Question No. 3,229, answered on January 26, 1976, have there been any changes in cost since that date?

Mr. Bob Kaplan (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Finance): July 4, 1977—Statement by the Bank of Canada on the costs of its new head office building: The Bank of Canada estimates that the total construction cost of its head office building project in Ottawa will be $57.3 million. This figure includes both the construction of the new buildings on the head-office site, for which earlier estimates were provided, and the renovation and integration of the existing head-office building, for which no estimate has hitherto been given. In line with common practice, the figure above includes as construction costs outlays on permanent interiors, built-in equipment and landscaping (rather than showing them in other categories as was done in the statement of January 1976). The estimate for construction costs also includes the salary cost of Bank employees allocated to full-time work on the building project. It does not include fees for architects, consultants and other inspectors, and furniture, which are shown separately. Because of the Bank's security requirements, outlays on special construction and on built-in equipment are much larger than in the case of a typical office building; the figure above includes more than $5 million for security facilities such as vaults, secure doors, secure delivery and working areas, and security monitoring systems. An amount of $6.5 million in respect of the existing head office building is included in the above figure for total construction costs. It covers not only a thorough renovation of all the electrical and mechanical systems in that building but also the construction of a larger roof top mechanical room to accommodate equipment to serve the rest of the building complex, the completion of the bridges which connect the building above grade to the rest of the complex, space on the ground floor to house a museum for the National Currency Collection, and the total integration of the below grade floors of the building into the new basement areas. The whole complex, which will be substantially complete by the end of 1978 or early in 1979, is in accordance with a plan approved by the Bank's Board of Directors in August 1971 and announced in October of that year. The architectural plan accommodates the decision of the Bank to preserve the original Bank building. The complex will consist of two new symmetrical 12 storey buildings flanking the existing building, with the 3 buildings connected above grade by an enclosed court and bridges. Much the greater part of the ground floor area will be devoted to public facilities, including the connecting court, the Currency Museum, and a large plaza along Bank Street. Three levels of basement will extend across the whole of the block bounded by Wellington, Bank, Sparks and Kent Streets, The whole of the basement areas will be devoted to the Bank's operations; in addition to vaults and associated security areas there will be working space there for up to 300 people. No space is provided for staff parking. The building complex was planned to be built in stages so that the Bank could continue to operate on the site during the construction period. The first and major phase is now completed, and the final two phases, namely completing the East Tower and renovating and integrating the existing building, are underway. The estimate of $36 million for new construction costs provided in October 1971 did not cover the renovation and integration into the complex of the existing building and, in the event, included far too little allowance for the rapid increase in construction costs that occurred between 1971 and the date at which contracts for later stages of the work would be let. That estimate was based on a narrower definition of construction costs than that used above, and thus excluded some of the interior work and built-in equipment included in the present figure. Like the present figure, it included nothing for architectural, consultant, and inspection fees or for furniture. The current figure on the same basis as the October 1971 figure would be about $46 million, and the difference is due to the extent of about one-half to subsequent additions to the work planned and about one-half to higher costs than originally anticipated. The cost of architectural, consultant and inspection fees associated with the construction of the complex, and the cost of insurance during construction, is now estimated at $5.3 million. The cost of fitting up the building, i.e. the purchase and installation of office furniture and special-purpose facilities and the related architectural fees, is estimated at $4.2 million.

SUPPLEMENTARY RETIREMENT BENEFITS ACT

Question No. 1,961—**Mr. Lawrence:**

1. Since the coming into effect of the Supplementary Retirement Benefits Act, how many persons with the rank of (a) deputy minister (b) assistant deputy minister (c) associate deputy minister (d) chief executive officer of a Crown corporation or agency, or one of their subsidiaries (e) ambassador or high

commissioner, have resigned from the Public Service, thus becoming eligible under the terms of the Act?

2. How many persons holding a position of equivalent classification and status to any of the positions mentioned in Part 1, have resigned from the Public Service, thus becoming eligible under the terms of the Act?

3. (a) In each case, what is their name (b) what was the effective date of their retirement (c) what position did they occupy prior to retirement (d) which ones have been re-employed or retained in any way, by the government, Crown corporation or any agency, either directly or indirectly, as consultants or under contract or similar financial arrangement?

Hon. Jean-Pierre Goyer (Minister of Supply and Services): The information requested is not readily available. There are 93,000 recipients under the Supplementary Retirement Benefits Act (all public servants are entitled). A master list of names would have to be set up by referring to all departments, agencies and crown corporations. They in turn would have to prepare a list of employees who occupied a position listed in parts 1 and 2, who have retired since the coming into effect of the Act (April 1970). A manual verification of personnel records would have to be initiated some of which have been destroyed after two years. Of the information assembled we would have to program our computer in order to match the master list supplied to us by the departments, agencies and Crown corporations. Once this has been done we must refer back to the departments, agencies and Crown corporations to verify if any of the recipients have been rehired under contract. This would entail a lengthy and costly examination of countless files of departments, agencies and Crown corporations, which cost in manpower and time would be exhorbitant and prohibitive.

FUNDY TIDAL POWER DEVELOPMENT AGENCY

Question No. 2,418—**Mr. Howie:**

Has the government announced its intention to include an environmental impact study in the second stage of the Fundy Tidal Power Development Study and, if so, is it the intention of the government to provide a formal opportunity for the public to submit presentations to the study and, if so, will this practice be followed in future environmental studies?

Hon. Roméo LeBlanc (Minister of Fisheries and the Environment): The Bay of Fundy Tidal Power Review Board has referred the project to the Environmental Assessment Panel for review. The Panel will submit to the Board guidelines for the preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement which will be prepared as part of the second stage of the Fundy Tidal Power Study. In connection with the Panel Review, formal public hearings will be held in Maritime communities in order to obtain presentations from all interested parties. All briefs and statements from the hearings will be reviewed and considered by the Panel in the preparation of its report. Public participation is an integral part of Panel operations and is being practised for all projects presently under review under the federal Environmental Assessment and Review Process.

[Mr. Lawrence.]

WORKING WOMEN

Question No. 2,480—**Mr. Fairweather:**

1. What percentage of working women are (a) alone and supporting themselves (b) the head of a family?

2. What percentage is the average income for women compared to that of men?

3. What percentage was the average income for women compared to that of men 20 years ago?

4. How many women are in the labour force?

5. What percentage do women make up of the total labour force?

Mr. Hugh Poulin (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): Statistics Canada reports the following: 1. (a) The percentage of working women who are alone and supporting themselves is 20 per cent. This figure includes all females employed, those unemployed but seeking work and, those on temporary layoff. The term "alone and supporting themselves" is assumed to be all females not included in a "census family"*. These females may or may not be living alone. (b) The percentage of working women who are the head of a family is 5.3 per cent.

2. In 1974, women in the labour force had an average income which was 50.1 per cent of the income of men in the labour force.

3. The percentage of the average income for women compared to that of men in the 1961 Census was 41.3 per cent. The question on income was not included in the 1956 Census.

4. During 1976 the average number of females in the labour force was 3,859,000.

5. On the average, women constituted 37.4 per cent of the labour force in 1976.

---

* The definition of a "Census family" is a husband and wife, with or without children or a parent with one or more unmarried children (regardless of age).

IMPORTS AND EXPORTS OF FURNITURE

Question No. 2,648—**Mr. Lambert (Bellechasse):**

1. In the (a) 1975-76 (b) 1976-77 fiscal years, did Canada import furniture and, if so (i) in what amount (ii) from which countries (iii) what was the percentage value by country?

2. For the same years, did Canada export furniture and, if so, what was the (a) total value (b) value by province?

Mr. Hugh Poulin (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): Statistics Canada reports the following: 1. Statistics on imports of furniture in the fiscal years (1975-76 and 1976-77 are shown on the attached table (No. 1) in terms of value and per cent by country.

2. Canadian exports of furniture in the same period are shown on table (No. 2) by each province of lading.

Table 1—Statistics Canada—External Trade Division
Imports of Furniture by Countries, Fiscal Years 75-76, 76-77.
Values in Canadian Dollars
9 June 1977

		Value (75-76)	% of Total	Value (76-77)%	% of Total
001	United Kingdom	4,080,848	2.5	4,786,159	2.5
017	Ireland	22,127	—	37,901	—
043	Austria	21,528	—	90,795	—
044	Belgium-Luxemb	873,354	0.5	1,011,846	0.5
049	Denmark	11,962,129	7.4	14,221,058	7.4
053	Finland	475,459	0.3	577,042	0.3
054	France	1,093,327	0.7	855,579	0.4
055	Germany West	2,684,779	1.7	3,511,257	1.8
059	Greece	32,669	—	9,231	—
063	Iceland	392	—	—	—
067	Italy	3,774,199	2.3	6,108,563	3.2
073	Netherlands	1,914,357	1.2	1,586,077	0.8
076	Norway	753,695	0.5	584,228	0.3
078	Portugal	167,439	0.1	95,177	—
082	Spain	960,512	0.6	979,271	0.5
085	Sweden	3,672,656	2.3	4,560,535	2.4
086	Switzerland	283,468	0.2	462,153	0.2
246	Czechoslovakia	788,684	0.5	944,294	0.5
258	Germany East	—	—	9,224	—
262	Hungary	1,476,564	0.9	982,096	0.5
277	Poland	726,292	0.5	550,481	0.3
279	Romania	1,858,022	1.2	1,991,277	1.0
287	USSR	3,944	—	21,576	—
288	Yugoslavia	2,701,050	1.7	3,413,748	1.8
347	Iran	—	—	1,325	—
355	Israel	107,332	0.1	355,712	0.2
363	Lebanon	200	—	—	—
379	Syria	—	—	—	—
385	Egyptian A.R.	6,751	—	15,701	—
413	The Gambia	—	—	16,139	—
414	Ghana	10,380	—	10,320	—
415	Kenya	1,248	—	274	—
419	South Africa	11,194	—	513	—
447	Cameroon	839	—	—	—
455	Benin	—	—	—	—
473	Morocco	3,671	—	227	—
486	Togo	—	—	—	—
487	Tunisia	117	—	—	—
516	Hong Kong	1,505,616	0.9	2,719,869	1.4
519	India	123,695	0.1	114,955	0.1
524	Malaysia	1,765	—	529,213	0.3
527	Pakistan	12,449	—	27,131	—
528	Singapore	161,336	0.1	754,892	0.4
542	Afghanistan	—	—	1,315	—
553	People R China	173,333	0.1	129,748	0.1
556	Indonesia	1,467	—	26,062	—
559	Japan	784,448	0.5	1,036,104	0.5
564	Korea South	118,506	0.1	335,476	0.2
567	Philippines	146,267	0.1	262,297	0.1
578	Taiwan	3,110,945	1.9	5,459,964	2.8
583	Thailand	8,163	—	136,034	0.1
586	Viet-Nam	—	—	—	—
614	Australia	36,086	—	132,862	0.1
622	New Zealand	1,323	—	19,140	—
716	Guyana	204	—	600	—
744	Argentina	18,703	—	—	—
752	Brazil	244,831	0.2	627,242	0.3
758	Colombia	28,347	—	22,765	—
763	Ecuador	—	—	—	—
774	Peru	3,798	—	2,466	—
777	Surinam	—	—	990	—
813	Bahamas	—	—	815	—
815	Bermuda	275	—	—	—
822	Barbados	—	—	30,000	—
824	Jamaica	945	—	27,020	—
828	Trinidad-Tobago	500	—	225	—
845	Costa Rica	40,717	—	58,834	—
855	Dominican Rep	307	—	562	—
864	Guatemala	123	—	—	—
867	Haiti	1,626	—	4,877	—
869	Honduras	—	—	1,149	0.2
874	Mexico	236,896	0.1	295,174	0.2
876	Neth. Antilles	1,355	—	490	—
879	Nicaragua	—	—	3,130	—
886	Puerto Rico	—	—	412	—
933	Greenland	—	—	10,658	—
990	United States	114,057,099	70.7	131,435,851	68.5
Total		161,290,351	100.0	191,998,101	100.0

Table 2—Statistics Canada— External Trade Division
Exports of Furniture by Province of Lading, Fiscal Years 75-76, 76-77
Values in Canadian Dollars
9 June 1977

		Value (75-76)	Value (76-77)
OX	Newfoundland	22,648	17,694
00	Nova Scotia	247,197	195,637
02	New Brunswick	135,298	90,795
03	Quebec	17,068,367	21,851,580
04	Ontario	37,741,299	45,829,003
05	Manitoba	467,695	229,542
06	Saskatchewan	48,152	17,490
07	Alberta	92,367	224,469
08	British Columbia	1,157,658	1,568,140
09	Yukon	400	9,693
Total		56,981,081	70,034,043

UNIVERSITY ASSISTANCE

Question No. 2,723—**Mr. Howie:**

1. Are there programmes available under the Department of Fisheries and of the Environment to assist in the construction of university buildings or for the provision of equipment, teaching aids or other such facilities and, if so, what are they?

2. Are there programmes available under the Department to assist university staff members to further their knowledge and teaching careers and, if so, what are they?

3. Is there any such assistance for teachers at the primary and secondary levels under the Department?

Hon. Roméo LeBlanc (Minister of Fisheries and the Environment): 1. The Department of Fisheries and the Environ-

ment has no programs for the purpose of assisting in the construction of university buildings. Policies of the department do, however, allow for advanced students and university staff to participate in research cruises, and to use laboratory equipment when participating in cooperative investigations. The Crown also leases property to the Huntsman Marine Laboratory which is used in part for student training.

2. The department participates in Executive Exchange Program with Canadian Universities, this program being administered by the Public Service Commission. The department also manages a subvention program in support of university research, and the journal of the Fisheries Research Board of Canada enables university staff to publish their research results subject to required page charges.

3. No.

DSS—TRANSPORT SERVICES

Question No. 2,776—**Mr. Bawden:**

1. Does the Department of Supply and Services provide transport services to other departments and, if so (a) what are they (b) at what cost?

2. How large is the fleet of trucks owned or leased by DSS?

3. What is the total cost for the trucks and other transportation equipment?

Hon. Jean-Pierre Goyer (Minister of Supply and Services): 1. Yes. (a) (i) Inventory items held in stock are transported to destination points selected by other departments. (ii) DSS offers a transport service to other departments in connection with its public warehousing activity. (b) (i) The cost for the delivery service is included in the selling price of the stocked item. (ii) The costs for this service are as follows: A. small van with driver—$15 an hour. B. Large vehicle with driver and helper—$23.50 an hour. C. Tractor-trailer—at negotiated rates.

2. The trucks owned are: 29 light trucks; 18 medium trucks; 4 heavy trucks; 2 tractor-trucks; 2 trailers. These trucks are located in: Vancouver; Edmonton; Toronto; Ottawa; Montreal; Halifax; and Goose Bay. There are no leased trucks.

3. Total acquisition cost: $375,870.

EXPENDITURES—SAULT STE. MARIE

Question No. 2,822—**Mr. Symes:**

What was the total amount spent in Sault Ste. Marie from October 1972 to date by the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development?

Mr. B. Keith Penner (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): $23,999,476 (October 1, 1972 to March 31, 1977).

FORT LANGLEY NATIONAL HISTORIC PARK—FEES

Question No. 2,834—**Mr. Wenman:**

1. On what date, was a fee first charged for admission to the Fort Langley Historic Park, British Columbia?

2. What were the yearly attendance figures for the five years prior to the year when a charge was first levied?

[Mr. LeBlanc (Westmorland-Kent).]

3. What were the attendance figures for the years subsequent to the date a charge was first levied?

4. (a) What amount has been collected in admission charges on an annual basis (b) are all the amounts collected used to maintain and enhance the historic site?

5. What was the yearly cost of operating the historic site for the (a) five years prior (b) years subsequent, to the date when a charge was first levied?

Mr. B. Keith Penner (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): 1. June 23, 1975.

2. 1970—130,127; 1971—102,710; 1972—118,935; 1973—140,878; 1974—134,607.

3. 1975—102,638; 1976—90,480.

4. (a) $43,000 (1976-77); $37,000 (1975-76). (b) Yes.

5. (a) 1970-71, $73,899; 1971-72, $103,744; 1972-73, $136,-879; 1973-74, $162,883; 1974-75, $198,305. (b) 1975-76, $242,631; 1976-77, $266,671.

[*English*]

Mr. McKenzie: Mr. Speaker, on January 24 of this year, six months ago, I placed a starred question on the order paper with regard to whether the government had purchased the Gulfstream 2 executive jet. I have raised this matter four times since January. It is ridiculous, when the government cannot find out whether they have purchased an aircraft. I see the minister is here again today. I spoke to him once before about this. I still have not received an answer.

Mr. Speaker: Shall the remaining questions be allowed to stand?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

IMMIGRATION ACT, 1976

AMENDMENTS TO IMPLEMENT CHANGES IN IMMIGRATION POLICY

The House proceeded to the consideration of Bill C-24, respecting immigration to Canada, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration.

Mr. Speaker: Hon. members will realize that there are 55 motions standing on the order paper at the report stage of Bill C-24. I have had the opportunity to examine these motions. I should like to indicate to the House that I have reservations, on procedural grounds, with respect to eight of them.

There are two groups. Motions Nos. 2 and 9 in the name of the hon. member for Okanagan-Kootenay (Mr. Johnston) are grouped together. In my opinion, they introduce, subject to argument, a new concept into both the bill and the clauses of the bill which they seek to amend. That is, the concept of

Canadian domicile as it may relate to some special privileges or rights with regard to immigration. It seems, on a preliminary examination, that the concept of domicile is a totally new one in respect of the provisions of the act.

Mr. Brewin: It has been in there for years.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. If the hon. member for Greenwood (Mr. Brewin) wishes to make an argument, I have indicated that this is my preliminary view, subject to discussion. It seemed to me that I was doing a courtesy to hon. members to give them this information and to make available the preliminary arguments and concerns of the Chair in order that hon. members can address themselves to the preliminary argument.

Subject to argument on the point, it seems that motions Nos. 2 and 9 suffer from a procedural difficulty with respect to the introduction of a new concept. Similarly, the motions which relate to motion No. 40, motions Nos. 34, 35, 36, 43 and 45. These all relate to the basic proposition put forward in motion No. 40 which seeks to introduce an entirely new concept into the act in the form of a refugee claims board with certain powers, to say nothing of the fact that the board, consisting of some 18 members, I believe it is proposed in the motion, would have to be paid. Some expense there would have to be contemplated. Presumably, there is a fundamental difficulty in respect of the royal recommendation. If not that, there is at least the difficulty of introducing into the act a concept that seems to be beyond that contemplated within the four corners of the bill and the clauses mentioned here.

These are the areas in which I would be prepared to hear argument in terms of procedure. I again indicate, as I have in the past, that I will ask for copies of these notes to be circulated to hon. members to assist them in their preparation. I have not cited the references to the procedural text because hon. members will see those during the course of the argument.

The remaining motions seem to be acceptable, on a preliminary analysis, on procedural grounds. I would attempt to group them as follows. Motions Nos. 1, 3, 4 and 5 should be grouped for debate, with separate votes on motions Nos. 1 and 4. A separate vote will also be taken on motion No. 3, and this vote will dispose of motion No. 5. Motions Nos. 6, 7 and 8 could be grouped for debate and voted on separately. Motions Nos. 10, 11, 12, 22, 27, 28, 33, 46, 47, 48, 53, 54 and 55 will be debated and voted on separately.

Motions Nos. 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21 and 25 could be grouped for debate. Motions Nos. 13, 14 and 17 would be voted on separately. An affirmative vote on motions Nos. 14 and 17 would dispose of motions 15 and 18. However, a negative vote on the motions will require separate questions to be put on motions Nos. 15 and 18. Motion No. 16 will be voted on separately, and this vote will also dispose of motion No. 25.

Motion No. 19 will be voted on separately. Motion No. 20 will be voted on separately, and this vote will also dispose of motion No. 21. Motions Nos. 23, 24 and 26 could be grouped for debate, and a vote on motion No. 23 will dispose of motions Nos. 24 and 26. Motions Nos. 29, 30, 31 and 32 could be grouped for debate. A vote on motion No. 29 will dispose of motions Nos. 31 and 32. A separate vote is required on motion No. 30.

Motions Nos. 37 and 38 should be grouped for debate and voted on separately. Motions Nos. 39 and 41 could be grouped for debate and voted on separately. Motions Nos. 42 and 44 could be grouped for debate and voted on separately. Motions 49, 50, 51 and 52 will be grouped for debate. A separate vote will be called on motions 49 and 51. A vote on motion No. 50 will dispose of motion No. 52.

● (1510)

Those are my preliminary suggestions. The House may now wish to begin discussion of the first group, motions 1, 3, 4 and 5. However, since we would probably move on rather quickly to motion No. 2, with respect to which, as I have indicated, the Chair finds some difficulty, it might be useful to hear argument now. I notice, though, that the hon. member for Okanagan-Kootenay is not present at the moment, so perhaps the House would wish to discuss the first group of motions, and in the course of that discussion the Chair might be given some idea when argument with regard to motions Nos. 2 and 9 will take place.

Mr. Epp: Mr. Speaker, with regard to motions 2 and 9, in relation to which Your Honour mentioned that a new concept of domicile had been introduced, I should like a ruling from the Chair on motions 22 and 23 which also bring in the concept of domicile. Possibly that ruling could be given before we continue.

Mr. Brewin: Mr. Speaker, I have not had time to assimilate all the suggestions made by Your Honour, but with regard to motions 2 and 9, which deal with the question of domicile, I respectfully submit that this is not a new concept. For many years the concept of domicile has been a familiar one—a certain number of years of residence in Canada excluding, except in extreme cases the right of the government to deport someone if that person had acquired Canadian domicile. This feature was discussed by the minister in committee, and I respectfully submit that the effort made by the hon. member for Okanagan-Kootenay in motions 2 and 9 is entirely in accordance with the right of parliament to say that it wishes this long-standing provision to remain in the law.

Mr. Speaker: I want to make sure whether the hon. member for Greenwood is indicating that this bill, Bill C-24, contains in it any reference, other than report stage motions, to the term "domicile".

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the suggestion made earlier, that this procedural debate might be deferred until we have dealt with the first

group of motions, namely, 1, 3, 4 and 5. If they move quickly, we could perhaps go on to motions 6, 7 and 8, and meanwhile arrange for some consultation on the matter and advise Your Honour when we would be ready for the procedural discussion.

Mr. Speaker: That was the suggestion I made a few moments ago. We all wish to move with some speed to deal with this complex bill, and our opportunity to examine the measure is to some extent limited by the compression of time. This is why I am very receptive to argument that the concept of domicile does, perhaps, exist elsewhere in the statute and has not been introduced for the first time in these motions. Hon. members have an opportunity to develop this aspect and make reference to it, but I would think it worth while to go on to deal with the first two groups of motions and leave the procedural argument until later.

Mr. Epp: On the point of order, Mr. Speaker. To ease the work of the House, I should like to mention that when we get to the question of domicile and the argument on that point—whether it is a new concept, or whether it is already in the bill—the hon. member for Okanagan-Kootenay (Mr. Johnston) will not be here to put forward his views.

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps we can proceed, then, to the consideration of motions Nos. 1, 3, 4 and 5.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Louis Duclos (Montmorency) moved:

Motion No. 1.

That Bill C-24, An Act respecting immigration to Canada, be amended in Clause 2 by striking out lines 20 to 28 at page 1 and lines 1 to 5 at page 2 and substituting the following therefor:

" "refugee" means any person who, by reason of a well-founded fear of persecution for reasons of race, religion, nationality, membership in a particular social group or political opinion,

(*a*) is unable or, by reason of such fear, is unwilling to avail himself of the protection of the country of his nationality, or

(*b*) not having a country of nationality, is unable or, by reason of such fear, is unwilling to avail himself of the protection of the country of his former habitual residence;".

[*English*]

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood) moved:

Motion No. 3.

That Bill C-24, respecting immigration to Canada, be amended in clause 2 by striking out lines 27 to 37 at page 2 and substituting the following therefor:

" "family", for the purposes of any provision of this act, shall mean any person being a husband, wife, natural son or natural daughter under the age of 18 or mainly dependent on the family for support, father, mother, fiancé, grandfather or grandmother, brother, sister, nephew or niece, grandson or granddaughter under the age of 18 years, sponsored by a Canadian citizen or a person admitted to residence in Canada;".

Hon. Bud Cullen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration) moved:

Motion No. 4.

That Bill C-24, respecting immigration to Canada, be amended in clause 2 by striking out lines 27 to 37 at page 2 and substituting the following therefor:

" "family" means the father and mother and any children who, by reason of age or disability, are, in the opinion of an immigration officer, mainly dependent upon the father or mother for support and, for the purpose of any provision of this Act and the regulations, includes such other classes of persons as are prescribed for the purpose of that provision;"

[Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre).]

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood) moved:

Motion No. 5.

That Bill C-24, respecting immigration to Canada, be amended in clause 2 by striking out lines 17 to 20 at page 3 and substituting therefor:

"person who is a member of the family as defined in this act;"

[*Translation*]

Mr. Louis Duclos (Montmorency): As we are nearing the end of this session, Mr. Speaker, I feel it is important that all hon. members should co-operate to conclude the business of the House as soon as possible, but there are matters of principle which we should not overlook just for the sake of making our lives more agreeable.

The purpose of the amendment which I proposed to the House is to define more generally and—if I may use the word, Mr. Speaker—more liberally the expression "Convention refugee" in clause 2. Bill C-24 defines the expression "Convention refugee". This convention we are dealing with here is the Geneva convention which was signed in 1951 and to which Canada is signatory. We must realize, Mr. Speaker, that the Geneva convention which was signed almost immediately following World War II had a very particular and special significance in that it did not concern essentially people who were politically persecuted, but people who had been displaced by the unfortunate events the world had gone through between 1939 and 1945. Canada being a party to that international convention undertook to accept certain minimum obligations. On the contrary, article (5) of the convention very clearly indicates that with respect to their obligations towards refugees go beyond the signatory countries may easily that to which they committed themselves by signing the convention.

Mr. Speaker, it would be truly unrealistic to stick to the definition of the Geneva convention when we know that an increasing number of people will want to claim the status of refugee from within their own country, when the convention says that to qualify as a political refugee, one must necessarily be out of the country of his nationality. The proliferation of totalitarian regimes in the world can only increase that trend because of violations of human rights by an increasing number of countries. Mr. Speaker, this is a situation that is recognized by the department when, for example, in issue no. 11, reference is made to clauses 115(1)(d), 6(2), 115(1)(e), when the reasons are given for the regulations that will accompany the legislation and it is suggested in support of what I just said, that there is an increasingly frequent number of situations where certain groups are the victims of serious political persecutions and must seek to settle somewhere else although they do not meet the definition of the term "refugee" under the United Nations convention, and it goes on to mention the Ugandan and Chilean cases.

Mr. Speaker, it would only be natural to include in the legislation what is in any case being done in practice, what is being done in the case of the Ugandans, what is being done in the case of the Chileans, through administrative directives, or special programs. It is suggested, Mr. Speaker, that if we

included in the law what has been done in practice for some time already, and what will have to be done with increasing frequence in any case in view of the new modern trend toward development, toward the proliferation of totalitarian regimes, Canada could literally be invaded by people claiming the status of political refugees.

Still, Mr. Speaker, I think we must make a distinction between the admissibility and the selection of individuals coming to Canada or wishing to come here. It is obvious that if a much broader or narrower definition of a refugee were given, a greater number of individuals would become admissible. However, under the legislation, at the selection stage Canada can always reserve the right to receive or to accept a limited number of applicants, in accordance with our possibilities. Nevertheless, and it must be pointed out, we would have to give priority to the most urgent cases, that is to the people who are most politically threatened. We should not use that possible reservoir of immigration to improve the quality of our immigrants, because they are really special cases, as it has been recognized by the minister when he accepted an amendment to clause 6 of Bill C-24.

Mr. Speaker, in the document which the minister distributed a few weeks ago on the procedures concerning the recognition of the refugee status, the following appears on page 2: "The bill provides for the great majority of refugees accepted by Canada to continue to be selected abroad." The individuals can be selected either in Canada, in their country of origin or in a third country. Since it is recognized that only a minority will be selected and will receive the status of political refugees in Canada itself, it remains that the majority of refugees will be selected either in a third country or in their own country, and, Mr. Speaker, according to very recent history, we know that the majority of those who come and who will have been chosen outside Canada will have been selected within their own country. The amendment therefore simply asks the government to recognize in the legislation what is done in practice through administrative directives and special programs.

Mr. Speaker, it would be truly shameful if Bill C-24 so restricted the definition of refugee that it would not include perhaps the majority of people who would want to come to Canada as refugees. I would very quickly like to point out to the House that my amendment is within the spirit of the recommendations, more specifically recommendation 93 of the special joint committee of the House of Commons and the Senate, and I know that the minister has been saying since the beginning of the debate, and especially in committee, that such a provision of the bill followed the recommendations of the special joint committee. Mr. Speaker, I believe that this argument should not be used only when convenient. I believe that the joint committee has done some great work and I would like to pay tribute to all my colleagues who took part in the work of this committee, but as much as we can say that the work and the recommendations of the special joint committee were useful in other cases concerning other sections of the bill, we can also say that this argument is valid in the case of my amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to close by saying that it is important that the act itself contain a definition of refugee which takes more into account the present realities concerning this issue, and I know that the House in general has set an example to the rest of the world in this matter during the last few years and that it has been generous. However, the new legislation should not use terms which are too restrictive. We will perhaps have to live with it for 10, 15, 20 or 25 years. It would not be a good thing if in 10 or 15 years, a government that is not as receptive or a minister who has something against such people were able to hide behind a narrow definition to justify a policy which would be equivalent to refusing to take its moral responsibilities towards the international community.

● (1520)

[*English*]

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, I should like, first of all, to say that I most wholeheartedly support the motion of the hon. member for Montmorency (Mr. Duclos) which I think is an excellent motion, and rightly is a reasonable, up to date definition of "refugee" which is essential if we are to live up to our promises in this regard.

My next point is this. I see that the President of the Privy Council (Mr. MacEachen) has moved over to this side of the House for a moment and I want to say something to him as a preliminary to my remarks. A lot of people, not just members of parliament but the various staffs around this place, resent what I would call this inhumanity, this almost insanity, of forcing the House to go through this sensitive, difficult and lengthy bill in the middle of July. I do not think there is any necessity for that whatever. I credit the minister with much more common sense than to have advocated this himself; I think it must have been pushed on him by these young Turks who have sometimes adopted the style of a steamroller to try to get their way.

I make honourable exceptions here, Mr. Speaker. In our committee on this bill, the hon. member for Montmorency and the hon. member for Davenport (Mr. Caccia) worked hard, stayed with it and took it seriously. But apart from that we had platoons of people who just put up their hands without showing the slightest interest in what was going on. I want to protest that and say that it is not fair to force members of parliament to stay here in the middle of July to deal with this bill when we in our party—I cannot speak, of course, for any other party—were perfectly ready to come back in August after a decent break. This procedure disrupts family arrangements, reasonable plans for travel and holidays which have been made, and disrupts going to one's constituency. I think it is absolutely deplorable. I want to express that opinion right here and now.

● (1530)

As far as this bill is concerned, I have submitted a number of amendments. They do not constitute a radical revision of the proposed bill. There are some things in the bill of which we

approve. I certainly approve the setting out of objectives in the bill, although there are some changes that should be made. Particularly I welcome the clauses which refer to the reunion of Canadian citizens and permanent residents with their close relatives from abroad. There must be close co-operation among the federal government, the provincial governments and all levels of government.

We accept the rejection of discrimination on the grounds of race, colour, ethnic origin, religion, sex or political opinion which are contained in clause 3 of the bill. In particular, we welcome the explicit statement of Canada's determination to fulfil international obligations with respect to refugees and to uphold its humanitarian approach with respect to the displaced and the persecuted.

We share the view of the joint special committee of the Senate and the House of Commons that Canada needs immigrants, not only on demographic and economic grounds, but to take into account families and humanitarian considerations. The view of the joint committee is embodied in the bill as a whole. It is an aid to vastly increased mobility. Canada cannot afford to have an open-door policy. It has to maintain some control over the total number of immigrants coming to Canada each year. We do not support the policy of total rejection of immigrants flowing into Canada. Our preference is for a policy of moderation in the choice of the people we allow in, and a fair and decent handling of the people who apply to come to this country.

The statement of the principles and the objectives in the bill in no way obviates our criticism of some of the clauses which urgently require amendment for reasons we will outline as the various amendments come forward. We regret that so large a part of the provisions of the bill which applies to immigrants has been drafted by public servants and is based on regulations and orders in council. Such a process fails to secure adequate knowledge or scrutiny by the general public or by those concerned. I have introduced amendments which deal with this. We have had many excellent representations from church committees, legal aid societies, the Law Union of Ontario, civil liberties unions, la Ligue des Droits de l'Homme, and other organizations. Almost every one of the amendments I have proposed is based on those recommendations.

I should like to deal with motion No. 3. It spells out the class of people who shall be admitted to Canada as sponsored immigrants, that is to say, should be allowed into Canada with a minimum of regulations and obstacles put in their way. This is supposed to be the purpose of this bill. Clause 3(c) reads as follows:

> to facilitate the reunion in Canada of Canadian citizens and permanent residents with their close relatives from abroad;

Motion No. 4 in the name of the Minister of Manpower and Immigration (Mr. Cullen) is typical of his amendments and his approach. It includes such other classes of persons as are prescribed for the purpose of that provision. In other words, even when we are trying to advocate the reunion of families, we have to turn to the executive to do so. We in this parliament are not asked or permitted, apparently, to state the number of positive persons who should be admitted.

My amendment under motion No. 3 deals with husband, wife, mother, father, fiancé, grandfather, grandmother, and so on. It does not change the law except in certain minor particulars. At present, the law is in the regulations and is not in the act. Under the present regulations, the law is not substantially changed by my amendment. My amendment contains two things, one of which the government has announced to be its intention, namely, the admitting of people who are fathers, or mothers, over 60 whether in the work force or not.

Hitherto the law has been that one could be sponsored only if he were over 60 or so disabled that he could not work. In my judgment, the government has rightly suggested that persons can and should be allowed to sponsor their mothers or fathers regardless of their age. I have added one other change, and that is to include the words "natural son or natural daughter". The reason is that there are many countries, some of them not far away from Canada, where the institution of formal marriage is not the same as in our country. People marry, live together and have a family, but they are never formally married. In those circumstances, under the present regulations a mother is entitled to bring in what is referred to as her illegitimate child, which is a distasteful term. The same right should be extended to a father who has supported, looked after a child and behaved as the father. I feel that wording should be included, and that is why I suggest it.

The basic purpose of this amendment is to have parliament take the responsibility, and not the bureaucracy. There is a difference. We are sent here to legislate on sensitive and important issues, and I resent the growing habit, which has been evident for quite a while, of delegating these things to the governor in council, which is another term for the bureaucracy. I have never been in Her Majesty's privy council or cabinet, and thus I am not sure what they do with their time, but I imagine they have a great deal to do and do not have much time to direct to the question of immigration. There is a difference between the minister and myself, and the minister and some supporters of his party. That basic difference is whether we believe in the supremacy of parliament, or not.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. David MacDonald (Egmont): Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak on this group of motions I will not be too long. However, I should like to say a few words at the outset with general reference to the process we have been dealing with. In particular, I agree with the remarks of the hon. member for Greenwood (Mr. Brewin) concerning the non-liberal attitude of the government in terms of propelling so rapidly the final decision of the House of Commons in this debate.

● (1540)

I think the editorial in this morning's *Le Devoir* is entitled, if I can give a rough Anglophone translation, "A bad climate for a fundamental law". I agree. The law we are presently dealing with in this statute having to do with immigration is the first

major revision of our immigration procedures in a quarter of a century, as the minister well knows. In the process of, first, the green paper, subsequently the special joint committee which travelled to about 45 different centres throughout Canada and had a great many meetings here in Ottawa and elsewhere, and finally the bill itself, there has been realization of the tremendous amount of interest which exists with respect to the whole question of immigration. In fact, a newsman this morning, in commenting on the issue of immigration, said that this is one matter on which everybody has an opinion. Unfortunately, sometimes there are situations wherein we get opinions off the tops of people's heads, and not the considered view that Canadians are capable of giving to the matter of immigration.

I suppose that one of the reasons immigration touches people in every walk of life so deeply is that it goes to the heart or the essence of community itself, the essence of the nation. Certainly, as a country that is still relatively new, we realize that we have been fundamentally dependent on immigration. Also, we can observe that in the past decade public opinion has gone through wild swings and gyrations with respect to immigration. As I think I mentioned during the second reading debate, it is most instructive to realize that when we last dealt with immigration in a major way, which was in the white paper on immigration produced a little more than a decade ago by Mr. Pearson's government and Mr. Marchand when he was minister, the attitudes among the general public and in the media, and certainly as reflected in speeches in the House, were such that one faced the subject of immigration with exhilaration and with a sense that immigration was one of the important characteristics, one of the really hopeful aspects, of the unfolding history of this country.

Unfortunately, during the last four or five years, particularly as the economic and social situation has become uncertain and difficult for a great number of Canadians, with internal problems, some of them affecting the integrity of the country, and with questions related to the future evolution of the province of Quebec, immigration has become a difficult subject for many people. It has tended to be treated—this is one of the unfortunate aspects—in a rather pathological way, with the idea that somehow immigration is now rather like a genie out of the bottle; that we must look upon it as something that is perhaps somewhat dangerous for the development of Canada. I know that the special joint committee said in its report, and the minister, as well as his predecessor who was connected with the special joint committee and the green paper, stated that immigration is significant and important to Canada. This has always been said with, "Yes, that is the situation—but." That is what made difficult the work of our special joint committee.

I am delighted that the co-chairman of the special joint committee, the hon. member for Scarborough East (Mr. O'Connell), is here this afternoon, because he did a difficult job and he did it well. Perhaps it means more for me to say that than some other members, because he and I at times were not in agreement. But I can say that he gave important and constructive leadership to that committee in a most difficult situation.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald (Egmont): All of us who served on the committee won our spurs, in a sense, because we had to go through a great deal of trial and tribulation as we tried to make ourselves available to public opinion and public participation. We had a further aspect of public participation, to a degree, in the work of the Standing Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration, because some briefs and submissions were heard there. I would like to go on the record as commending the very capable work that was done by the hon. member for Trinity (Miss Nicholson). I think she was most fair and helpful in trying to produce a most constructive piece of legislation in that context.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald (Egmont): Of course, perhaps we did not happen to suffer as much the kind of "road show" exposure in the standing committee as did the special joint committee a couple of years ago. I say all this because, as hon. members will know, I have not been entirely happy with the process because I think there were times when we did not consult public opinion adequately or effectively. I am really quite shocked and seriously disturbed at the fact that the government House leader and some members on the government side seem to be fanatically obsessed with having this legislation become law in the shortest possible time.

They seem to want to use some kind of pressure or steamroller tactic to push this bill through in a few days during a period when most people would recognize that anyone with any sense would not want to sit or stand in this legislative chamber, but would rather enjoy the all too brief summer that comes to this country. I feel it is unfortunate, and it is no credit to the government that they have committed themselves to rushing this bill through so that they can take whatever credit is due to them by having this legislation become a new statute on the books.

It would have been exceedingly valuable for the Canadian public in general had they had a few weeks to reflect upon the work that was done in the standing committee. It is significant that the minister, in writing a letter of thanks to the various members of the committee, recognized the fact that some 99 amendments were passed and made as amendments to Bill C-24. That is not to mention a number of other amendments made from both sides which were not accepted but merely served to give an indication of the complexity and importance of this piece of legislation. We are here, after all, not acting on our own behalf; we are acting in some sense as the representatives of the whole of Canada, trying to put on the statute books of this country a reformed immigration act which will presumably stand for a number of years to come.

I cannot for the life of me understand why the government or the Liberal caucus would want to pass the bill this month, rather than in a few weeks, perhaps in the early part of

September. It seems to me that would have at least allowed for some responsible democratic participation in the key elements—and I think there are a number, as evidenced by the 55 amendments we are dealing with now at report stage—on which the Canadian people would like to register their concern either directly to the Minister of Manpower and Immigration (Mr. Cullen) or to each and any of us as individual backbenchers.

Having said that, I would like to say a few words with respect to the specific motion No. 1 put foward by the hon. member for Montmorency (Mr. Duclos). I am very pleased to support this motion and I congratulate the hon. member for putting it forward. Obviously, it arises from his own experience and the experience of some of the rest of us in trying to understand and, to the degree possible, to suggest effective reforms with respect to the way in which we deal with refugees. I want to make it quite clear at the outset, because I think there is often a misunderstanding when it comes to dealing with amendments to the whole structure of procedures for refugees, that the concern which all of us have with respect to the refugee amendments is not in terms of Canada not accepting enough refugees. As the minister has recognized, we have had a commendable record, in terms of responding to situations of great human peril and anguish. Certainly this is so with regard to refugees coming from Europe, Africa, Southeast Asia and Latin America. Canada has gained a worldwide reputation for being ready to respond and to take seriously the great problems that exist for people who become exiled either within or outside their own country.

One thing we have discovered is that because the whole phenomenon of refugees is an increasingly important one, both in the world sense and in the way in which we as Canadians respond, procedures that may have been adequate 20 or 30 years ago are no longer adequate, and that our approach has been either of an ad hoc nature, which makes it difficult to determine whether or not we are handling the situation fairly and equitably, or we have been faced with a situation in which there is no legal framework at all, as in the case of the motion moved by the hon. member for Montmorency.

● (1550)

The interesting thing about this amendment is not just the fact that it was recommended by the special joint committee, which I believe is significant, but also that it really would put into law what is the current practice of the governement. This is what makes it very difficult for the Minister of Manpower and Immigration to say that it is not a worth-while amendment. In a sense, we are suggesting to the minister that we want to give him, in legislative terms, the kind of role which has been exercised both by himself and by his predecessors in recent years. If that is not a reasonable proposition, for the life of me I do not know what is.

As has been referred to already this afternoon, increasingly there are situations where there are breakdowns of civil rights or human rights in various countries and where there is oppression, whether it comes from an ideology to the left or to the right. We know—and we have responded on a humanitarian basis—of situations where thousands of people have been caught within their own countries, suffering all the things which are defined under the UN convention on refugees, and because of the fact that those people are not actually physically outside their countries they cannot be regarded in traditional terms as coming under the refugee category.

We recognized this a few years ago when we faced a situation which was difficult and deplorable in Uganda, and we recognized it, after that, in Chile. There were situations in which tens of thousands of people were suddenly subjected to massive persecution from the authorities in control of those countries. They did not come under the refugee definition of the United Nations. This situation was recognized by the special joint committee. So the department, in its wisdom—and I think it was wise—introduced the category of oppressed minorities. It does not exist in this particular statute, but that was a regulatory way for the department, the government and the Canadian people to respond to these very real human crises and tragedies.

We did respond, and I do not know—perhaps the minister can tell us—of anybody who has objected to the minister responding in this way. However, we have to recognize the fact that even though we handled those people as refugees, referred to them as refugees and established them in Canada on a refugee basis, and even though they were not legally situated as refugees, we participated and went along with it. I suppose it was really to save us going through an enormous debate here and having to amend the immigration law. Here we are, now trying to make our immigration law modern and relevant, and that is why I think the amendment of the hon. member for Montmorency is reasonable and sensible. In fact, I think it would not be sensible not to accept his amendment. The special joint committee recommended, at page 53:25, in recommendation No. 93, the following:

> The committee regards the United Nations definition of "refugee" as too narrow and not adequate to accommodate the present-day variety of circumstances and emergencies confronting citizens of many countries. One difficulty is the stipulation that the person be outside his country to qualify as a refugee. Canada has eased this requirement to accommodate Chileans and Ugandans, but the committee sees a need for firm criteria to reflect contemporary refugee situations in which persons must leave their home countries because they have been stripped of citizenship and denied the right to remain. The definition should also include persons living in their homeland who face persecution or punishment for political reasons, provided their governments allow them to leave.

The hon. member referred to that, and there are a number of hon. members in the House this afternoon who sat on the special joint committee and who will recall this, but I think it is useful to have it on the record when we are dealing with this particular motion. That recommendation states the case as succinctly and as reasonably as I think it is possible to do. One of the things which was uppermost in the mind of the minister, his predecessor who worked on the drafting of this bill, and departmental officials, was that they wanted to try to reflect the wisdom and insight which was accumulated by the special joint committee.

The amendment brought forward this afternoon is eminently sensible. Having had a chance to consider this in the commit-

tee, but perhaps not sufficiently, and a chance to consult with his officials to see if there is any aspect of this redefinition which would create other problems—and I have not heard of any from the minister or his officials so far—I hope the minister will accept the amendment as being reasonable and sensible. Quite frankly, I think the Canadian people would expect no less.

What we are really trying to do this afternoon is reform the law in terms of present practice. I am sure the minister does not what to say to us this afternoon that in the years to come we are not going to be able to be in a position from time to time to respond to situations in which people will be, for all intents and purposes, refugees within their own home countries. People whose lives are in jeopardy, who have to flee and find residence in another country, will be looking for a homeland, and we should be able to provide a homeland for some refugees. Of course, under UN designation at the present moment I suppose millions of people are categorized as refugees. We are not talking here about any increase in numbers we are talking specifically about having the law defined in the clearest possible terms so that all Canadians can be proud of what is now the current practice and responsibility of the government.

Hon. Bud Cullen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, first I should like to commend the hon. member for Montmorency (Mr. Duclos). I believe he attended practically every one of the 33 meetings of the committee. He has been consistent in his representations, and we held many discussions both privately and at the committee stage. I thought perhaps my arguments would be more persuasive than they have been but notwithstanding that, the hon. member has brought forward his amendment.

I also thank the hon. member for Greenwood (Mr. Brewin) for his comments on many of the items in the bill, which are excellent. The bill is a very marked improvement over the legislation which is presently in existence. The establishment of objectives in the bill is a good move. Our responsibility to refugees is at long last incorporated into legislation. There is a myriad of improvements in this bill. We removed some of the more objectionable words which appeared in the former bill. As I read it, the former bill seemed to indicate that we were endeavouring to do everything we could to stop immigration, whereas in this bill we are indicating why we want immigration, why it is good, what Canada's obligations are, and what objectives we are hoping to meet through our immigration policy, so that those who come here and those who welcome them will know what the objectives are.

I think it is important that we get on with this legislation. My information is that almost every minister of immigration since 1952 has been endeavouring to bring forward an immigration bill. They have got to various stages only to find that sessions ended, elections were called or there was more important legislation. I think the time to move ahead is when there is a good feeling in the country about a bill and about immigrants. We have a good bill, and it is time to press on and get it passed.

At the committee stage we spent some 70 hours going over 99, or perhaps in excess of 100, amendments. We looked very carefully at the amendments. Some of them were accepted, some were changed, and some were rejected. When I look at the amendments which have been put forward, particularly those put forward by the hon. member for Greenwood, I am reminded of a good friend of his, I am sure, and a man I knew mostly by reputation, Mr. Justice Walsh, when he was counsel practising before the court of appeal. On one occasion when he was before the court he handled five appeals. A judge asked him if he appealed all his cases. He said, "No, My Lord; just the ones I lose". That seems to be the precedent followed by the hon. member for Greenwood who has, once again, introduced ten of the amendments which were voted down at the committee stage.

This amendment purports to remove from the internationally accepted definition as contained in the convention the stipulation that a person must be outside his country of citizenship or normal residence before he can claim refugee status. Although the United Nations High Commission does not object to nations extending refugee-type benefits to classes beyond the convention definition, it does oppose any wholesale broadening of the definition itself, as being likely to cheapen the concept of "refugee" and thus impair its ability to secure assistance and protection for true refugees.

● (1600)

From a purely Canadian standpoint, as I said time and again in committee, the proposed amendment would enable literally millions of people to claim treatment as refugees when seeking admission to Canada, which would be an intolerable situation for the administration of the immigration program and would work to the detriment of true refugees.

The bill, however, does not preclude sympathetic consideration being extended to oppressed minorities, expellees, etc., in particularly urgent and meritorious circumstances. This is precisely the reason for clauses 6(2) and 115(1)(d) and (e), which will allow the government, taking into account people's need for resettlement and Canada's current ability to provide settlement opportunities, to recognize certain groups for refugee-like treatment. These are the provisions that would have been invoked, had they been in force, at the time of the troubles in Uganda, Chile and Lebanon. The bill will, in fact, achieve the end sought by the hon. member for Montmorency, but in a more orderly and effective manner.

What could be the result of accepting this amendment? If we expand the definition to include the majority of the world's population, surely we might have to stop giving refugees priority and processing them next to the family class. Second, we might have to apply reduced selection standards when dealing with refugees. So on that basis it could have an effect opposite to that which the hon. member intended.

I suggest the hon. member for Egmont (Mr. MacDonald) is not correct when he suggests that acceptance of the motion would give the sanction of law to the present practice. That would not be the case. Bill C-24 as presently printed would

make our present practice the law. Therefore, for the reasons given I oppose broadening the definition as suggested in the amendment, especially given the changes we have made in the bill in clauses 6(2) and 115(1) (d) and (e).

I now come to the motion proposed by the hon. member for Greenwood, dealing with the definition of "family". From my reding of it, the apparent intention is to enshrine in the act virtually all the classes of relatives who can be sponsored or assisted, meaning nominated, plus all illegitimate children. Like the hon. member, I do not like that term, preferring to call such children natural children. Taken with the hon. member's proposed amendment to the definition "member of the family class", it would make all these relatives permanently sponsorable, with no possibility of addition or subtraction except by way of amendment of the act.

I wonder if the hon. member for Greenwood has failed to notice that the definiton "family" is not intended to govern admissibility provisions but, rather, serves the purposes of several other provisions of the act, most of which concern removal from Canada, for example sections 19(2)(*c*), 27(1)(*f*), 27(2)(*l*), and 33. His amendment would expose all the relatives named to removal because of the removability of a person to whom they are related. The proposed amendment is thus unacceptable from both the admission and the enforcement standpoint.

In clause 4, which stands in my name, I propose to include a new definition of the word "family" or, more appropriately, the old definition. I do this because of apprehensions expressed to me by some members that the original definition or the amendment passed by the committee would be seen by some as evidence of severe restriction in immigration policy.

The definition of "family" in the 1952 act uses the words "father", "mother" and "dependent children". This has always been open to the misconstruction that it covered three, rather than two, generations, although only the latter interpretation has ever been applied. The intent of Bill C-24 was to clear up the ambiguity. Nevertheless, I am given to understand that some people would take disappearance of the words "father" and "mother" as confirmation of an unfounded suspicion that sponsorship privileges are to be reduced, although the definition has nothing to do with the admissible classes. To avoid this appearance, if it is the wish of the House I am prepared to revert to the wording of the definition in the 1952 act, given that it has not caused any legal difficulties. The proposed amendment would restore the 1952 language, with the addition of the new optional power to extend the definition for specific purposes of the act and regulations.

Mr. Jake Epp (Provencher): Mr. Speaker, this bill, now being debated at report stage and soon to be passed at third reading, hopefully, is the culmination of a number of years of hard work. Even before the green paper on immigration matters was made public, members of the parliamentary committee and those concerned with immigration called for the appointment of a special joint committee which would travel across the country to gather the views of Canadians on immigration. That committee was appointed; it travelled across the country and heard the views of many. In one or two areas, because witnesses found it difficult to attend, it did not hear quite so much testimony.

The spirit which animated that special joint committee has also animated our standing committee which has been chaired so ably by the hon. member for Trinity (Miss Nicholson). I say this because the committee behaved in a non-partisan way, and serving on it has been one of my finest experiences since being elected in 1972. It considered all questions relevant to immigration and what will be best for Canada's future and for immigrants. We considered 99 amendments and spent 71 hours trying to improve the bill.

Mr. Alexander: Thank God for you, sir.

Mr. Epp: Some may argue the committee did not go far enough. Yet unquestionably the bill reported to this House represents the consensus of the committee. Its members tried to introduce amendments which would result in fairer immigration laws and reflect the reality of modern-day Canada. The point is this: it does not matter if members of parliament want to go home in July. We spent so much time considering this bill that it deserves consideration at the report stage and passage on third reading.

No one can say we did not spend enough time on it. The special joint committee considered it at length. We debated it on second reading and in committee, and we are considering it again at report stage. Here let me raise an important point. Certain amendments brought forward during the committee stage have again been brought forward at the report stage. I think the House leader should consider this practice carefully, since I do not think it was contemplated when our Standing Orders were revised.

• (1610)

I want to mention, with regard to the refugee clauses, that members on this side feel that Canada's international reputation in the area of accepting refugees is second to none. Throughout our history that has been the case. I believe all of us can point to certain times when we were perhaps not as forthcoming as we should have been. But when you consider countries that are internationally touted as being leaders in refugee matters, they fall well behind Canada on their total flow. That is over a period of years.

The definition in the bill is one to which Canada agreed as a signatory to the United Nations convention. As I understand it, the definition would allow Canadian immigration officials, refugee officials or whoever they might be, to intervene to the point of where a person is a prisoner of conscience or a political prisoner imprisoned in his or her own country, to say that that person is a refugee. Surely that is as far as we can go. If you look at the turmoil in the world today, you see we have a situation which we would simply not be able to control. The definitions which the signatories and members of the United Nations have agreed to, fit our purposes adequately.

I now come to the question of family. The hon. member for Greenwood (Mr. Brewin) brought forward the amendment. I

realize that the concept of family class is not in the bill. This is where we have some trouble debating the bill. What we would really like to debate is the regulations. In the regulations there is a so-called family class. The definition of "family" here does have, either directly or by inference, a bearing on the family class. The whole question of family and the family class, or nominated class as it is called in the old bill, needs very thorough re-examination. In testimony in committee we were told that at the present time approximately 66 per cent of our flow is from the sponsored classes or nominated classes. If we expand into the sponsored classes parents, of any age, of Canadian citizens, it is estimated that the flow will increase to about 70 per cent.

I am very concerned about what we are going to do as we establish an annual target. If we increase those eligible under refugee clauses and increase the refugee definition, it will virtually eliminate the independent class. I refer to the immigrant who is an entrepreneur, the immigrant who would come here, not because of family reasons but for the simple reason of making a new start. If this trend continues, we are going to be in trouble. The independent immigrant who does not have relatives in Canada, but who is an immigrant we desperately need, will not come to Canada.

If we go back far enough, we have to concede that someone in our family came here as an independent immigrant and established a family, business, farm, or whatever the case may be. We today are the beneficiaries of that. Some people call them "new seed" immigrants. Call it what you will, I want to place this matter before the minister. I know his officials are very aware of it because I have hammered it so many times already. I am deeply concerned about any expansion of the sponsored class and the family class. I am not against family reunification in any way, shape or form. However, if we expand that definition too far, the independent immigrant, the entrepreneur, will have less chance to come into this country and allow us the benefit of what they can give us. This is the point that must be stated clearly and openly.

With that in mind, the amendment on refugees is not acceptable. I want, again, to stress to the minister and his officials that when we look at any expansion of the "family" definition—although I know it is not in the bill as a family class, but it is in the regulations—we should not take steps whereby the sponsor or family class will increase to such a degree that we will virtually remove the possibility of the independent immigrant coming to this country.

Mr. Goodale: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. It has to do with private members' hour this afternoon. There have been some discussions about how best we could use the hour between five and six o'clock today. Earlier today, the House leader for the NDP, whose party has the business for that hour this afternoon, agreed that it would be useful to use that hour to continue the discussion on this bill, rather than private members' business. As a result of that willingness on his part, there have been the usual discussions. I believe Your Honour will find agreement in the House, now, that the hour between five and six today be used for consideration of Bill C-24 rather than private members' business.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Is that agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I stand by what I suggested earlier.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): It is so ordered.

Mr. Epp: Mr. Speaker, I rise on an associated point of order. In order to ease the work of the House, I wonder if we could have an order as to when votes that are deferred will be taken. Will they be taken at the end of the day on which they have been deferred? How does the Chair rule on that matter?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): It is my understanding there have been discussions and that votes will be deferred to the end of the day. Votes will be taken tonight on votes deferred today.

Mr. Paproski: At 9.45.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I object to these discussions taking place in public before there has been consultation. I was approached about this a few minutes ago. I said I would discuss it with my colleagues and report later. Let us do it in the right way.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Is it agreed that private members' hour today between five and six o'clock will be dispensed with in order to carry on with Bill C-24?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): It is so ordered.

Mr. John Gilbert (Broadview): Mr. Speaker, I wish to comment briefly on the remarks of the Minister of Manpower and Immigration (Mr. Cullen). He stated that it is good to have set forth in the bill the principle of reunification and the principle with regard to refugees. He said there is a good feeling in Canada at the moment and, therefore, let us get on with the bill. If the minister were to look at yesterday's *Globe and Mail*, he would see there has been a substantial reduction in the inflow of immigrants. One reason is the law pertaining at the moment, as well as the ill-feeling pertaining across the country.

I say to the minister that if we want to create good feelings among new immigrants, we must have proper policies with regard to employment, housing and some of the other social problems. Only then will we generate good feelings among immigrants. At the moment, in the major cities in particular, there are racial tensions which could flare up at a moment's notice. I wish to comment on that matter and underline it for the minister.

Remarks have been made on motion No. 1 concerning refugees. I rather subscribe to the remarks which accompanied

the motion of the hon. member for Montmorency (Mr. Duclos), the hon. member for Egmont (Mr. MacDonald), and the hon. member for Greenwood (Mr. Brewin). If there's a will, there's a way. The minister set forth some of the administrative difficulties he foresees if the motion moved by the hon. member for Montmorency is accepted.

● (1620)

Mr. Speaker, if we had the will to accept the up to date definition given by the hon. member for Montmorency, I am sure we could find a way to deal with the difficulties the minister has outlined. If we wish to remain in the forefront in dealing with refugees, it is not sufficient to say that if we accept an up to date definition there will be administrative difficulties. If the up to date definition offered by the hon. member is correct—and there was a feeling throughout the committee that this is the case—we ought to accept that definition and then put in place the necessary administrative machinery to meet the situation. We ought not simply to accept the excuse offered by the minister.

There is another area to which I should like to refer. In motion No. 3, my hon. friend from Greenwood wants to make sure of the definition of "family". He wants it in the bill, not just in the regulations, so he sets forth in strict terms what he means by "family". I have spoken to the hon. member. His motion says that for the purpose of any provision of the act, "family" shall mean any person being a husband, a wife, natural son and natural daughter. I asked him whether this included adopted sons and adopted daughters.

My experience before the Immigration Appeal Board is that difficulties arise in the case of adopted children because many of them are adopted in countries which follow procedures different from our own and at times it is difficult to determine whether a youngster has been adopted legally. I should like the minister to give us some assurance that the words "any children" in motion No. 4 include not only natural children but adopted children. I am well aware of the problems which arise with respect to certain adoptions, but I am sure such problems can be taken care of by regulation. However, it should be said that young children, whether natural children, in the words of the hon. member for Greenwood or "any children," in the words of the minister himself, should include adopted children. These are the main comments I should like to make with regard to these motions.

Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North): Mr. Speaker, my remarks will not continue at any great length, and I may say it is not my intention to speak very frequently on this bill. First of all, it seems to me, on the basis of what I have been able to observe since I came to parliament, that the question of refugees and the question of immigration are to a large extent separate issues. I am not as concerned about the volume of immigration, the numbers who come here as a result of the legislation, whether amended or unamended, as are some members of parliament. I say this because I have watched immigration rise from 100,000 to almost 250,000 in some years, and then decline again by 20 per cent or 30 per cent, as it has done in the last year and a half, all without any changes in the act and without many changes in the regulations.

These fluctuations to a large extent reflect the economic situation in the country. When there is prosperity, we let more people in, and when there is large-scale unemployment, as there is at the present time, we let fewer people in. Somehow, the officials of the department get a message and they are able, certainly without any instruction from parliament—what instructions they get from the minister, I do not know—to regulate the flow. This is done chiefly through changes in the regulations. At one time a person wishing to immigrate to Canada was required to produce a firm job offer. But as unemployment grew there was a change in regulations and suddenly the job offer was not good enough. The applicant was required to produce a job offer in respect of a job which no Canadian wished to take. I am not saying this is wrong, because I am one who believes that in times of high unemployment there should be less immigration, and I do not expect this situation to change very much no matter what the act or a new set of regulations may say.

I am concerned, though, about the question of refugees. We have a good record, probably one of the best in the world. We have permitted large numbers of refugees to come here. I might mention some of the countries from which we have received refugees. At the time of the revolution in Hungary we relaxed our rules and admitted large numbers of refugees from that country. At the time the Asians were ordered out of Uganda we permitted large numbers to come to Canada. When the Viet Nam war was approaching its climax and many people wished to leave South Viet Nam, we relaxed our regulations in their favour.

I have the impression, though—and it is shared by many people—that our generosity was somewhat less toward refugees from Chile after the military junta took over. I have the impression we were much more selective in our treatment of refugees and that the authorities, whether they be in the immigration department or the RCMP responsible for security clearance, were much tougher in the case of Chileans who wanted to come to Canada than they had been with respect to those admitted from the other countries I have mentioned. This attitude, to put it mildly, does not enthuse me. If the people of Canada, correctly or not, have reason to believe that their government is picking and choosing the types of refugees it allows to enter, there is likely to be much less acceptance of the idea that we should be generous in our treatment of refugees. We are living in a world in which citizens of any country may be tomorrow's refugees. This being the case, we ought to be as generous as possible in our definition of what is a refugee and in the provisions under which refugees are admitted here.

It was interesting to hear the minister suggest that as a result of the green paper discussions, the production of this bill, and then the hearings before the committee, a great deal of consensus had been reached. I find this hard to believe. Firstly, in view of the fact that there are over 50 amendments to the bill, many by members of the Liberal party, there does

not seem to me to be much consensus. Secondly, when I note some of the views expressed by the Inter-Church Committee on Human Rights and the Inter-Church Committee on Population, both of which committees represented a very broad range of all the major religious denominations in this country, it seems to me that the minister has been very loth to accept what I consider to be some of the very sensible recommendations which they made. Let me quote just two short extracts from the presentations which were made, firstly by the Inter-Church Committee on Human Rights in Latin America. I quote from the minutes of proceedings and evidence of the Standing Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration for June 2, 1977. As found at page 30A:23, they say:

● (1630)

We are asking your initiative and support in three ways:

1. that you go on record supporting the development of criteria appropriate to refugees separate from those applied to regular immigration applications.

2. that you support the right to a personal oral hearing before a panel which would make the final decision, with appropriate opportunity to prepare such a hearing, for applicants for refugee status within Canada. To this end we are recommending the creation of a refugee claims board.

3. that you support amendments to the new immigration bill which would institutionalize these changes.

They then go on to outline the clauses which would implement those proposals. At page 30A:35 of the same day's proceedings, when dealing with the need for special refugee criteria, they had this to say:

In any situation, but especially in a world filled with evidence of growing brutality and oppression, refugees, the displaced and the persecuted should find quick refuge and untroubled safety among us Canadians. We are concerned that Bill C-24 does not really provide for special handling of these people with special needs.

In light of those two assessments of the bill, I find it very easy to support the motion of the hon. member for Montmorency (Mr. Duclos) and I am surprised that the hon. member for Provencher (Mr. Epp), and also the minister, suggested that this would open the door to millions of people. If, as suggested in the amendment, people in foreign countries were permitted to apply for refugee status, this would not mean that they could leave that country. After all, Vladimir Bokovsky, to mention one of the most recent dissidents who wanted to leave the Soviet Union, was not permitted to do so until that government agreed to let him go. Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn did not want to leave the Soviet Union, but he left when the government put him out. So to say that we will permit people to be classed as refugees if they want to leave their country merely broadens the classification.

So far as we are concerned, the country in which those people are living must first permit them to leave, and I suggest that on the basis of both past and present experience the door would not be opened very much more than it is at the present time. I agree with the hon. member for Broadview (Mr. Gilbert) that if we have the will, it is certainly not beyond the ability of the department to work out a procedure that would be satisfactory.

I want to say a few words about families. In his motion No. 4, the minister proposes that the act be amended so that at a certain point which he defines, clause 2 would read as follows:

—"family" means the father and mother and any children who, by reason of age or disability—

These are, to me, the important words.

—are in the opinion of an immigrant officer, mainly dependent upon the father or mother—

And so on. I can see 20 different definitions there. An immigration officer in Vancouver may use that definition to decide that a certain person is in the family, whereas an immigration officer in Winnipeg may come to a different conclusion, an immigration officer in Toronto may arrive at a third definition, an immigration officer in Montreal a fourth, and so on. Or two officers in adjoining offices in the same city could come to two completely different decisions.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): So could the same officer, on two different days.

Mr. Orlikow: Or, as my colleague from Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) says, so could the same officer, on two different days or in two different hours. So it seems to me that motion No. 4 as drafted by the minister is very deficient, and that motion No. 3 as drafted by my colleague from Greenwood (Mr. Brewin) includes a much better definition of "family". It is much more specific and gives quite a clear directive to an immigration officer, rather than leaving it to the whim or fancy of one immigration officer as opposed to another. The criteria are quite clear, and it seems to me the motion should be supported. I urge the minister to reconsider his position and to be a good deal more generous than he proposes to be on the subject of refugees. I ask him to adopt the motion proposed by the hon. member of his own party, the hon. member for Montmorency.

● (1640)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Serge Joyal (Maisonneuve-Rosemont): Mr. Speaker, during its proceedings the House must consider various bills, but by their nature and their object some of them deal with the substance of the country itself and more especially define our prospects for the future which must be specified during the discussion so that the country in which we will be living during the next few years meet the objects of democracy and freedom without which a society cannot make any progress, but comes to a standstill.

The amendment moved by my colleague from Montmorency (Mr. Duclos) deals with one of those notions reconsidering our international responsibilities. When the Geneva convention was signed, it dealt with the sovereignty concept as known and applied after the Second World War. The drafters of that time wanted the country to keep total jurisdiction over its subjects, citizens, nationals as long as they remained within its borders and as soon as they had left their territorial boundaries, they could then claim protection from other states. But a foreign state could not intervene within that country in an attempt to

remove from the jurisdiction of the laws of that country those nationals who had not yet left that territory.

This concept is the one contained in the very definition of the word "refugees" spelled out in the Geneva convention, and in the wording of Bill C-24. The motion presented by the hon. member for Montmorency (Mr. Duclos) aims at enlarging this very narrow definition and to surround the concept of the word "refugees" with a democratic context which is recognized today by most international bodies as necessary. One of the most recent international bodies to have seen the day, namely the European Common Market, made it mandatory for its members to respect the basic notion of a democratic regime and it has even provided for specific procedures to preclude or even reject certain requests for admission in cases where the political regimes of these countries did not meet those objectives with regard to freedom that all members of the European Economic Community are bound to uphold.

The definition given by my colleague, the hon. member for Montmorency, to the concept of "refugees" matches this evolution in international law which is now entrenched in the constitutional charter of the most recent regional international organizations. There is no doubt, as it has been underlined by the Minister of Manpower and Immigration (Mr. Cullen) that a broader definition of the concept of "refugees" would lead to less stringent admissibility standards. However, it would not change the criteria or the conditions. Essentially it aims at extending to a greater number of individuals who are experiencing trouble with the prevailing law of their country, the possibility of applying for admission to Canada. It does not constitute an obligation per se for a potential guest country—under those circumstances, Canada— automatically to grant the requests for admission made by those refugees. Essentially, the aim is to allow applications for political refugee status by foreign citizens at odds with the laws of their country for the reason that the latter do not meet with the democratic goals and freedoms to which Canada is committed.

Obviously, as emphasized by the Minister of Manpower and Immigration, the extended definition will entail extra work for immigration officers having to deal with such applications. It would certainly not lead to the excessive levels of applications that have been referred to at certain stages of the bill. It is vital in my view, dealing with the motion by the hon. member for Montmorency (Mr. Duclos) that we as a Parliament ask ourselves what Canada's responsibility is, that we promote and defend a certain commitment, a certain content of international responsibility, that we use up to date concepts.

The hon. member for Egmont (Mr. MacDonald) stressed in his speech that the most difficult cases before us today involve precisely nationals still living in their own countries. I think the amendment gives us an opportunity to redefine the context in which Canada will be operating tomorrow at the international level. You yourself, Mr. Speaker, have a large experience of a number of countries that went through difficult political circumstances but that, thanks to the support, help and understanding of other countries more deeply committed to those goals, are trying to redevelop a certain concept of international life different from that which prevailed after World War II, but better adapted to the historical context of the later part of the 20th century.

[Mr. Joyal.]

Therefore, the amendment now before us has in my view a significant symbolic value, in that it makes reference to the role that Canada proposes to play during the years to come. On the very long list of amendments proposed today some are built on basic concepts in our democratic society. I had an opportunity outside Parliament to refer to some of those concepts and those amendments are a new opportunity to come back to them. However, at this stage of the debate, it seems to me perfectly convenient to replace the purposes of this legislation within the context of Canada's international obligations.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. Members: Yes.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

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

Some hon. Members: Yea.

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

Some hon. Members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The deferred division on motion No. 1 also defers division on motion No. 4. As announced by the Chair, I will now put the question on motion No. 3 standing in the name of the hon. member for Greenwood (Mr. Brewin).

[*English*]

At this time I have to put the question on motion No. 3, which will dispose of motion No. 5. Motion No. 3 is in the name of the hon. member for Greenwood (Mr. Brewin). Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

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

Some hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All those opposed to the motion will please say nay.

Some hon. Members: Nay.

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

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): On division.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion negatived on division; and this division disposes of motion No. 5, also in the name of the hon. member for Greenwood.

Motions Nos. 3 and 5 (Mr. Brewin) negatived.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The question is now on motion No. 4 in the name of the hon. Minister of Manpower and Immigration (Mr. Cullen). Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

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

Some hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All those opposed to the motion will please say nay.

Some hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): On division.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I declare motion No. 4 carried on division.

Motion No. 4 (Mr. Cullen) agreed to.

● (1650)

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[*English*]

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 40, to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: the hon. member for Egmont (Mr. MacDonald)—Transport—Increase in freight rates on potatoes and provision of additional equipment—Reason for timing of announcement; the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre (Mr. McKenzie)—The Canadian Economy—Report of Fitzgerald Associates on "The Way Ahead"—Request for tabling of report or reference to committee; the hon. member for Brandon-Souris (Mr. Dinsdale)—Veterans Affairs—Date of establishment of local office in Brandon.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

IMMIGRATION ACT, 1976

AMENDMENTS TO IMPLEMENT CHANGES IN IMMIGRATION POLICY

The House resumed consideration of Bill C-24, respecting immigration to Canada, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Hon. members may consider this to be an appropriate time to proceed with the argument in respect of motions Nos. 2 and 9 and also motion No. 40 and other motions related thereto. If there are any members who wish to discuss the procedural regularity of motions Nos. 2, 9 and 22, I would be pleased to hear their arguments now, although I note that the hon. member in whose name motions Nos. 2 and 9 stand is not expected to be here to pursue those matters.

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I should like to argue in defence of the procedural regularity of motions Nos. 2, 9 and 22. I recognize the points you made when you gave your preliminary opinion, to the effect that there is no reference to domicile in Bill C-24 and that therefore these report stage amendments bring in a new proposition.

Mr. Speaker: The situation that we are facing here seems to me to be very similar to the one we faced in the bill to amend the Criminal Code with respect to capital punishment, that is, that what was a concept in the immigration law previously, namely, the concept of domicile, was removed by this bill which repeals the existing law and replaces it with a concept of permanent residence. That being so, the question that would remain is whether reinstating a concept which was taken out of the law by virtue of a bill which repeals it is simply a change in detail or a change of such a fundamental nature that it goes to the principle of the bill.

I would indicate that since the amendment is sought to be made to clause 4 of the bill, it is significant that clause 4 appears under the heading "Principles", and that the principles of the bill appear to be stated in clause 4 as relating to concepts of Canadian citizenship and permanent residence. If that is so, the concept of permanent residence would appear to be part of the principle of the bill in place of the previous concept of domicile. Therefore, the amendment which would seek to reinstate from the statute law an aspect of the law which was there before, but which is repealed by this bill, would seem to be going contrary to the principle of the bill. I thought I would expose that reasoning for the benefit of the hon. member.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for adding to what you said earlier. I thank you in particular for drawing the parallel to the legislation that we had with respect to the criminal law. Initially, may I make the

point that in that case we did not repeal the entire Criminal Code and bring in a new one; we amended the Criminal Code in one respect. In this case we are repealing, in its entirety, the present Immigration Act, as provided in clause 128 of the bill.

I submit that because clause 128 of the bill repeals in its entirety the present Immigration Act, Bill C-24 is removing the question of domicile from the existing legislation. It seems to me that there is something that is analogous to the very principle of the report stage, indeed to the rules that govern the report stage which give us the right at that stage to put back into the legislation something that was removed at the committee stage. I realize that the time when the concept of domicile was removed was when the bill was brought before the House and given second reading, but what I am trying to address myself to is Your Honour's contention that there is nothing in Bill C-24 on domicile, and therefore that report stage motions Nos. 2, 9 and 22 bring in a new idea.

My contention is that Bill C-24 pronounces on domicile by virtue of the fact that it repeals in its entirety the previous legislation known as the Immigration Act, and that it is relevant to the whole process of striking out the whole concept of domicile for members at the report stage to ask that the concept of domicile be put back into the legislation. It is for this reason that I contend, sir, that motions Nos. 2, 9 and 22 should be allowed, at least procedurally.

Hon. Bud Cullen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, I do not think there is any necessity to elaborate on the arguments that have already been put forward by you and the introduction that you were good enough to make to the House when you indicated the grouping of the particular motions. What we have done here, very clearly, is to eliminate the original bill. We do not have a bill that we are simply amending; we have done away with the bill completely, and all the concepts that we are dealing with are subject to amendment.

What is attempted by motion No. 9 is to reintroduce a concept which was in the old bill. It endeavours to introduce another concept in the bill which was not considered when we brought this new bill into being. On that basis, it seems to me that your point is well taken, sir, and that the idea of reintroducing a concept of domicile from an old bill into this new one, which does away completely with the old act, is inappropriate. Therefore, the motion should be ruled out of order.

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, the minister has said that we have done away with the old Immigration Act. He is a little premature. We have not done away with it. It is still the law of this land. As my colleague pointed out very clearly, we are changing the law, or we are proposing to change it, I assume, by repealing the Immigration Act at a later date. In the meantime, I would respectfully submit that a concept such as domicile, which has historically been associated with the right to immigrate or to stay in this country once you have immigrated, is part of the legislation in respect of immigration.

[Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre).]

I find it difficult to comprehend how parliament at this stage of the proceedings should not be entitled to say there is a concept which we think protects people and it should be incorporated. I am not trying to argue the merits of it now; I am merely trying to argue the procedural point of view. It would seem to me that the function of the rules of parliament should permit us to do something which is clearly relevant to the basic theory of immigration. We have in the bill provisions which deal with residence, and we want to add a clause or put back a clause that was formerly recognized regarding people who have acquired Canadian domicile.

● (1700)

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): And keep alive a concept.

Mr. Brewin: And keep alive a concept which is there at the present time. I respectfully submit that parliament should be allowed to do this, and should not be restricted by any interpretation of the rules which would prevent the will of parliament being expressed on this highly important subject.

Mr. David MacDonald (Egmont): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Okanagan-Kootenay (Mr. Johnston) and I briefly discussed these motions, and I am prepared to act on his behalf and move them, if they are acceptable to the Chair. With regard to the acceptability of motions Nos. 2 and 9 concerning the concept of domicile, it has already been stated clearly by some hon. members that this is something that is part and parcel of the present Immigration Act. There is a real question, in line with the comments of the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles), as to whether, in dealing with the new legislation, that would be considered to be a new motion. That is particularly so with respect to the fact that there are going to be hundreds of thousands of people—we do not know exactly how many; this is something we tried to determine in committee; perhaps the number will be well over a million—who will continue to be defined under this category.

Perhaps Your Honour did not have an opportunity, because of the length and complexity of the bill and the shortness of time, to notice that in clause 127 the concept of domicile is very clearly stated and very clearly referred to as being part of the new administration in terms of the coming into force of this bill. Just to refresh the mind of hon. members, in clause 127 we find these words:

> Where a person acquired Canadian domicile in accordance with the Immigration Act as it read before it was repealed by subsection 128(1) of this act and did not lose Canadian domicile before the coming into force of this act, a deportation order may not be made against that person on the basis of any activity carried on by him before the coming into force of this Act for which a deportation order could not have been made against him under the Immigration Act as it read before it was repealed by subsection 128(1) of this act.

In other words, what I am saying is that it is not just a question of this presently being the status under the Immigration Act, which will cease to exist when Bill C-24 becomes law; indeed, there is going to be for many hundreds of thousands of Canadians certain legal protection and legal recognition under

the designation of domicile as it presently exists. The minister will well recall that in the discussion we had concerning the inclusion of the domicile provision in the new legislation, he was quite willing to recognize that for many hundreds of thousands of people—and we cannot fix an exact figure because apparently exact figures are not kept—the domicile provision and designation will still apply.

That is very clearly why it is part of clause 127. Therefore, when this bill comes into effect there will be a domicile provision, a domicile designation and a domicile categorization. While it is quite true that it will be quite different with respect to the functioning of the law—Bill C-24, as compared to the present law—it is not true to say that there will not be, for the purposes of definition or even of administration, the concept of domicile. That is why I argue strenuously that this is not a new concept. It was an important concept, and it was incumbent upon the department to provide some kind of recognition and continuing designation for a very substantial number of people who have lived in this country, for a considerable length of time in some instances, and who will have to live, as long as this new bill will be in effect, under the designation of domicile.

So I argue that it is not just a question of what was in the former act. That has been suggested, and I think that is a valid point in terms of the importance of it. I argue that it is also in this bill and it is very clearly defined in clause 127. That sets out very clearly the legal situation and the legal protection for those who enjoy the designation of domicile. Of course, it will be fixed to a date, the date of the proclamation of this bill; but this bill in no way discontinues the designation of domicile. What is proposed by the hon. member for Okanagan-Kootenay in motions Nos. 2 and 9 is merely the extension of the provisions of domicile as they are set out in clause 127, and to elaborate them somewhat; but certainly not to introduce a new definition into the context of this bill.

Having said that with respect to those two motions, I must say, quite frankly, that my arguments and my position can be a good deal more convincing with respect to that, as well as to the questions Your Honour has raised concerning a number of my motions, particularly motion No. 40 which would establish a refugee claims board. As Your Honour has recognized, I was attempting, through a series of amendments, to set out a particular procedure with respect to dealing with refugees. The minister is well aware of this because it was discussed in committee.

Mr. Speaker: Order. I think the record would be a little tidier if we dealt with one set of motions at a time. If the hon. member has concluded with respect to motions Nos. 2 and 9, perhaps I can now see if there are any other hon. members who wish to make a contribution to that argument. If not, perhaps I could conclude.

I have some sympathy with the arguments which have been advanced with respect to these motions. I do not want to mislead the House by saying that the concept is unknown to the immigration law. In fact, the concept was part of the statute as it existed previously. Neither do I want to indicate that it is not relevant to the bill. I do not want to confuse any of that language. Certainly, anything which would define the status of people in Canada would certainly be relevant to this bill because it relates to the subject of immigration.

The problem I have is simply this. The bill which the House passed at second reading contains a principle. The principle is the repeal of the existing law on immigration and the replacement of that law with the one contained in Bill C-24. One of the principles involved in that, however those principles are defined, seems to be the elimination of the concept of domicile. The argument made with respect to clause 127 seems to be a counter-productive argument, with all due respect.

In fact, it seems to me that clause 127 simply advertises that elimination and makes provision for those who up to the time of the passage of this bill had acquired domicile. That seems to me to be a reinforcement of the fact that one of the purposes of this bill, which was passed at second reading, is to repeal the immigration law in such a way as to remove the concept of domicile and replace it with the concept described in clause 4 of the bill.

My difficulty there is not whether the concept is a new one, in the sense of the immigration law, or whether it is relevant, but whether it is appropriate to permit, by way of a motion at the report stage, an amendment to a bill which, it seems to me, would be counterproductive to the very basic principle of the bill. One of the basic principles and purposes of the bill is the elimination of domicile from the law. It seems to me that to permit an amendment which would reinstate the law of domicile is to say that amendments could be used to contravene directly the principle of the bill. That is something which we obviously do not support and I cannot consider.

The language used in clause 4 of the bill leads me to believe that it is certainly intended to be a rather fundamental principle of this bill that the concept of domicile be removed. Therefore, any amendment at this stage which would seek to reinstate that falls into precisely the same category as amendments which I previously had to rule on and which one by one sought to reinstate capital punishment when it had been removed by the bill. I ruled in each case that those amendments were directly contrary to the principle of the bill.

I find the parallel here irresistible. If this were simply a change of some detail, or some incidental circumstance with respect to the application of the bill, I would follow and accept the arguments of the hon. members who have spoken in favour of the amendments. The reason for my ruling them out is that they offend the principle of the bill.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre); Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Earlier this afternoon, when one of Your Honour's deputies was in the Chair, a point was raised about the possibility of some recorded divisions being taken tonight. I complained that this was raised before any opportunity for consultation. So far as I am concerned, that consultation has now taken place, and we are prepared to agree to the taking tonight, at 9.45, of recorded divisions on any report stage amendments stored up to that time, so to speak. But that is all

we are suggesting. Let each day's evil take care of itself. We will let tomorrow go without any votes, and take care of Monday when it comes.

• (1710)

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, we understand the suggestion shall apply to today only. To that extent, we agree. We can discuss what is to happen on other days.

Mr. MacFarlane: Mr. Speaker, that suggestion is agreeable to us.

Mr. Speaker: It is agreed, and so ordered, that the taking of deferred divisions on report stage amendments will proceed at 9.45. The proceedings will be interrupted at 9.45 this evening for the taking of any deferred divisions which have accumulated within our procedures up to that point. We may consider how this procedure will affect the adjournment debate already announced.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, could the bells not ring for 15 minutes only?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: Part of the order should say that the proceedings will be interrupted at 9.45, the bells will ring for 15 minutes, and the votes will be taken at ten o'clock. That would allow the adjournment debate to proceed as announced a few moments ago.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: For the purpose of the procedural argument, perhaps we could address ourselves to motion No. 40.

Mr. David MacDonald (Egmont): Mr. Speaker, as I said before you ruled on motions 2 and 9, it is somewhat difficult to argue in support of the establishment of a refugee claims board primarily because the establishment of the board will involve some financial expenditure, which is beyond the ability of a private member to recommend. Although I was absent from the committee hearings when the point was discussed, members of the committee experienced certain difficulty in having this matter brought forward and voted on during the committee's regular proceedings. However, committee members tried to bring about a more effective, efficient and fair way of dealing with refugees than our present immigration procedures contemplate. I recognize that the introduction of a refugee claims board may introduce a new element into our procedures. However, if I can set aside for a moment any suggestion of a charge against the Crown, I suggest that this is not a foreign idea. At least, the idea of suggesting one procedure as against another is not foreign to us.

As Your Honour may know, and as the minister has said several times, there is in the bill a much more clearly stated procedure with respect to the processing of refugees than ever was contained in our immigration law. I am attempting to bring about, by way of this particular procedure and motions set down on the order paper, much more clearly defined procedures, perhaps more public procedures and, in the final analysis, a much fairer way of processing refugee claims which may come to the attention of the department. If one can judge by what has been said in the House today, there is concern that somehow one of two things will happen: that an enormous number of people will suddenly appear on our doorstep—

Mr. Cullen: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. With respect, I thought we were debating the procedural acceptability of the motions, and not debating their merits. It seems to me the hon. member is now debating their merits.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. In every case, anticipating what may be raised hereafter by way of argument on the merits, I may perhaps be lulled into being somewhat generous with remarks concerning the procedural point. However, I should bring the hon. member back to the point being debated.

Mr. MacDonald (Egmont): Mr. Speaker, I thought I was debating the procedural aspect. I wish to make clear that I am not attempting to introduce a proposition at variance with what is contained in Beauchesne's fourth edition. I am not trying to introduce a proposition foreign to the proposition of the bill. I do not think the minister himself would argue that anything in these motions is foreign to the purpose of the bill. I merely wish to make our procedures more equitable. Being concerned with equity, I argued that this particular series of motions should be accepted. I did not intend to introduce any factors inconsistent with the over-all scope of the immigration bill. That scope, or those objectives, are set out clearly. There is an attempt in my motion to be much more non-discriminatory, more open and more fair with respect to those whom we judge should be granted refugee status.

The question of costs involved can be interpreted perhaps in one of two ways. From time to time private members have proposed legislation allowing for the appointment of individuals, and such legislation has in no way obligated the Crown with respect to expenditures. Realistically, I recognize that this would very likely be the case in the present instance and I would accept Your Honour's ruling in that regard. I think the ideas incorporated in the motions are eminently reasonable and in harmony with the bill as presently printed.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I am sure the hon. member recognizes his fundamental difficulty in proposing the motions he has just defended. I am sure the motions are well-intentioned and would put forward a régime designed only to extend greater justice and fairness to those who seek refugee status under our immigration law. However, it is basic and fundamental, under our practices and precedents, that it does not lie within the power of a private member to put forward, by way of amendment or otherwise, measures which would call for the expenditure of funds, unless he has been able to contrive, I presume with the assistance of the minister, the royal recommendation in respect thereto.

But that is not the case at present. Therefore, on that one, basic ground alone, without going further, the motion fails. It

seems to me that the motion relating to the establishment of a different kind of board than now exists under our immigration law would obviously provide for expenditure. Therefore, on that basic, fundamental ground, I rule the motions out of order. Motion No. 40 having been ruled out of order, the motions related to it also fail, those being motions 34, 35, 36, 43 and 45.

As I said earlier, motions Nos. 2 and 9 having failed, motion 22 is the only other motion which mentions specifically the concept of domicile. Therefore, motions 2, 9 and 22 are out of order.

I note that motion No. 23 was referred to earlier. I have examined the language of motion 23 and do not find the word "domicile" in it, although there seems to be language in it which has a similar description or connotation. In fact, the word "domicile" is not used. Therefore, on procedural grounds I am not able, without further elaboration, to find difficulty with that motion.

That brings us to the consideration of motion No. 6 in the name of the hon. member for Provencher (Mr. Epp). That, in accordance with early discussion, also brings forward motion No. 7 in the name of the hon. member for Greenwood (Mr. Brewin), and motion No. 8, in the name of the hon. member for Egmont (Mr. MacDonald). I should also add that Mr. Paproski is the seconder of motion No. 6, Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre) the seconder of motion No. 7, and Mr. Brewin the seconder of motion No. 8.

Mr. Jake Epp (Provencher) moved:

Motion No. 6.

That Bill C-24, respecting immigration to Canada, be amended in clause 3 by striking out lines 11 to 13 at page 5 and substituting the following therefor:

"long term demographic goals as shall be established by the government of Canada from time to time after consultation with the provinces, concerning regional demographic needs and after consultation with such other persons, organizations and institutions as it deems appropriate in respect of the size, rate of".

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood) moved:

Motion No. 7.

That Bill C-24, respecting immigration to Canada, be amended in clause 3 by striking out line 19 at page 5 and substituting the following therefor:

"ter of Canada and the multicultural nature of Canada;".

Mr. David MacDonald (Egmont) moved:

Motion No. 8.

That Bill C-24, respecting immigration to Canada, be amended in clause 3 by striking our line 41 at page 5 and substituting the following therefor:

"origin, colour, religion, sex or legal political opinion or activity;".

Mr. Jake Epp (Provencher): Mr. Speaker, when the special joint committee reported, and during second reading debate on Bill C-24, my party stressed the need for a Canadian demographic policy. We contended, on second reading, that Canada has no demographic policy. The minister's remarks on second reading convinced us that this is the case.

• (1720)

When this matter was raised during committee stage, further evidence was brought to our attention which illustrates that, in fact, Canada does not have a developed demographic policy. The purpose of this amendment is to put into place the mechanism by which a demographic policy would, in fact, be developed. We are not calling for a demographic policy to be put in place, and to be in place immediately. What we are calling for is that the procedure and development of that demographic policy to be put into place in very fair terms.

The minister went part way in clause 7. I am not trying to move ahead, Mr. Speaker. I hope I am in order. In clause 7, the minister went part way in the development of a demographic policy. I must stress that he only went part way. The amendment in clause 7 is acceptable. We endorse it and hope to go further on it. Clause 7 states that after the establishment of annual levels—

The minister . . . shall lay before parliament, not later than the sixtieth day before the commencement of each calendar year or, if parliament is not then sitting, not later than the fifteenth day next thereafter that parliament is sitting, a report specifying

(a) the number of immigrants that the government of Canada deems it appropriate to admit during any specified period of time; and

(b) the manner in which demographic considerations have been taken into account in determining that number.

What the amendment does is obligate the minister to lay before parliament the target, not the exact number, of the number of immigrants who will be landed in the next year. That target might be overshot or undershot largely on the basis of the number of refugees that we land during that given year. We cannot determine beforehand, on any demographic considerations or manpower considerations, the number of refugees who might be landed in that given year. I believe that is clearly understood by those members who sat on the committee.

What will happen at this stage is that the minister, under clause 7(b), will have to place before parliament the demographic considerations, in other words, the rationale for the number he deems wise to land in that given year. That is fine as far as it goes. However, demographic considerations have not been defined in 7(b). The minister can give us the demographic considerations as he sees them. A process must be established whereby we will get those policy statements and demographic considerations. That is the reason for the amendment.

I believe I am supported in this by the report of the special joint committee. I do not recall how the committee split at that time. I do know there was general agreement on recommendations Nos. 84 and 85 of the special joint committee. It is important that they be read into the record at this time. Section 84 of the special joint committee report, page 53:23, reads as follows:

As now proposed, the only inducement offered to a prospective immigrant to settle in a designated community is the opportunity to emigrate immediately. This would be attractive only if a waiting list had developed. With a waiting list, an immigrant choosing to settle in a designated community would do so entirely voluntarily since he would be admissible in any event if he were prepared to wait.

These are the operative words.

The committee urges that this proposal be approached imaginatively, and that consultation with the provinces be undertaken about the various ways of applying the principle which the committee wishes to promote that one of the goals immigration can help to serve is regional development.

Section 85 reads as follows:

The committee is under no illusion that its proposal would solve the problems of regional development or urban congestion. It recognizes that incentives must be available to attract Canadians as well as immigrants to areas where people are needed. However, a proposal along these lines could go a little way toward meeting these objectives, and the committee urges that such a change be implemented on an experimental basis, and carefully monitored.

Our amendment would obligate the federal government to develop long-term demographic goals. In the amendment we placed before the committee we set a time period of every five years. We have removed that in order to make it more feasible, because of the difficulty the time period might create. However, longer term demographic periods should be provided, because all we have in 7(b) is a yearly basis of landed immigrants subject to demographic considerations. There is no obligation to give long-term projections.

It is vital that there be an obligation in the legislation to consult with the provinces. Everyone on the committee paid lip service to consultation with the provinces. During the special joint committee hearings there were numerous representations to the effect that it is the provinces, municipalities and school-boards which are faced with large financial obligations because of an immigration policy in which they have had little, if any, input. It is the federal government which puts the policy into place and lands the immigrants. There should be a consultative process to determine the impact on the communities and the need for the services these people will require.

One of the recommendations of the task force the western premiers established is that an ongoing consultative process be put into place. If my amendment does not carry, this will not take place. That is why we believe it is necessary. Further, there is the question of regional needs. It has been brought forward, especially by the hon. member for Egmont (Mr. MacDonald), that a whole new approach for maritime Canada will have to be viewed with respect to immigrants in order to get entrepreneurial skills into the maritimes and somewhat alleviate the chronic unemployment in those areas. That is a valid point. It holds true for other areas as well.

The provinces would have a much better tab on their input into regional needs. Their information could be put into the consultative process, not only so that immigrants will benefit Canada but, which is more important, so they can establish themselves successfully in Canada. This amendment will force the federal government to put into place and follow the consultative process.

The amendment goes further and opens up a consultative process with any group interested in demography. I will not go into that in great detail. However, it has been stated many times that immigrants will play a larger role than heretofore with regard to population increase. That is only half of the argument. The other half of the argument is this: by all economic factors we need to create 400,000 to 500,000 jobs in a given calendar year in Canada. At the present rate the government is creating only some 200,000 jobs a year and the consultative process will help us decide how immigrants fit in and how sufficient jobs are to be created for Canadians coming onto the labour market, whether they be young Canadians or women who have not been in the labour market but are now entering at the rate of some 150,000 a year.

• (1730)

Surely it is apparent that Canada is in need of a demographic policy, a consultative process. All my amendment does is to go further than the minister has already decided to do. It merely puts into place a consultative process and stresses the need for a demographic policy.

I say quite openly that this is a new area for Canadians and we have a long way to go. But I believe it is apparent that we must lose some of the attitudes we have had about Canada—that Canada is a vast land and that we can accept people without any further view as to the distribution of the population, the demand on natural resources, housing, transportation, education, you name it. It is for that purpose I would like to see something in place which would finally create a small committee or group of persons who I know have the expertise to put into place a demographic policy which is definitely needed in this country. I therefore commend this amendment to the House.

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): I do not intend to speak on the amendment moved by the hon. member for Provencher (Mr. Epp). I have never found "demography" to be a very useful word. I have read some books about it and their authors, like all experts, disagree with each other, so I am not at all sure I am as enthusiastic as is the hon. member about these demographic goals. However, he has had his say. He may be perfectly right, and maybe he has persuaded me, but I am not quite sure, yet.

The amendment to which I propose to call attention is motion No. 7. I would remind hon. members that Clause 3 sets out a Canadian immigration policy. It says:

—the rules and regulations made under this act shall be designed and administered in such a manner as to promote the domestic and international interests of Canada, recognizing the need . . .

Then the clause goes on to list various things, including

(*b*) to enrich and strengthen the cultural and social fabric of Canada, taking into account the federal and bilingual character of Canada.

This is the paragraph to which I should like to draw particular attention. I say "Amen" to it as a very sound statement of purpose, but I believe it falls short in one important particular. It is true we have a federal and bilingual character: I pay full tribute to that and to the necessity for it. But it so happens we also have a multicultural fact. There are many different peoples in this country. I have not counted them all up but there must be at least a million people whose roots are not in the French or English speaking areas.

Mr. Paproski: Three and a half million.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): There are a million Paproskis.

Mr. Brewin: I underestimated the Paproskis, it seems. I do not know how many there are exactly, but there are a great many of them. Most of them have come here in fairly recent generations, and most of them want to be consulted and to be recognized as citizens with a status equal to that of other Canadians. In my own city of Toronto there is a real multicultural fact. People from many different parts of the world have come to make their homes in the city, and may I say they have immensely improved it. They want to feel they were consulted, that they were part of the pattern, that when we speak about the purposes of this legislation we are not speaking just about French and English Canada.

We are fully justified, of course, in making reference to our French and English heritage, but I do not think we are justified in omitting any reference to that other fact of life, the multicultural nature of Canada. I cannot understand the minister's objection to doing so. I would have thought it would have been wise for him to have included such a reference if only for political reasons. The government of which he is a member has spent money on multiculturalism. The hon. member for Parkdale (Mr. Haidasz) was the minister in charge of the multicultural program. We recognize the right of people to be different and to cherish different cultures.

It seems to me this is a most inoffensive amendment; it is hard to conceive of one which should meet with less objection. Perhaps the minister and his advisers decided at one point that they would make no concessions whatever. I would say that his refusal to make a concession on this point is equivalent to a slap in the face to citizens who have their origins in various countries.

The minister reproves me for having introduced too many amendments. I can tell him that every amendment I have introduced has been suggested to me by organizations and that many of these organizations represent particular ethnic groups. Does he think they are not entitled to be consulted? He shows a great deal of complacency about these matters. If he would only show an ounce of common sense he would accept this amendment.

Mr. David MacDonald (Egmont): Mr. Speaker, I should like to say a few words about all three of these amendments. The hon. member for Provencher (Mr. Epp) has raised a crucial issue, one which was brought forward time and time again during the meetings of the special joint committee as it travelled across the country. It is at the heart of the reason for having an Immigration Act in the first place. The reason is, surely, to regulate the flow of people who come here either as visitors or to seek landed immigrant status. The whole question of why they come and where they go is as crucial as any other aspect of the bill.

● (1740)

It is interesting that in this bill, as in no previous immigration law before it, we have a clearly stated set of objectives, which I know the minister feels quite keenly about and for which I think he and his staff should be commended. It is fundamentally important that we have stated in very clear and ringing tones in the objectives the purposes of the immigration bill. We should indicate the non-discriminatory character of our immigration policy and the basis on which our immigration programs and Immigration Act will operate.

It is therefore important at the outset, in the very first clause of the bill respecting the fundamental purposes of the legislation, that we have stated that it is for the attainment of demographic goals. I suppose I share a bit of the feeling of the hon. member for Greenwood (Mr. Brewin) who said that he is not quite sure what "demography" means. All kinds of people who pass themselves off as demographers or demographic experts might have trouble agreeing, but if we slip away from that technical word or from a word that smacks of some kind of jargon we recognize that what it really says is where people live, and asks what kind of settlement, what kind of community building, what kind of evolution in human terms, will take place in this country.

I suppose in a previous generation this was all caught up in a kind of laissez-faire situation. One did not talk about demographic goals 25 years ago when the last Immigration Act was passed. At least if we had talked about it I do not think we would have received a very good hearing. There was a pretty general feeling that people simply lived where they chose to live. Communities developed almost willy-nilly as a sort of unseen hand in events took control. Yet because the complicated and sophisticated society in which we move has become very apparent, certainly in terms of a much more complex immigration bill this time than the one we had 25 years ago, we have to be concerned with the way in which communities, provinces and regions develop.

All of us are reminded, almost on a daily basis, of the problems which arise when we suffer urban congestion or rural depopulation or regional disparity and housing problems. There are any number of social and economic problems which confront us. Quite frankly, one of the difficulties in trying to resolve immigration policy is that we have concluded that by dealing simply with the subject of immigration we were going to affect in a fundamental and total way all of the economic and social problems that we are facing in this country. I think that most of us who have become involved in this subject for a while realize that this is not the case. However, Mr. Speaker, we do know that increasingly, perhaps primarily because of a declining birth rate, the phenomenon of immigration is going to become critically important.

Much of the evidence which was placed before the special joint committee very often came from urban areas which had strong views about the impact of immigration on their particular community. This was particularly so in the larger urban centres across Canada. What was not nearly so obvious, but which became obvious, when we moved into regions which had not experienced on a per capita basis the same amount of immigration, say over the past half century, was that there were also problems there respecting what I call a shortfall in

the number of immigrants who arrived. We could spend a lot of time canvassing the various reasons why this occurred—the dynamism, employment opportunities, attractiveness of very rapidly growing urban centres in this country which absorbed a higher percentage of the immigrants who have arrived this century.

Whether the factors be those or others, we do know that immigration has not followed an even pattern. In fact if one were to look at the present situation, it is an extremely uneven pattern. A high proportion of the immigrants coming to this country are concentrated within one province; indeed, they are concentrated within one specific geographic area.

I am concerned on two fronts, Mr. Speaker. I am concerned that with the recognition of demographic goals set out in the objectives there will be a much greater consciousness on a longer term basis, on the part not only of public officials but the general public itself, of the implication of immigration, not just on an immediate basis in terms of the economic situation—which is uppermost in our minds at the present time—but on a longer term basis in terms of the evolution and development of the country.

What concerns me, and I think should concern the minister, is that when he recognizes the importance of trying to achieve demographic goals I am sure he must also recognize that this is not something which can be achieved unilaterally. Surely the lesson we have learned in recent years is that the federal government cannot by itself establish demographic policy. It would run into enormous difficulty if it sought to do so.

I know the minister has no such intention and has indicated so clearly. I also know that the present demographic group which is set up to co-ordinate the fact finding and projections on the part of a number of key departments in the federal government is also working closely with the provinces. But I think it must be clearly stated in law that this is one of the very clear objectives, namely, that the demographic goals which are to be evolved over the next few years, for the life of this legislation, will be evolved in full consultation with the other legitimate authority—the provinces—and other organizations and even individuals who have something important to contribute to this very important process in community and country building.

Unless that commitment is clearly stated in the objectives, then surely the minister is not attempting to put on the statute books a law which is both realistic and fair so far as the evolution of this country is concerned. I hope that the minister will give serious consideration to this amendment submitted by my colleague from Provencher and will see it within his power to accept it as reasonable and right.

With regard to motion No. 7 moved by my colleague from Greenwood, which raises the whole issue of the multicultural nature of Canada, I do not think the argument really needs to be reiterated. I think it was very clearly stated. We are both a bilingual country in terms of our origins and the evolution of this country since Confederation, and multicultural in character. I could wax eloquent about the multicultural aspects of Prince Edward Island but I realize that that is not the purpose

[Mr. MacDonald (Egmont).]

of this debate this afternoon. If this is to be a modern and relevant piece of legislation, and if it is to be clearly stated in the objectives that it is the character of this country which has to be preserved and enhanced, then it is only reasonable and right that, in addition to the bilingual characteristic which is now increasingly and generally recognized, its multicultural nature should also be included.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I want to refer to my own motion, No. 8, which refers to the clause which clearly states that we are to have a non-discriminatory policy. I refer to Clause 3(f) which provides:

—to ensure that any person who seeks admission to Canada on either a permanent or temporary basis is subject to standards of admission that do not discriminate on grounds of race, national or ethnic origin, colour, religion or sex;

This is a time when increasingly authorities, national governments, even agencies under the purview of the United Nations are making clear the position that there is the concept of equity and equality. If we fail to state this, there is always the possibility, hopefully less than probably, that acts of discrimination will take place, particularly against those who may seek admission to this country. There were a number of predecessors to the present immigration minister who declared in this House, since I have been a member, that we would have a non-discriminatory policy. The late Prime Minister Lester Pearson made it very clear, in support of that concept, that Canada would adopt a policy of non-discrimination in its immigration program. Those on the special joint committee and those who have studied immigration closely take the view that only in recent years, really only within the last decade, can Canada rightfully say that its immigration policy is non-discriminatory. What I am asking for in this amendment is that it be realistic in terms of potential discrimination which exists both in this country and in the world today. We must recognize that in the past there has been discrimination on the basis of race and creed. These are no longer acceptable as bases of discrimination in the type of democratic society which is existent in Canada today.

● (1750)

We have left uncovered an area of increasing potential for discrimination. The world in which we have moved in the late sixties and early seventies is one increasingly polarized with respect to strong political opinions and activities. There have been instances within our own society of actions being taken which were based on a person's political point of view. Unfortunately in one or two instances I have encountered discrimination with respect to political opinion, which is something we must be very careful to guard against. In a highly complicated technocratic society it is dangerous to start narrowing the borders of accepted and legitimate political activity and opinion.

During the last few years we have seen a number of countries which previously enjoyed democratic and parliamentary institutions such as our own, lose those institutions because of intolerance and a regime which eliminated free political expression and activity. It is not encouraging to realize that there are fewer parliamentary groups and fewer

countries in the world today which tolerate freedom of political expression and activity than there were before I became a member of this Chamber.

In a world which is faced with very strong contending pressures and ideologies, there is a danger that we might succumb, for some possible short term gain, to the temptation to reject political opinions which would be legitimate in normal times. We might believe, for some reason or other, that they should be eliminated or discriminated against.

What I have said here has been discussed in committee and was originally proposed by the hon. member for Greenwood. I am referring to the fact that we should include the aspect of non-discrimination in this legislation with respect to legal political opinion and activity. To do less than that is not to provide for pressures which will exist during the course of the years when this particular bill will serve as the immigration statute for this country. Therefore I hope the minister will give serious consideration to the inclusion of this provision in the legislation.

Hon. Bud Cullen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Egmont (Mr. MacDonald) and the hon. member for Provencher (Mr. Epp) indicated that the determination on the demographic policy would not be amenable. The hon. member for Provencher referred to Clause 7 which clearly spells out that the minister, "after consultation with the provinces concerning regional demographic needs," etc.—thus there is an obligation on the minister.

As has been said, the bill already recognizes that national demographic goals may be established in the future. In that case immigration planning and operations must be consistent with those goals. However, in our opinion the Immigration Act is not the appropriate vehicle for establishing statutory provisions respecting demographic planning. Demographic planning will involve much more than immigration. In fact immigration may well be a relatively small element. In any event it is also questionable whether such a positive subject as demographic planning should appear in a statute which is predominantly enforcement oriented.

I will not repeat the comments I made at second reading, but commencing on March 10, 1977, at page 3863 of *Hansard* I elaborated on those comments. Motion No. 7 is in the name of the hon. member for Greenwood (Mr. Brewin). In my opinion the immigration statute, which pertains mainly to the admission of people to Canada, including visitors, and the removal of offenders from Canada, is not a suitable vehicle for official endorsation of multiculturalism. From a practical standpoint one would have to be apprehensive that the inclusion of multiculturalism in the governing objectives could be used to try to compel a government either to maintain the present ethnic composition of the Canadian population or to make a deliberate effort to speed its rate of change. Neither of these extremes is acceptable.

Motion No. 8 is in the name of the hon. member for Egmont. Primarily he has refugees in mind in proposing this amendment. There should be no distinction among refugees, fleeing rightist or leftist persecution. However, the effect of the amendment would be much broader than that. It is difficult to see how most provisions respecting subversion and national security could be reconciled with the proposed amendment. No political party is illegal in Canada, yet membership in a particular party abroad, where it is probably legal, is often the principal evidence that a person is a security risk.

With the amendment it would appear that the subversion/security provisions could apply only in the case of an overt act defined as an offence in Canadian law. This would be going too far in the case of refugees. It would effectively prevent the screening out of people, although refugees by definition, who were forced to leave their countries of citizenship or residence because of their adherence to parties with extremist policies, which would be just as dangerous in Canada as elsewhere. For those reasons I would be against these motions.

Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North): Mr. Speaker, I rise to express surprise at the minister and the government for not accepting the amendment proposed in motion No. 7. This is an extremely important and fundamental matter, because it deals with the whole question of the policies of biculturalism and bilingualism in this country, something which has been accepted by all parties.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to call it six o'clock.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It being six o'clock, I do now leave the chair until eight o'clock tonight.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 8 p.m.

Mr. Orlikow: Mr. Speaker, I support the amendment moved by my colleague, the hon. member for Greenwood (Mr. Brewin), contained in motion No. 7 which proposes to add to Clause 3 the consideration in this act of the multicultural nature of Canada. I find it difficult to understand the government's reluctance to accept this amendment.

This country has been committed by parliament for almost 15 years to the concept of increasing the use of both the English and French languages. That policy was first announced by former Prime Minister Pearson. It was worked upon by the Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism which he appointed and whose findings were supported by all party leaders and the majority of members of all parties represented in this parliament. The Official Languages Act, which was brought forward by the present Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau), was supported by all four party leaders and by the majority of members of all four parties.

Members of parliament have supported the idea of the bilingual nature of this country because we recognize the importance which the people of Quebec, particularly the majority of the people of Quebec who are French speaking,

give to the concept that this country should recognize that the people who founded this country spoke two languages. Members of parliament in all parties, if they are honest—I speak now only of members of parliament who represent English speaking constituencies because I cannot claim to be as knowledgeable about those who represent French speaking constituencies—know how much hostility there is among so many of their constituents, how often they are telephoned or receive letters asking why the French language is being rammed down their throats. Representing, as I do, a large ethnic constituency in which the majority of people are neither of French nor English origin, I know that among the most skeptical, among those to whom it is most difficult to explain the necessity for increasing the use of French in this country, are people who are neither of French nor of English origin. Their suspicions are based on the idea, I believe, that to the extent the second language is given more power, more influence and more recognition, their status as first class citizens is jeopardized.

One of the things which the government has done with the support of all parties to try to combat that feeling is to support the language and culture expansion and development of those ethnic or religious groups which come from non-English or non-French speaking countries and who have maintained, and indeed expanded, until recently on an almost completely voluntary basis, the languages, the culture, the music, the art and all the other forms which their culture took in the countries from which they came.

● (2010)

In recent years federal and provincial governments have stepped in without clearly understanding that the continuation of these other cultures, languages and arts has to be essentially on a voluntary basis. It has to be based on people's desires, whether they be Italians, Greeks, Portuguese, German or Jewish. I could go down the list with dozens of examples. They must want to do this. However, federal and provincial governments have been prepared to help them financially and materially.

We now have a Minister of State (Multiculturalism) (Mr. Guay). The federal government proposes and parliament agrees to the expenditure of millions of dollars to help fund the work of various ethnic and racial groups. In view of the importance these groups put on the preservation, maintenance and expansion of their cultures—the roots from which they came—it seems to me that every opportunity should be used to make it clear to these groups that we encourage them to develop the multicultural foundations of this country. Recognizing, as the minister said earlier today, that the purpose of this bill is essentially to deal with people who are coming into this country, and recognizing that this is not the place to discuss in any great detail the whole question of multiculturalism, I still believe that the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Greenwood is a good one.

The amendment would reinforce the knowledge of the people of this country who are of neither English nor French origin that they too are equal, first class citizens of this country and that the Government of Canada cares about them and wants them to succeed in their efforts to maintain their languages and cultures. I intend to support this motion, and I express my surprise and dismay that the minister has rejected it.

[Mr. Orlikow.]

Mr. Lincoln M. Alexander (Hamilton West): Mr. Speaker, I just want to put a few points on the record. The hon. member for Provencher (Mr. Epp) has done an excellent job as my party's spokesman regarding Bill C-24.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Alexander: I am a little concerned about the reluctance of the minister. I know the minister, and I respect him. In terms of implementing our immigration policy he has a very onerous job, but all the hon. member for Greenwood (Mr. Brewin) is attempting to do is bring to the attention of the House and the country what this country is all about.

This bill contains objectives, and I do not want anyone to think that these objectives relate only to the immigrant or the person coming into the country. They apply also to those who live in the country now. All the members of the committee of which I was very fortunate to be a member were interested in seeing that we have a just and fair immigration policy and that there be certain objectives set out in the bill. One objective is that our immigration policy be non-discriminatory. Second, we should be concerned about and aware of the need to reunify families. Third, we need to take a new approach to refugees.

Within the confines of those three principles the minister brought in Clause 3(b) which reads as follows:

to enrich and strengthen the cultural and social fabric of Canada, taking into account the federal and bilingual character of Canada;

All the hon. member for Greenwood wants to do is add a few words to bring about an actual realization that we appreciate the contribution which has been made by people of all colours, races, creeds and cultures to the development of this country, and the minister stands in his place and says he will not accept those further words. After the word "Canada" the hon. member for Greenwood wants to add "and the multicultural nature of Canada". That is all we are talking about here. I do not want to say that the government is playing politics with the policy of multiculturalism, but it seems to me that we have an on and off policy. That is continually brought home to me in terms of multicultural policy. Canada is a multicultural and multilingual country, with English and French as its two official languages. That is a fact.

I once asked the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) how he and his cabinet members devise policy and on what basis. This can be checked somewhere in *Hansard*. The Prime Minister said, "On the basis that this is a multicultural country, but bilingual".

Mr. Kaplan: I don't think he said that.

Mr. Alexander: The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Kaplan) says he does not believe it. I would bet him $100, and he could well afford it. I am trying to

be responsible. I am trying to show that the government plays footsy and displays a hypocritical attitude at times when it comes to the multicultural policy, and that disturbs me. This policy was brought in on October 8, 1971. At that time the secretary of state was Gérard Pelletier. He has gone on to big and better rewards. He is now the ambassador to France. What did he say around October 8, 1971? I would like to read from a paper entitled "Towards a Canada Uniquely Canadian" by Dr. Joseph Kage, President of the Quebec Ethnic Press Association. There is no date on this document, but I want to put on the record what the good doctor indicated. He quoted what the Hon. Gérard Pelletier said. The paper states:

"When we speak of cultural pluralism we are making a fundamental choice for Canada, both now and for the future, for we are talking about the development in Canada of a multicultural society. The government refuses to sacrifice, in the name of unity through conformity, any of the cultures which are represented in our population, whether these cultures are European or native to Canada such as those of the Indians and Eskimos. Canada is not a 'melting pot' and the government is opposed to any measure aimed at assimilation. On the contrary, it encourages all initiatives which have as their object the promotion and dissemination—alongside the two main cultures, English and French—of other cultural values".

Mr. Haidasz: Hear, hear!

Mr. Alexander: I am going to get to that hon. member later on.

I have another undated document. This is one signed by one Bernard Ostry, Assistant Under Secretary of State. It is on the letterhead of the Department of the Secretary of State. It is entitled "Guidelines for Submissions for Grants under the Multicultural Programme".

Mr. Epp: Wasn't he in charge of Canadian unity?

Mr. Alexander: Yes. I do not have much time. Let me put a few things on the record. I do not know what the date of the document is, but it must have been around October 8, 1971, or shortly thereafter. This is what Bernard Ostry stated:

Funds may be made available only to projects which fulfil some or all of the objectives of the multicultural programme:

Notice, Mr. Speaker, how that word "multicultural" is always springing in there.

They will assist the development of a Canadian ethno-cultural group or groups which have demonstrated their desire and ability to develop their culture within the Canadian context and to contribute to modern Canadian society, as well as a clear need for assistance.

● (2020)

They are designed to share a cultural heritage with other Canadians.

They will promote an awareness of Canada's cultural diversity.

They have the participation and financial support of the community to which they are directed.

They assist immigrants to become full participants in Canadian society.

That is what we are talking about. The government whip will not remember what was said in those days; he was not around then, and will not be around much longer.

Mr. MacFarlane: I wouldn't bet on it, if I were you.

Mr. Alexander: He is not aware of what I quoted, which is why he was surprised at my comments on multiculturalism. That was the policy of the government on and around October 8, 1971. I am amazed at the minister's policy. He was first elected to the House of Commons at the same time as the hon. member for Hamilton West, in 1968. He knows that his government accepted the objectives of multiculturalism. The government first brought forward the principle of multiculturalism, which we all accept. Now the minister says he cannot accept the amendment the hon. member for Greenwood (Mr. Brewin) has proposed. He will not accept that nine-word amendment.

I ought to put on record certain facts and statistics to show that when it is in the government's interest to do something, it will do it. But when it acts, it does not think of the hardship its policies will work on those who may be affected. On October 8, 1971, the government announced its multicultural policy, which had hitherto been under the aegis of the then Secretary of State, Gérard Pelletier. There was a young member of this House, the hon. member for Scarborough East (Mr. O'Connell), who is still a member, who was made minister without portfolio responsible for multiculturalism. I have great respect for the hon. member; unfortunately, his constituents did not return him in the 1972 election. I cannot understand why. Consequently, we were without the services of that minister without portfolio. But even when he was minister, his job was not full-time. He was not a full minister of state; he was a minister without portfolio, responsible to Gérard Pelletier who took over-all responsibility for the multicultural program.

After the election of 1972 the young doctor from Parkdale, the hon. member for Parkdale (Mr. Haidasz), was made responsible for multiculturalism. The government suddenly said, "We recognize the significant contribution our various peoples have made to this country's development and, for the first time, shall appoint a full-time minister responsible for multiculturalism."

Mr. Paproski: We want Stanley Haidasz.

Mr. Alexander: That minister did his best.

An hon. Member: What's your point?

Mr. Alexander: Mr. Speaker, I think the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance wants to make a speech.

Mr. Paproski: He doesn't care about multiculturalism.

Mr. Alexander: I am coming to my point. As I said, the hon. member for Parkdale was the minister responsible for multiculturalism, but sometime in October, 1974, the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) said, "We do not need you any longer. Multiculturalism is not important." The Prime Minister removed from office this country's first full-time minister of multiculturalism and put the implementation of the policy under the armpits, as it were, of the Minister of Labour (Mr. Munro). I say, shame to that. That is what I mean when I say the government is playing footsy with this policy.

Mr. Fairweather: It is an armpit policy.

Mr. Alexander: Next, the Prime Minister appointed a young man from St. Boniface—

Mr. Epp: Who?

Mr. Alexander: A young man from St. Boniface. He had nothing to do. Suddenly the government thought he could give leadership to parts of the western provinces. It wanted those provinces to elect some Liberal members. It had to give the hon. member something to do. Consequently, the government appointed the hon. member for St. Boniface (Mr. Guay) as Minister of State (Multiculturalism). In other words, the government has been hypocritical, which disturbs me. Having accepted the principle of multiculturalism by appointing a full-time minister, the government, as shown by the Minister of Manpower and Immigration (Mr. Cullen), has flip-flopped again. The minister has said in so many words, "We do not have a multicultural society."

Mr. MacFarlane: He has not said that.

Mr. Alexander: Despite anything the government whip may say, I suggest, since the government has recognized the fact of multiculturalism by appointing a full-time minister, it should accept the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Greenwood, which would incorporate the objectives of multiculturalism in the language of the bill. If it did this the government would be consistent. Since on the one hand we have a minister responsible for multiculturalism and since, on the other hand, the Minister of Manpower and Immigration says in so many words "No, I am not interested," or "this is not the policy," there is something wrong with the government's position. If the minister has any heart, if he has compassion for those who are other than Anglophone or Francophone—and sometimes I think we talk only about those two groups and forget all the other people who built up this country—the minister will accept the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Greenwood. But apparently the minister does not recognize the contribution other groups have made to this country's development.

Mr. Paproski: He does not care.

Mr. Alexander: That minister does not care.

Mrs. Holt: Don't say that.

Mr. Alexander: Don't tell me not to say it, Simma. I said it and I will say it again.

Mr. MacFarlane: Then wash your mouth out with soap.

Mr. Alexander: If the minister cares, let him accept the hon. member's amendment, and thus show that he supports the policy of multiculturalism. I am ashamed at the minister's attitude, and shocked. We are debating this provision at length, to give the minister time for sober, second thought. Let him reflect on our position. He has nothing to lose by adopting it, and much to gain. If the minister refuses to accept the amendment he will put himself in the position of being accused as an opponent of multiculturalism. Or, at best, the government will be accused of hypocrisy, and we would not want that to happen, would we? Therefore I hope the minister will stand in his place and say that, having considered the matter, he will accept the reasonable and needed amendment the hon. member for Greenwood proposed.

[Mr. Fairweather.]

Mr. Gus MacFarlane (Hamilton Mountain): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member who spoke just now and others have tried to leave the impression that somehow the Minister of State for Multiculturalism (Mr. Guay) is not suitable for his job. I want to correct that impression. Considering his Métis background, his own background and his family, I think he is eminently suited for his position, and I want to correct the erroneous impression some have tried to create.

We should not forget that other government policies have to do with discrimination. At present we are debating a bill to do with immigration. We are debating a long-standing policy. It has always been this country's policy to satisfy, by way of immigration, the requirements of its two founding races. That is why the bilingual situation is mentioned. Personally I think that if you went further to deal with the multicultural area, you might get into some kind of quota system. I would be very concerned about that. I am not saying that is what is intended in the amendment. However, just as the hon. member seems to have some concern about other provisions in the bill and is moving this amendment, his amendment causes me concern. I would rather have the bill as it is. Therefore I speak against the amendment.

• (2030)

I do not think multicultural people in my area, whether they be Scottish, Italian, Hungarian, West Indian or East Indian, find any offence in the present policy. I certainly have not run into it. I just want to put that on record. Personally I do not support any tampering with the policy as it stands and, therefore, I do not support the amendment.

Mr. Bob Kaplan (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, like my colleague, the hon. member for Hamilton Mountain (Mr. MacFarlane), I will be very brief. I have to put on record how astonished I am to hear the hon. member for Hamilton West (Mr. Alexander) seriously insisting that this amendment be adopted. It is nothing more than pure tokenism. There is not one single thing in it to increase the rights of immigrants or prospective immigrants. It is absolutely pure, unadulterated tokenism. It is nothing but hypocrisy for him to stand up and argue that the implementation of nine words, which do not do anything for immigrants or prospective immigrants, will make as much difference as he insists they will. I normally have great respect for that hon. member, but tonight I am ashamed of him.

Mr. Art Lee (Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General): I enter this debate very briefly, Mr. Speaker. I am rather surprised at the comments made by my colleague, the hon. member for York Centre (Mr. Kaplan). I do not feel this amendment is hypocrisy. Indeed, it is an honour to rise and

enter this debate in support of the motion moved by the member for Greenwood (Mr. Brewin), to include in the statement of objectives, section 3(b), the word "multicultural".

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lee: Canada is a country made up of hard-working and talented people, many of whom have come from other countries to make this their home. There are thousands of native born as well, and together we represent a great range of ethnic backgrounds and many political parties. We have Canadians who have come from Italy, Germany, Yugoslavia, the Netherlands, from other European and Asiatic countries and, of course, from Great Britain. We are glad they chose Canada. It was on that basis the federal government introduced the policy of multiculturalism in 1971, and in so doing affirmed multiculturalism to be a fact of the cultural and social fabric of Canada.

I am also in support of this motion as I firmly believe that multiculturalism is an excellent means to foster and facilitate national unity. I say this as a westerner, for westerners take great pride in our earnest hopes for a united Canada based on the diversity of our ethnic origin.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I strongly encourage the Minister of Manpower and Immigration (Mr. Cullen) to accept the motion of the hon. member for Greenwood.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

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

Some hon. Members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): All those in favour will please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

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

Some hon. Members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Pursuant to Standing Order 75(11), the recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood) moved:

Motion No. 7.

Immigration

That Bill C-24, An Act respecting immigration to Canada, be amended in Clause 3 by striking out line 19 at page 5 and substituting the following therefor:

"ter of Canada and the multicultural nature of Canada;"

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

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

Some hon. Members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Pursuant to Standing Order 75(11), the recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

Mr. Alexander: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. When I am speaking in this House I do not want the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway (Mrs. Holt) to make any reference to the fact that perhaps some of my comments have anything to do with my skin. She was not standing in her place at that particular time. I thought she understood this particular problem. I do not want her at any time in the future to make reference to my skin. It was not an offensive intervention, but I just question why she had to bring that in. That is my point of order. I have been here nine years. It is the first time I have heard that. I want to let hon. members in this House know that Alexander can be quite tough when it is required.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Order, please.

Mr. Alexander: I am still on my point of order, Mr. Speaker.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Order, please.

Mr. Alexander: I just want to say that I have a great deal of respect for the hon. lady, but let it not happen again.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Order, please.

Mrs. Holt: On a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): The hon. member for Hamilton West (Mr. Alexander) speaking on a point of order referred to remarks made by some hon. members. The Chair cannot rule on what was said by a member who was not recognized. There has been, and I am sure there will continue to be, shouting across the aisle which the Chair cannot recog-

nize unless an hon. member rises in his place and is recognized. Therefore the Chair cannot rule on such a point of order. The hon. member for Hamilton West may have a valid point, but I cannot accept it as a point of order.

Mrs. Holt: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege. My name was referred to, and it has been implied on the record that I am a racist—

Mr. Alexander: I never said that.

Mrs. Holt: —and that I made a reference to the difference in skin. I said I am an anonymous ethnic because my skin is not a different colour. However, I am still of the ethnic group. I was not being racist, and I want that to be on the record.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Order, please. We can all enter into this question of privilege. It will then degenerate into a debate. With the kind permission of hon. members, we will move on to motion No. 8.

Mr. David MacDonald (Egmont) moved:

Motion No. 8.

That Bill C-24, An Act respecting immigration to Canada, be amended in Clause 3 by striking out line 41 at page 5 and substituting the following therefor:

"origin, colour, religion, sex or legal political opinion or activity;".

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

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

Some hon. Members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Pursuant to Standing Order 75(11), the recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

Mr. David MacDonald (Egmont) moved:

Motion No. 10.

That Bill C-24, An Act respecting immigration to Canada, be amended in Clause 4 by striking out lines 27 to 36 at page 6 and substituting the following therefor:

"(*b*) in the case of a Convention refugee, it is established that that person is a person

(i) described in paragraph 19(1)(*c*) unless the offense in question is a political offense; or

(ii) described in paragraph 19(1)(*d*)(ii), 19(1)(*e*), 19(1)(*f*), 19(1)(*g*), 27(1)(*c*) or 27(2)(*c*); or

[The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier).]

(iii) who has been convicted of an offense under any act of Parliament and has been sentenced to a term of imprisonment of two or more years."

He said: Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak briefly with respect to this motion. It concerns the situation affecting the present U.N. convention on refugees. As the minister well knows from conversation in committee, very real concern was registered in terms of the general provisions as they are presently outlined in Clause 4(2)(*b*). It very clearly states that a person under this category of convention refugee can indeed be affected by crimes that were not of a political nature, but will be regarded under these present terms of the act as serious enough to prevent recognition or acceptance of that individual as a refugee.

● (2040)

It seems to me there is no clear delineation in the bill between those who are legitimate refugees and those who might be either a threat to Canadian society or have committed acts of a criminal nature and who should not, and would not, be accepted. The bill, it seems to me, would be in breach of the convention on refugees which we signed, I believe, some four years ago. I hope the minister will offer some explanation of how this particular clause will square with our acceptance of the UN convention on refugees. Can he give us an assurance that the High Commission for Refugees has accepted this as a valid interpretation of article 1F under the present convention because, if not, it would seem to me we are in danger of putting on the statute books of the country a law, one section of which would fly in the face of the agreement we presently have on refugees.

It seems to me as well that the definition of a political offence is too narrow with respect to those who might come to Canada as refugees after committing acts of a criminal nature. I think the minister should recall a recent decision by the Federal Court in the Armstrong case. This involved extradition proceedings on the part of the United States in which it was argued that because of the nature of the accusation against Armstrong, the fact that there had been a bombing as part of a political protest against the war in Viet Nam, he should be regarded as a refugee instead of as one who had simply committed a criminal act within his own country. It is clear from the decision at that time, in 1973, that the Federal Court adopted a narrow definition of "political offence". Therefore the action by the minister in asking for this kind of provision, one which is to my mind much too broad, is unsatisfactory and will create real problems in its implementation.

With respect to the latter part of the amendment concerning the lengthening of the period of imprisonment from six months to two years, may I say that both in our own country and in a number of European countries, the practice is to regard as serious offences those which are of a "penitentiary nature" or which begin with a "penitentiary offence" of not less than two years. To have it start at the six month figure, which can cover a much wider range of situations and experiences both in our own country and others, seems to me to be much too sweeping and to demand an unrealistic standard with respect to those who come under the refugee classification. I would therefore

suggest seriously to the minister that he reconsider his position concerning Clause 4(2)(*b*) and indicate whether some adequate adjustment could not be made in order to avoid putting ourselves in defiance of the UN convention of refugees and so as not to create an onerous situation with respect to the six months' imprisonment provision.

Hon. Bud Cullen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, the proposed amendment would make three changes respecting reasons for refugees' loss of protection. It would exempt refugees from loss of protection because of a 19(1)(*c*) type offence, if the offence was of a political nature; it would exempt them from loss of protection for being likely to commit an indictable offence in Canada; and it would amend the standard for which refugees could lose protection because of offences committed in Canada.

It is my opinion that there is no need for the exemption for political offences. On the one hand it is unlikely that a truly political offence would be construed as an offence under Canadian law, as required by the provision respecting criminality. On the other hand it is doubtful that we should welcome a person who has committed a 19(1)(*c*) type offence—murder, arson, kidnapping, etc.—even if it was committed for political purposes.

The distinction proposed to be made between refugees likely to commit an indictable offence (19)(1)(*d*)(i) and those likely to participate in organized crime (19)(1)(*d*)(ii) is difficult to understand. The former are the more immediately dangerous and there would be greater justification for denying protection to them, but the motion proposes just the opposite. In practice, however, we believe that both classes are serious enough to warrant a denial of protection.

The hon. member for Egmont (Mr. MacDonald) also wishes to change the standard of criminal offences committed in Canada for which a refugee would lose protection. During committee consideration of the bill, this standard was made identical to that for permanent residents, whether the refugee is a permanent resident or a visitor, that is, an offence for which the person actually received more than six months or was liable to five years or more. The hon. member would change this to a single standard of an actual sentence of two years or more. It is difficult to say whether this would mean raising or lowering the standard, since court sentencing practices vary so much. It would have the effect, however, of creating yet another standard in an area that is already complex.

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

Some hon. Members: Question!

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): The question is on motion No. 10 in the name of the hon. member for Egmont (Mr. MacDonald). All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

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

Some hon. Members: Nay.

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

Some hon. Members: On division.

Motion No. 10 (Mr. MacDonald (Egmont)) negatived on division.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): The House will now proceed to the consideration of motion No. 11.

Mr. R. Gordon L. Fairweather (Fundy-Royal) moved:

Motion No. 11.

—That Bill C-24, An Act respecting immigration to Canada, be amended in Clause7

(*a*) by striking out line 29 at page 7 and substituting the following therefor:

"7.(1) The Minister, after consultation with";

(*b*) by adding immediately after line 3 at page 8 the following new subclause;

"(2) The number announced by the Minister pursuant to subsection (1), shall in no way limit the number of refugees admitted to Canada."

He said: I intend to be very brief, Mr. Speaker. Perhaps, if the minister can clarify this clause, I shall not need to move my amendment, in which case I shall ask for unanimous consent to withdraw it.

I am sure the minister means that the quota is exclusive of refugees. That is the only interpretation a humane government or anyone else could reach. I think our Canadian history with regard to refugees has been particularly honourable. We think of the Hungarians, the Czechoslovaks, the Ugandans and the Chileans who came to Canada in special circumstances, and I would be very upset to think that these refugees were deducted from the quota enunciated in the clause I seek to amend. If the minister could assure me that they are not to be deducted, and that I am under a misapprehension, I would then ask for permission to withdraw. Otherwise I will pursue the amendment and ask hon. members to support it. I hope we are not playing a numbers game and that, if there are special circumstances, the refugees who are admitted are not deducted from the general total.

I should like to draw the minister's attention to a particularly poignant story which is much to the point in terms of the dilemma faced during the British mandate over Palestine. Refugees were assembled in terrible circumstances in Cyprus and special arrangements were made with Britain to try to relieve the refugee camps on Cyprus. With regard to the movement particularly of orphans of one-parent families and of young parents with children, the objective was to move this group out of the Cyprus refugee camps. The British government, to their eternal shame in my opinion, deducted this particular movement of refugees from the quotas into the mandated country. I hope that this occurrence will not happen in present day Israel. I hope there would not be a refugee deduction in a place like Lebanon. The minister should have credit for a very sympathetic movement of people from Leba-

non, although I guess they were not particularly in the refugee category.

● (2050)

I hope this point can be cleared up rapidly. If it can, I will ask my colleagues to let me withdraw my amendment.

Hon. Bud Cullen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member's concern might be more relevant if we in fact said that each year we were going to accept a certain number. What we are talking about here is setting levels which will be most flexible.

Just so there will not be any misunderstanding, there need be no concern that the use of levels will arbitrarily limit the admission of refugees, contrary to Canada's humanitarian traditions. If it is understood—and if it is not, it should be—our intention is to use the processing priorities provided for in 115(1)(f) to ensure that refugees, through being given second priority—first priority is the family class—would never be subject to numerical limitation. There is virtually no likelihood that the level would ever be set so low as to restrict or delay the admission of the family class, convention refugees, or those like persons who may be designated pursuant to 115(1)(d). In other words, they will be top priority. If we were dealing with a specific number here, there might be some concern; but the fact that we are dealing with levels gives us the flexibility that we need. The priorities that we set under the act, putting convention refugees in the second category after the family class, I feel give no real cause for concern.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Order, please. Is the Chair to understand that there is a request to withdraw the motion?

Mr. Fairweather: I think we had better test the House, Mr. Speaker.

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

Some hon. Members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): The question is on motion No. 11. All those in favour will please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

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

Some hon. Members: Nay.

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

Mr. Paproski: On division.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Negatived on division.

Motion No. 11 (Mr. Fairweather) negatived.

[Mr. Fairweather.]

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood) moved:

Motion No. 12.

That Bill C-24, An Act respecting immigration to Canada, be amended in Clause 14 by striking out lines 8 and 9 at page 11 and substituting the following therefor:

"grant; or"

He said: Mr. Speaker, this amendment requires a little explanation. It has to do with terms and conditions. It applies to lines 8 and 9 of Clause 14, at page 11 of the bill. The clause presently provides as follows:

(a) he—

That is, an immigration officer.

—shall grant landing to that immigrant, in which case he may impose terms and conditions of a prescribed nature;—

My amendment seeks to strike out the last two lines which read "in which case he may impose terms and conditions of a prescribed nature".

The idea of imposing terms and conditions on people we admit to this country is a new one. The terms and conditions are not to be revealed to parliament; they are entirely within the discretion of the immigration officer who is handling the case. As far as I can make out—the minister will correct me if I am wrong—there are no restrictions on what sort of terms and conditions are referred to. If my amendment is turned down and we pass the clause as presently worded, we are giving to an immigration officer the right to impose terms and conditions on a person he has found admissible to Canada under the regulations. I think that is wrong.

I think there is somewhere else in the bill a restriction on the terms and conditions, but in the clause with which we are dealing here an immigration officer grants landing and he can impose terms and conditions. I think that under Clause 15 the terms and conditions apply only for six months.

In committee at the instance of the hon. member for Davenport (Mr. Caccia) the committee passed an amendment which restricted certain terms and conditions which could be applied; but it is my submission to this House that no case can be made out for giving an immigration officer power, in effect, to legislate, to say what terms and conditions apply to a person whose landing would otherwise not be contrary to this act. An immigration officer would be able to say he will land that person but only if he observes certain undefined, vague, and perhaps highly onerous or ridiculous terms and conditions as imposed by that officer.

I do not think I need say more than that. Throughout the bill I have suggested a number of amendments designed to remove restrictive, unnecessary clauses which multiply the powers of officials, and in this case not even officials but any immigration officer. I am trying to simplify the procedure. We have never had this sort of thing before, and I do not want to be part of any process which imposes it now.

Hon. Bud Cullen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, when I read this motion in the first instance the intent of it was not clear. It seems to me that it would have the effect of eliminating the power of an immigration officer at a

port of entry to impose terms and conditions on the landing of an immigrant. No such change is proposed with respect to an immigration officer at an inland point under clause 14(4), a senior immigration officer under clause 23(1)(a), or an adjudicator under clause 32(3)(a). The proposed amendment would be unacceptable for this reason alone, if no distinction among the different situations was intended.

During committee stage we agreed to and accepted an amendment giving up the power to impose conditions specifying place of residence. We did this by accepting the amendment to add clause 115(4). For the purpose of ensuring the integrity of the selection system, we wish to retain the power to impose conditions related to the occupational selection factors. Conditions respecting the admission of fiancées and people requiring medical surveillance are also important. It must be remembered that the duration of conditions is only six months at the most, and that even within that short time they may be changed or cancelled for good cause.

[*Translation*]

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

Some hon. Members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): All those opposed to the motion will please say nay.

Some hon. Members: Nay.

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

Some hon. Members: On division.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): I declare the motion negatived on division.

Motion No. 12 (Mr. Brewin) negatived.

● (2100)

[*English*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Motions Nos. 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21 and 25 will be grouped together for debate. Motions Nos. 13, 14 and 17 will be voted on separately. A vote on motions Nos. 14 and 17 will dispose of motions Nos. 15 and 18. However, a negative vote will require separate questions to be put on motions Nos. 15 and 18.

Hon. Bud Cullen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration) moved:

Motion No. 13.

That Bill C-24, An Act respecting immigration to Canada, be amended in Clause 19 by striking out lines 24 to 27 at page 13 and substituting the following therefor:

"in the opinion of a medical officer concurred in by at least one other medical officer,"

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood) moved:

Motion No. 14.

That Bill C-24, An Act respecting immigration to Canada, be amended in Clause 19 by striking out lines 11 to 12 at page 14.

Mr. R. Gordon L. Fairweather (Fundy-Royal) moved:

Motion No. 15.

That Bill C-24, An Act respecting immigration to Canada, be amended in Clause 19 by striking out lines 13 to 15 at page 14 and substituting the following therefor:

"(i) commit one or more offences referred to in paragraph (c), or".

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood) moved:

Motion No. 16.

That Bill C-24, An Act, respecting immigration to Canada, be amended in Clause 19 by striking out line 36 at page 14 and substituting the following therefor:

"force of any democratic government;".

Motion No. 17.

That Bill C-24, An Act respecting immigration to Canada, be amended in Clause 19 by striking out lines 40 to 44 at page 14 and substituting the following therefor:

"lives or safety of persons in Canada;".

Mr. Louis Duclos (Montmorency) moved:

Motion No. 18.

That Bill C-24, an act respecting immigration to Canada, be amended in clause 19 by striking out line 41 at page 14 and substituting the following therefor:

"likely to participate".

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood) moved:

Motion No. 19.

That Bill C-24, an act respecting immigration to Canada, be amended in Clause 19 by striking out lines 46 and 47 at page 14 and substituting the following therefor:

"an adjudicator, have entered Canada not for the purposes of being an immigrant or a visitor but for the purpose of circumventing the legal means of entry required by the Act or regulations; or".

Mr. David MacDonald (Egmont) moved:

Motion No. 20.

That Bill C-24, an act respecting immigration to Canada, be amended in clause 19 by striking out line 34 at page 15 and substituting the following therefor:

"the Criminal Code, the Customs Act, the Excise Act, the Food and Drugs Act, the Income Tax Act or the Narcotic Control Act, where".

Motion No. 21.

That Bill C-24, An Act respecting immigration to Canada, be amended in Clause 19 by striking out line 5 at page 16 and substituting the following therefor:

"or given under this Act or the regulations and which have been made public."

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood) moved:

Motion No. 25.

Immigration

That Bill C-24, an act respecting immigration to Canada, be amended in Clause 27 by striking out line 45 at page 20 and substituting the following therefor:

"by force of any democratic government,"

Mr. Cullen: Mr. Speaker, it is difficult to sound enthusiastic before one starts his speech. I feel I should pound on the table to get the attention of hon. members.

Clause 19(1)(*a*) seeks a workable compromise between the original text of the clause and the amendment passed in committee. Although we are sympathetic to hon. members' concerns that underlay the committee amendment, my colleague, the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Lalonde), is very apprehensive about the practical impact of that amendment.

The committee amendment added two elements to the clause: the motion of reasonable grounds, and the need for consultation with a medical specialist. Both could have serious implications for administration of the law. The reasonable grounds addition would open medical officers' prognosis to judicial review. We disagree in principle with trying to apply judicial precision to questions that must remain a matter of professional experience and judgment applied to the peculiar circumstances of each case, but apart from this there would be serious practical problems.

If a medical officer's decision can be challenged legally, it follows that he must be available for examination and cross-examination. Since most medical examinations are carried out overseas, it would be extremely difficult and costly to arrange for medical officers' availability at judicial proceedings in Canada. In addition to constant disruption of service, it is estimated costs would reach as much as $2½ million a year. Nearly all medical examinations overseas are performed by local practitioners as part of their normal practice. It is believed that few would be willing to tolerate either the exposure of their judgment to Canadian judicial scrutiny, or the need to travel to Canada at unpredictable intervals. It would be necessary to replace the whole overseas medical examination system with an all Canadian service at enormous cost.

There would be even more difficulties with the medical specialist addition. I should like to cite some of them. It is not clear how one would determine the appropriate medical specialist. It is highly questionable that one needs the advice of a specialist in every case of health impairment, for example, a child with measles or a person who had lost both eyes. There are few or no specialists available in many countries. Examination by a specialist would add substantially to the applicant's expenses. It may not be reasonable to expect foreign specialists to be able to make a judgment on danger to the public or use of health facilities in Canada. The required consultation between the medical officer and specialist would create still greater operating costs.

In short, the committee amendment would probably hamstring the immigration medical service to the benefit of a very few people. Nevertheless, in order to allay hon. members' fears about unfettered discretion exercised by single medical officers, we are prepared to offer two safeguards: first, the proposed amendment under which a finding of inadmissibility on health grounds would require the concurrence of at least two medical officers; and second, a commitment to a stipulation in the regulations to be made under clause 115(1)(*l*) that one of the factors to be considered by medical officers shall be any reports from relevant medical specialists where so indicated.

I have spelled out some of the more practical concerns which the Department of National Health and Welfare will visualize because it is the department that is responsible for this portion of the immigration laws and procedures. In committee we endeavoured to cover this particular ground and to do it in a way that was appropriate. The amendment as proposed by motion No. 13 goes a long way to allay the fears experienced by members.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Brewin: Mr. Speaker, it is difficult to speak on ten different motions all at one time. I do not propose to pursue what the minister has said about medical officers. I fail to understand the complexity of the problem as he has developed it.

Hitherto, the government, when dealing with medical cases, has proceeded on the opinion it secured from medical men. It should do that, and it should make up its own mind as to the evidence it wants to get. This theory of vast throngs of people having to be put on staff to do this job is typical of this minister and the department he represents. They conjure up totally exaggerated myths and dreams of all the terrible consequences if anything is done to change this bill.

The best thing would be to toss out the term "medical officer" altogether and insert the phrase "on the advice of a medical officer", the department may do so on and so forth. That was done before with no complaint. This myth-making by the minister, which we have been subjected to time and again, on the advice of those who advise him, has reached a point where I find it difficult to take some of these suggestions seriously.

I should like to deal with my motions which relate to the very core of what we consider to be the most objectionable feature of this bill. Clause 19 of the bill deals with the prohibition of people who cannot come to Canada. For the first time in the history of Canadian jurisprudence, it does not deal on the basis of having been convicted of an offence. It does not deal on the basis of having admitted an offence of some serious criminal nature. It deals with reasonable grounds for the suspicion that an offence is going to be done. Motion No. 14 strikes out lines 11 to 22 at page 14 of the original bill, Clause 19, which read as follows:

persons who there are reasonable grounds to believe will, while in Canada, engage in or instigate the subversion by force of any government;

The core of this is: "persons who there are reasonable grounds to believe will". It is not grounds that they have, but a belief they will do something which is considered offensive by the drafters of this legislation. The minister or his representative proposed an amendment to the original clause 19(d) which

is partly an improvement. It confines it to a pattern of criminal activity planned and organized by a number of persons in furtherance of the commission of any offence that may be punishable under any act of parliament by way of indictment. The original clause 19.(d)(i) reads as follows:

commit one or more offences punishable by way of indictment under any act of parliament . . .

We all know that the statute books are full of acts regarding some serious and some trivial offences. Regulations have been so innumerable in the past that it has been almost impossible to put them in books for a person to see how many regulations there are.

● (2110)

All you need to bar a person is to have an immigration official look into a person's eyes and say, "I have reasonable grounds to believe that you will commit some offence in the future or you will engaged in the future in the commission of some offence". The first is by way of indictment—those are more serious matters—but the second is under any act of parliament. It also says "by way of indictment". It is true that it is limited to the commission on the suspicion or speculation that you might do something that the immigration officer thinks would fall within the general definitions here, and that you might be punishable by way of indictment. I say to you, Mr. Speaker, and to the minister, that it is incredible that a so-called Liberal government would introduce clauses such as this one which deny the basic right to be tried before you are punished, which deny hearings, so that you do not know what you are being punished for. This is a move toward a repressive state and it is utterly wrong.

An hon. Member: That is untrue.

Mr. Brewin: That is what you say. I don't know how you know anything about it, but you certainly can talk.

Mr. Béchard: Are you God Almighty, Andy?

An hon. Member: Don't be so arrogant, for goodness sake.

Mr. Brewin: I am not arrogant.

An hon. Member: All he did was to ask you a question.

Mr. Brewin: He did not question me. He said that what I said was not true. He can get up and speak for himself. He is one of that platoon that walked in toward the end of the hearings and took pride in the streamroller proceedings that I referred to earlier.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member should address himself to the Chair. There might have been an intervention but I did not hear any of it, so I suggest the hon. member continue his remarks and address the Chair.

Mr. Brewin: I apologize for not addressing you, Mr. Speaker, and also I apologize if I showed some heat at this senseless, needless interruption that took place, but perhaps it is because of what we have been subjected to here in the last little while. We spent 70 hours in this committee—we sat there for hours and hours. I think the hon. member attended only about two of those hours and managed to make irrelevant observations during that period.

I have explained why we are against it. We are against it because it is contrary to the basic civil liberties and rights of people in this country. We oppose it, and we will continue to oppose it.

Mr. Jake Epp (Provencher): Mr. Speaker, I intend to address myself to motion No. 13. Let me say first of all that I am surprised that the minister should get up in his place tonight and try to reverse that which was done in committee, because I do not believe his heart is in it. It is really the ghost of the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Lalonde) which must be around somewhere.

An hon. Member: Even the body is here.

Mr. Epp: Let us put the facts on the table as they developed in committee. We know that the approval of medical certificates is done by medical officers of the Department of National Health and Welfare who, after examining them, send them to the Department of Manpower and Immigration. With all due respect to the medical profession—and I am not trying to step on sensitive toes—it must be said quite bluntly and honestly that the meeting we had with the medical officers of the Department of National Health and Welfare that evening was less than successful because no matter what questions we put to them, the answers implied that as lay people we knew nothing, nor should we ask. I do not accept that as a member of parliament.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Epp: I do not believe there is such a term as medical infallibility, but that is what we were getting from them. Now after passing the amendment in committee we hear that the Minister of National Health and Welfare got all hot and bothered and left it to the Minister of Manpower and Immigration (Mr. Cullen) to bring in this amendment, reversing what we have decided.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Epp: If you take a look at what our amendment was going to do you will see that it was trying to ensure that the person who was having the medical examination could avail himself or herself of the best medical help available—that is all. I know that medical check-ups are done by native doctors in the country where application is made. When the minister rose in his place tonight and told us they will need another $2.5 million, how can he justify that figure? Is that another thing that the Minister of National Health and Welfare fed to him? Did he check it out? Does he believe it? He knows the applicant pays for his medical examination. What is he talking about? Does he want us to buy that bill of goods?

Mr. McKenzie: Any excuse to spend more money.

Mr. Epp: What are we looking at? It came primarily from two groups. If I have not sounded very positive, it is because I believe this is a retrograde step by a minister who is only concerned about his ego and image. I am referring to the Minister of National Health and Welfare.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Epp: I want to commend the Minister of Manpower and Immigration for one thing in this regard. Clause 5 in the 1952 bill had words such as "imbeciles" and "morons". Thank God that is now removed from the bill. Also epileptics are removed.

● (2120)

I again want to commend the minister. I want to indicate for the record, so that we do not forget, the fact that we received a commitment in the committee that those persons who are in Canada on the minister's order and who cannot be landed because they were epileptic will be contacted once the bill has been promulgated and given an opportunity to get landed immigrant status. It is high time they were. The Canadian Association for the Mentally Retarded made a suggestion in their brief. It was not trying to negate the work of our medical officers, but it suggested that a person who is examined by a medical officer without the training of a psychiatrist or a psychologist and who does not pass the mental test should have the right to be examined by a specialist in that field. That is all we are asking for, but what this amendment would do would be to allow two medical officers to certify. The Canadian Association for the Mentally Retarded said at page four of its brief:

If immigration officials are to be able to give proper consideration to cases involving mental retardation, in addition to medical assessments, they should have available psychological, psychometric, educational and social assessments carried out by qualified professionals including psychologists, social workers, education and rehabilitation specialists.

That is all we are asking for, but no, the Minister of National Health and Welfare does not like it, and when the Minister of National Health and Welfare does not like something, we change. There is no such thing as a judicial review. I have too much respect for the Minister of Manpower and Immigration to think that on his own he would give us that kind of information. I believe his heart was not in it.

I want to raise another matter which I think has escaped most hon. members, and that is the matter of Canadians who want to adopt children who are orphans in the developing world, because their parents are gone for one reason or another. Very often it is because of war, especially in the case of the disaster and the terrible things which happened in Vietnam. I want to bring this matter to the attention of the House because I believe it is important. In the last four years Kuan-Yin has been able to place some 600 orphans with parents in North America, but hardly any have been placed in Canada, despite the fact that there are Canadians who want to adopt children. An official of that organization told me today that every step of the way is a battle with the Department of National Health and Welfare. The organization tells me it is too expensive to hire legal help and to go through the red tape which is required to place a child in Canada. This is a sad testimonial.

Some hon. members opposite and some hon. members on this side of the House will understand what I say because of their experience in teaching. Children are given standard psychological tests. They are tested for their mental ability. Some children from deprived backgrounds often score low, not because of a lack of mental ability, but because they do not have the social experiences which would allow them to score higher. For example, one child scored an I.Q. of 67. I do not take for granted the fact that one test is definitive. I do not think anyone who does psychological testing does either. Children who do not understand the language used in these tests will score low. In one case a child from Asia was asked what a mailbox was used for. The poor child had never seen a mailbox.

Mr. Fairweather: We don't know what a mailbox is for either.

Mr. Epp: With the service we are getting, perhaps that is true. After that child had been in North America for two years his mental ability was tested, and his score was 115. All we are asking is that a psychologist or a psychiatrist who has ability in this field be allowed to do the testing. However, the Minister of National Health and Welfare says no. Therefore we cannot have that.

This amendment is retrogressive, it is arbitrary, and it is another indication of the absolute power the Minister of National Health and Welfare wants. I say the amendment is wrong, and if hon. members have any sense of fairness they should not support it. The amendments which were passed in the committee were a small step toward fairness for those people who are less fortunate than some of us.

Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North): Mr. Speaker, I am happy to see that the hon. member for Niagara Falls (Mr. Young) wants to say a few words. I was surprised when the hon. member for Greenwood (Mr. Brewin) was explaining his amendments that the hon. member for Niagara Falls was arrogating for himself all the knowledge and wisdom.

Mr. Young: That wasn't my comment.

Mr. Orlikow: That is certainly what it sounded like. I want to put on the record some of the submissions made to the committee. If the hon. member for Niagara Falls had attended more than one or two committee meetings, he would have heard them. I wish the hon. member would either not interject, or at least interject loud enough so that I could hear him.

Mr. Young: I attended many more than one or two.

Mr. Orlikow: The hon. member may have attended, but he obviously did not listen. If the hon. member would refer to the minutes of the meeting of June 7, 1977, at page 32A:8 he would see the submissions of the Student Legal Aid Society and the Law Union of Ontario. I am not a lawyer, but these are organizations comprising lawyers and law students who

work in parts of Toronto where there are large numbers of immigrants. These organizations work with immigrants and their friends and relatives to help them come to this country.

They work with the department and with the law and the regulations as enacted by the cabinet and interpreted and administered by the department. For the edification of the hon. member for Niagara Falls I will read some of the criticisms of the bill which those two organizations made. If they sound familiar, I suppose it is because the hon. member for Greenwood has included most of these criticisms in the amendments which he has proposed. Let me begin on page 32A:8 and read their comments on Clause 19(1)(*a*).

● (2130)

Under the proposed Bill, conduct permissible in Canada yet criminally punishable in less democratic countries would constitute a bar to admission; the bar should only extend to those who have committed acts which would be prohibited in this country.

For instance, if in the Soviet Union one were to distribute books written by Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn, one would undoubtedly be prosecuted under Soviet law for doing something illegal in that country. If you applied the present section of the act to that person, you could exclude him from entering this country.

Commenting on proposed Section 19(1)(*c*) they say:

The prohibition on persons 'likely to engage in criminal activity' casts such a wide net that it may have the effect of both undoing the effect of other sections of the bill, and short circuiting Canadian law on criminal procedure. This class of inadmissible persons should thus be deleted from the bill.

They also say this about proposed Section 19(1)(*d*):

The present act puts a person in an inadmissible class only if he has been involved in subversion by force or other means of 'democratic government', but the Bill proposes to extend this to subversion by force of any government. Since subversion of any kind against democratic government is covered by s. 19(1)(*e*) of the bill, it is recommended that this subsection be deleted.

I cannot imagine ever being involved in the subverting of any government, but can well believe that some who want to come to Canada may try to subvert authoritarian, dictatorial governments, of which there are too many, for example in Africa. Yet under that clause in this bill they could be excluded from entry.

They say this about proposed Section 19(1)(*f*):

The prohibition against persons who are 'members of or associated with an organization that is likely to engage in acts of violence' is a broad and vague classification which is prone to abuse; deserving cases for exclusion are caught by the provision covering 'persons who are likely to engage in acts of violence that would or might endanger the lives or safety of persons in Canada.'

We have seen too many examples in the country south of us of the branding as criminals and the prosecuting of people it is supposed are likely to commit acts of violence, to use the language of the bill. In whose opinion are they likely to do this? In the opinion of the minister, or of the immigration officer? Surely we are not going to condemn someone for something we think he may do. That would be dangerous.

The Parkdale Community Legal Services organization repeated many of the criticisms just enumerated. Let me put on record some of their opinions. Speaking of the provisions of subsection 19(1)(*h*) they said, as recorded at page 32A:190 of the committee proceedings:

Subsection 19(1)(*h*) is a re-doing of the present subsection 5(P) and is every bit as vague and arbitrary as the old section. It is the section which, because of its lack of criteria, is often used to exclude anyone who is merely suspicious, inarticulate or different. It too should be deleted as there are many other sections to cover those truly undeserving of admission.

Let me put on record what they say about Section 27, which is covered by motion No. 25. They say:

Section 27 covers the removal of persons from Canada after their admission and includes the removal of landed immigrants regardless of their length of residence in Canada. Subsections 27(1)(*a*) and (*e*) suffer from problems already discussed under Section 19.

Subsection 27(1)(*e*) is substantially the same as the present subsection 18(1)(*e*)(viii) and poses the same inequities. The wording of this subsection coupled with the current case law, make it possible for someone to be deported after being in Canada any number of years, for very minor misstatements on their application. The Supreme Court of Canada has characterized the effects of this section as harsh. Furthermore, when coupled with Section 9 of the new Citizenship Act, a person may have his/her citizenship revoked and then be deported for relatively minor infractions on this subsection. It is not enough to suggest that this won't be done. The power is there, and has already been used.

If the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) were present he could tell the House more eloquently that I can how similar provisions in the Immigration Act were almost used following World War I in the attempt to deport from Winnipeg British people who had lived in the city many years. They had come to Canada from Great Britain and their only crime was that they were the supposed leaders of the general strike in Winnipeg in 1919. The authorities wanted to deport them under a similar section of the act, but desisted only after the protests of one who I think became a Liberal solicitor general, E. J. MacMurray.

I hope history has taught us something, has shown us we do not need such draconian legislation. Frankly, I am amazed that a so-called Liberal government should include such a provision in the bill. I urge members of the House to heed the advice of the Parkdale Community Legal Services, and of the other organizations to which I referred, and reject this clause. Such advice is based on knowledge of the law.

Hon. Marc Lalonde (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, I want to say a few words about the intervention of the hon. member for Provencher (Mr. Epp) in connection with motion No. 13. I can understand the motivation of the committee which led to the adoption of that particular amendment. It clearly was based on the presumed uncontrolled and unlimited discretion of the medical officer in formulating his or her opinion as to the health status of a particular immigrant. However, I believe there are serious grounds for concluding that the new wording proposed by the hon. member is incapable of achieving the control which was intended and, further, that it will not be virtually impossible for my department to continue to operate an immigration health service in support of Canada's immigration program. I should like to put a few reasons on record in support of this statement.

Hon. members must remember that it is not possible to designate medical practitioners for immigration medical pur-

poses in certain countries, such as Spain, China, Yugoslavia, Taiwan or the Soviet Union, much less to determine the qualifications of appropriate medical specialists in those countries, to use the wording of the amendment proposed in committee. In those cases the state concerned designates the local examining medical practitioners and occasionally accedes to request for medical consultations when these are required. Departmental medical officials ordinarily do not have any direct contact with these physicians. They certainly do not have any control with respect to their designation.

● (2140)

Another point worth bearing in mind is the incongruity of the so-called medical specialists in India, Japan, Lebanon, Ghana or Afghanistan, opining for example, on the subject of, and I quote the amendment passed by the committee, "excessive demands on health or social services" in Canada with respect to health impairment discerned in an immigrant applicant in one of those countries, assuming that the requirement for, and I again quote the amendment, "consultation with the appropriate medical specialist", as the amended version reads, applies to Section 19.

The hon. member raised questions as to costs. He went out of his way to point out that the applicant immigrants are paying for the medical specialist consultations. I suspect that what he proposed would end up hurting sick people whom he claims he would want to help. It is estimated that for approximately every 2,000 immigrants there might be as many as 50,000 cases where it would be appropriate to have a consultation with a medical specialist.

Let us assume a consultation fee of about $100 per immigrant. It immediately adds an additional $5 million to potential immigrants who will have to bear that particular cost. As the hon. member knows, many of these people come to Canada with relatively small means, especially if they suffer from a particular health impairment.

As to the figure of $2.5 million about which the hon. member was concerned, it is related essentially to having medical immigration officers from the department and medical specialists appear in litigation procedures and the costs arising therefrom.

[*Translation*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Order, please. It being 9.45 p.m., pursuant to the order made today, the House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred divisions on Bill C-24, an Act respecting immigration to Canada.

Call in the members.

● (2200)

Mr. Speaker: The question is on motion No. 1 in the name of the hon. member for Montmorency (Mr. Duclos).

The House divided on motion No. 1 (Mr. Duclos) which was negatived on the following division:

[Mr. Lalonde.]

(*Division No. 94*)

YEAS

Messrs.

Brewin	Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre)	Nystrom
De Bané	Lambert (Bellechasse)	Orlikow
Duclos	MacDonald (Egmont)	Peters
Gilbert		Saltsman
Joyal		Symes—13.

NAYS

Messrs.

Abbott	Francis	MacEachen
Alexander	Gauthier (Ottawa-Vanier)	MacFarlane
Allmand	Gendron	Maine
Appolloni (Mrs.)	Gillespie	Malone
Baker (Grenville-Carleton)	Gillies	Marchand
Beatty	Goodale	Martin
Béchard	Goyer	McKenzie
Bégin (Miss)	Gray	McKinley
Blais	Guay (St. Boniface)	McRae
Blaker	Haidasz	Milne
Blouin	Herbert	Muir
Boulanger	Hnatyshyn	Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich)
Breau	Holt (Mrs.)	Nicholson (Miss)
Brisco	Hopkins	O'Connell
Buchanan	Horner	Paproski
Campagnolo (Mrs.)	Isabelle	Parent
Caron	Jamieson	Penner
Clermont	Kaplan	Philbrook
Coates	Kempling	Pigott (Mrs.)
Collenette	Lajoie	Portelance
Comtois	Lalonde	Poulin
Corbin	Lang	Prud'homme
Crouse	Laniel	Reid
Cullen	La Salle	Roberts
Danson	Lawrence	Robinson
Darling	Leblanc (Laurier)	Rompkey
Demers	Lee	Sauvé (Mrs.)
Dinsdale	Lefebvre	Sharp
Douglas (Bruce-Grey)	Loiselle (Chambly)	Smith (Saint-Jean)
Drury	Loiselle (Saint-Henri)	Stanbury
Epp	Macdonald (Rosedale)	Stanfield
Ethier		Tessier
Faulkner		Turner
Forrestall		Watson
Fox		Yewchuk
		Young—102.

Mr. Speaker: I therefore declare motion No. 1 lost.

● (2210)

[*English*]

The question therefore is on motion No. 6 in the name of the hon. member for Provencher (Mr. Epp).

The House divided on motion No. 6 (Mr. Epp) which was negatived on the following division:

(*Division No. 95*)

YEAS

Messrs.

Alexander	Forrestall	McKinley
Baker (Grenville-Carleton)	Gillies	Muir
Beatty	Hnatyshyn	Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich)
Brewin	Kempling	Nystrom
Brisco	Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre)	Orlikow
Coates	La Salle	Paproski
Crouse	Lawrence	Peters
Darling	MacDonald (Egmont)	Pigott (Mrs.)
De Bané	Malone	Saltsman
Dinsdale	McKenzie	Stanfield
Epp		Symes
Fairweather		Yewchuk—34.

NAYS

Messrs.

Abbott
Allmand
Appolloni (Mrs.)
Béchard
Bégin (Miss)
Blais
Blaker
Blouin
Boulanger
Breau
Buchanan
Campagnolo (Mrs.)
Chrétien
Clermont
Collenette
Comtois
Corbin
Cullen
Danson
Demers
Douglas (Bruce-Grey)
Drury
Duclos
Ethier
Faulkner
Fox
Francis
Gauthier (Ottawa-Vanier)
Gendron
Gillespie
Goodale
Goyer
Gray
Guay (St. Boniface)
Haidasz
Herbert
Holt (Mrs.)
Hopkins
Horner
Isabelle
Jamieson
Joyal
Kaplan
Lajoie
Lalonde
Lambert (Bellechasse)
Lang
Laniel
Lapointe
Leblanc (Laurier)
Lee
Lefebvre
Loiselle (Chambly)
Loiselle (Saint-Henri)
Macdonald (Rosedale)
MacEachen
MacFarlane
Maine
Marchand
Martin
McRae
Milne
Nicholson (Miss)
O'Connell
Parent
Penner
Philbrook
Portelance
Poulin
Prud'homme
Reid
Roberts
Robinson
Rompkey
Sauvé (Mrs.)
Sharp
Smith (Saint-Jean)
Stanbury
Tessier
Turner
Watson
Young—82.

Mr. Speaker: I therefore declare motion No. 6 lost.

Motion No. 6 negatived.

Mr. Speaker: The question is on motion No. 7 in the name of the hon. member for Greenwood (Mr. Brewin).

The House divided on motion No. 7 (Mr. Brewin) which was negatived on the following division:

(*Division No. 96*)

YEAS

Messrs.

Alexander
Baker (Grenville-Carleton)
Beatty
Brewin
Brisco
Coates
Crouse
Darling
De Bané
Dinsdale
Duclos
Epp
Fairweather
Forrestall
Francis
Gillies
Haidasz
Hnatyshyn
Joyal
Kempling
Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre)
La Salle
Lawrence
Lee
MacDonald (Egmont)
Malone
McKenzie
McKinley
Muir
Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich)
Nystrom
Orlikow
Paproski
Peters
Pigott (Mrs.)
Saltsman
Stanbury
Stanfield
Symes
Yewchuk—40.

NAYS

Messrs.

Abbott
Allmand
Appolloni (Mrs.)
Béchard
Bégin (Miss)
Blais
Blaker
Blouin
Boulanger
Breau
Buchanan
Campagnolo (Mrs.)
Chrétien
Clermont
Comtois
Corbin
Cullen
Danson
Demers
Douglas (Bruce-Grey)
Drury
Ethier
Faulkner
Fox
Gauthier (Ottawa-Vanier)
Gendron
Gillespie
Goodale
Goyer
Gray
Guay (St. Boniface)
Herbert
Holt (Mrs.)
Hopkins
Horner
Isabelle
Jamieson
Kaplan
Lajoie
Lalonde
Lambert (Bellechasse)
Lang
Laniel
Lapointe
Leblanc (Laurier)
Lefebvre
Loiselle (Chambly)
Loiselle (Saint-Henri)
Macdonald (Rosedale)
MacEachen
MacFarlane
Maine
Marchand
Martin
McRae
Milne
Nicholson (Miss)
O'Connell
Parent
Penner
Philbrook
Portelance
Poulin
Reid
Roberts
Robinson
Rompkey
Sauvé (Mrs.)
Sharp
Smith (Saint-Jean)
Tessier
Turner
Watson
Young—74.

Mr. Speaker: I therefore declare motion No. 7 lost.

Motion No. 7 negatived.

Mr. Speaker: The question is upon motion No. 8.

The House divided on motion No. 8 (Mr. MacDonald (Egmont)) which was negatived on the following division:

(*Division No. 97*)

YEAS

Messrs.

Brewin
De Bané
Duclos
Fairweather
Forrestall
Joyal
Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre)
Lambert (Bellechasse)
MacDonald (Egmont)
Nystrom
Orlikow
Peters
Prud'homme
Saltsman
Symes—15.

NAYS

Messrs.

Abbott
Alexander
Allmand
Appolloni (Mrs.)
Baker (Grenville-Carleton)
Beatty
Béchard
Bégin (Miss)
Blais
Blaker
Blouin
Boulanger
Breau
Brisco
Buchanan
Campagnolo (Mrs.)
Chrétien
Clermont
Coates
Comtois
Corbin
Crouse
Cullen
Danson
Darling
Demers
Dinsdale
Douglas (Bruce-Grey)
Drury
Epp
Ethier
Faulkner
Fox
Francis
Gauthier (Ottawa-Vanier)
Gendron
Gillespie
Gillies
Goodale
Goyer
Gray
Guay (St. Boniface)
Haidasz
Herbert
Hnatyshyn
Holt (Mrs.)
Hopkins
Horner
Isabelle
Jamieson
Kaplan
Kempling
Lajoie
Lalonde
Lang
Laniel
Lapointe
La Salle
Lawrence
Leblanc (Laurier)
Lee
Lefebvre
Loiselle (Chambly)
Loiselle (Saint-Henri)
Macdonald (Rosedale)
MacEachen
MacFarlane
Maine
Malone
Marchand
Martin
McKenzie
McKinley
McRae
Milne
Muir
Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich)
Nicholson (Miss)
O'Connell
Paproski
Parent
Penner
Philbrook
Pigott (Mrs.)
Portelance
Poulin
Reid
Roberts
Robinson
Rompkey
Sauvé (Mrs.)
Sharp
Smith (Saint-Jean)
Stanbury
Stanfield
Tessier
Turner
Watson
Yewchuk
Young—100.

● (2220)

Mr. Speaker: I therefore declare motion No. 8 lost.

Motion No. 8 negatived.

Adjournment Debate

Mr. Speaker: It being after ten o'clock, in accordance with Standing Order 40 a motion to adjourn the House is deemed to have been moved and seconded. Therefore the question is: "That this House do adjourn."

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[*English*]

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 40 deemed to have been moved.

TRANSPORT—INCREASE IN FREIGHT RATES ON POTATOES AND PROVISION OF ADDITIONAL EQUIPMENT—REASON FOR TIMING OF ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. David MacDonald (Egmont): Mr. Speaker, it has been a long day. I hope now to be able to direct the attention of the House briefly during the adjournment debate to a matter of some major concern to potato producers in eastern Canada, particularly Prince Edward Island and New Brunswick. As the minister will recognize, it concerns the problem of transportation costs and transportation equipment for the potato industry.

This has become a major question. This is roughly the fourteenth time over the past eight months that I have raised it in the House, either in the question period or adjournment debate.

There has been a developing problem of major proportions in terms of equipment that will be made available for potato producers. As the minister and his officials know, most of the potatoes were moved in carriers that were not made in this country. In fact they were rented from American rail operators and remained available to the Canadian railroads at a very inexpensive rental cost.

These refrigerated cars, some 4,000 or 5,000 in number, were normally adequate for the movement of potatoes to central Canadian markets. However, when the American railroads decided it was no longer possible to obtain existing equipment or build new equipment, these deteriorated very rapidly both in number and in quality. The situation today is that we have roughly 25 per cent of those that were normally available, something around 1,000 cars.

Some provision must be made in the very near future. In fact some would say the time is already well past when such equipment can be available on time. Otherwise we will run into a crisis situation during the peak shipping month of February or March. There will simply not be enough vehicles available to move potatoes to markets where demands are greatest.

We might have encountered the situation in the last shipping year were it not for the fact that an unusual opportunity developed for potato producers in New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island to ship a very large amount of table potatoes to Europe after their own crop failed. I doubt whether that situation is likely to arise again this year or on many occasions. Indeed, with the bumper crop predicted for this year, we could well be in a very serious situation next spring when we try to move the bulk of our potatoes to market.

I raised this with the minister on June 9 because it had been announced a few days earlier, around the first of the month, that CNR was contemplating rate increases of 12 and 20 per cent. By the first of the year we will have something like a total rate increase of 34 per cent.

In addition, there was a suggestion that in place of the refrigerated cars which are no longer available or adequate for service, insulated boxcars roughly double or more the size of the present reefer cars should be provided. When the producers and retail operators heard of this, they were appalled, both at the discriminatory nature of the further rate increase which was away beyond any kind of guideline as it presumably existed with respect to cost increases under the present wage and price control program and, second, the appropriateness or adequacy of the insulated boxcars that CNR was contemplating using.

The rough experience that had been noticed over the past year, the difficulty with the substantial number of freeze-ups of potatoes that were in insulated boxcars, the problems of adequately handling them at the receiving end, as well as the problems in loading them for the producers came as extremely bad news to potato producers in eastern Canada. Therefore I was somewhat surprised when the Minister of Transport (Mr. Lang) told me the CNR had simply put this information on the table in order that they could proceed with discussions with the shippers on the subject of equipment, its availability and, presumably, its cost.

• (2230)

Since that time the special task force has worked diligently. Its report has now been circulated among potato interests in eastern Canada and it seems some break-through is being made. I believe we can expect an announcement that some cars will actually be built. The problem will, of course, be whether they will be in time or whether they will be enough. My understanding is that some 300 cars may be ordered of the size in the 90,000 lbs. range, and of the type suitable for the use of eastern potato producers, but that many of them may not be available for at least two or three years. Three hundred cars are really not adequate; they will accommodate, perhaps, less than 50 per cent of the real demand which will exist for these cars, and I hope more adequate consultation with the industry will lead to a more positive and more comprehensive plan being implemented.

In addition, I believe the plan to use insulated boxcars will not be any asset to the market or to the potato producers. I hope this proposal will be studied further. What is important, though, is to have a decision, to end this long and unsettled period in which potato producers do not know how to meet their marketing commitments. This is an industry which has tried desperately in recent years to get itself adequately organ-

ized so as to realize a fair return for producers, and further delay is not helpful. I trust the parliamentary secretary will be able to give us a favourable progress report this evening.

Mr. Bob Kaplan (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, the problems of transporting and distributing potatoes from Prince Edward Island and northwestern New Brunswick have ranged from inadequate rail equipment and port facilities, to inefficient market co-ordination and unrealistic transportation rates.

Both government and industry have long since recognized some of the complex issues in dealing with the question of distribution, and while some steps have been taken to improve the system, many of the basic issues remain unresolved.

Therefore, as the hon. member for Egmont (Mr. MacDonald) is aware, Mr. Speaker, in order to deal with the problems and to develop a consensus on future steps among all major interest groups, the Minister of Transport (Mr. Lang) appointed a working group on the Prince Edward Island-New Brunswick potato distribution system to consult with representatives of Prince Edward Island and New Brunswick producers and shippers, P.E.I. and New Brunswick governments, CN and CP, truckers and ports. It was the task of the working group to come up with recommendations by August, 1977, on a short term basis which would ensure the efficient and cost-effective distribution of potatoes for the 1977-78 crop year, and longer term measures by early in 1978 to ensure desirable system capability for future crop years.

As the minister said in the House just yesterday, a draft report by the working group on the first part of their task is complete. In fact officials were in Moncton today to discuss the report with the interested parties. A final report is expected within a week or so, at which time the government will consider the matter and take such actions as it deems necessary to ensure the most effective system of distribution for potatoes. We take note, of course, of the representations made by the hon. member and will also take note of the representations of other hon. members who may be interested.

THE CANADIAN ECONOMY—REPORT OF FITZGERALD ASSOCIATES ON "THE WAY AHEAD"—REQUEST FOR TABLING OF REPORT OR REFERENCE TO COMMITTEE

Mr. Dan McKenzie (Winnipeg South Centre): Mr. Speaker, on April 4 of this year I questioned the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) with regard to a document from the consulting firm E.P. Fitzgerald Associates of Ottawa entitled "Comments on The Way Ahead—A Framework for Discussion." This document contains a series of recommendations as to what action the government should take to rectify the serious economic mess Canada is in. I am here tonight not only to find out what action, if any, the Liberal government has taken on this document but also to draw attention to the very serious economic problems the government is ignoring because of the priority it places on such things as bilingualism and culture. This government, Mr. Speaker, has not been giving very serious attention to economic problems and it would be amazing to find out how many other documents like the E.P. Fitzgerald report are not being acted upon.

While of course there are many aspects to the economic fiasco the government has created, I believe one of the more critical items is the drain of Canadian investment money leaving Canada. On two occasions I have introduced motions under Standing Order 43 calling for the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic affairs to conduct an immediate investigation into the money leaving Canada by way of investments in the United States. The government, of course, chose to ignore this serious problem by rejecting these motions, just as it is ignoring all economic matters by not presenting a budget this fall.

I contend, Mr. Speaker, that the whole matter of the various documents the government has containing economic proposals, and the whole question of the drain on the Canadian economy of money leaving Canada by way of investments should be a matter for the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs to consider in detail.

For the record, Mr. Speaker, I should like to deal with the proposals of the Fitzgerald report dealing with the promotion of the private sector because there is such little faith in the Liberal government that it has brought about the drain of millions of dollars leaving Canada. The promotion of the private sector recommendations read as follows:

Promotion of the Private Sector

Because the private sector constitutes the main tax base for all government programs in addition to providing much needed employment, it is apparent that expansion of private enterprise should be given top priority.

It is suggested that some of the ways in which this could be done include the following:

(a) Emphasis on the development of high technology and secondary industry in Canada.

(b) Increased support to the setting up of labour intensive industry in the Third World while retaining capital intensive industry at home.

(c) Use of tax-bonds and de-taxation measures to return consumer oriented programs, e.g. the building industry, to private sectors.

Again, although the writer has specific proposals in mind in each of the foregoing areas, these have been omitted for the sake of brevity.

American business representatives are openly encouraging Canadian businesses to move from Montreal and Toronto to U.S. locations. It is alarming, Mr. Speaker, that it has reached the point where Canadian investment in United States real estate has gone from $300 million in 1972 to a high $2.5 billion this year; to the point where Canadian investors own 30 per cent of the major apartment complexes in Seattle, Washington, and Canadian firms have developed 17 major complexes in U.S. cities. All of this is because of the lack of faith in the economic policies of the Liberal government. Even a major firm like Canadian Pacific is making huge investments in the U.S.

In every year since, and including, 1973, Canadians have made more long term direct investments—real estate, plant and equipment, etc.—abroad than foreigners have made in Canada. Since 1973 more than $1 billion of direct investment capital has left the country. In more human terms, if an

average $60,000 capital investment is required to create one permanent job, more than 17,000 potential jobs have not been created because of this outflow.

The net outflow of capital has been growing in recent years. In 1976, even though foreign economies were plagued by stagnation, Canadians invested $555 million abroad. And, for the first time in at least 25 years, 1976 was the first year in which foreigners actually reduced the value of their holdings in Canada—by $395 million. Figures for the first quarter of 1977 show that the net outflow is continuing: $35 million in the first quarter, an annual rate of $140 million.

Statistics Canada, which is the Canadian government's statistical agency, reports, that Canadian long term investment in the United States increased by more than 66 per cent between 1969 and 1974, from $5,564 millions outstanding at the end of 1969 to $8,376 millions outstanding at the end of 1974.

The Statistics Canada figures show total Canadian direct investment in the U.S. in 1974 was $4,900 millions, up from $2,079 millions in 1969; portfolio investment $2,967 millions, up from $2,309 millions, and miscellaneous investment $500 millions, up from $216 millions.

These totals, of course, are far below total United States long term investment in Canada, which amounted to $46,675 millions in 1974, up from $33,045 millions in 1969.

● (2240)

With both inflation and unemployment running at disturbingly high levels in Canada, the opposition parties and labour organizations are all concerned about the outflow of capital which, if put to work in Canada, would provide more jobs, and in theory would counterprice inflation by encouraging price competition to sell more goods available. The federal budget presented to parliament on March 31 contained a good many tax relief items aimed at encouraging more investment in Canada and more jobs. The results have been disappointing. A fortnight ago a cabinet minister, the President of the Treasury Board (Mr. Andras), was almost shrill in a speech imploring businessmen to invest their capital in expanding operations and jobs in Canada.

In Florida, where Canadian tourists spend an estimated $500 million a year, Canadians are increasing their investments, not only in retirement condominiums, but in business ventures of many kinds—real estate, manufacturing, banks, etc. Florida economic development officials report more Canadian investment inquiries in the last five months than in the previous 14 months, mainly from small and medium-sized Canadian firms in many industrial sectors. Canada's Royal Trust Company recently bought the American Bank of Orange County in Orlando for $2.3 million.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Order, please. I regret to interrupt the hon. member but his allotted time has expired.

Mr. Bob Kaplan (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre (Mr. McKenzie) has been unfair because for several minutes he has been laying on the table hundreds of statistics on which I will not comment now. I do not accept them as being valid. I should like to take the time I have to deal with Mr. Fitzgerald's submission, which I understood was to be the content of his interjection. I should like to say that the Minister of Finance (Mr. Macdonald) and myself are very grateful to the many hundreds of individual Canadians, among them Mr. Fitzgerald, and to the groups and firms who took the time and effort to respond to our request for views on "The Way Ahead".

[Mr. McKenzie.]

Mr. Fitzgerald's submission put forward, in a rather general way, some criticisms of what he regards as conventional economics and mentions certain new concepts which he feels would lead to an improved understanding of economic processes and problems. The alternative theory which he has offered is not very clear, but a more general point is that governments do not usually act on the basis of general critiques of economic theory or of new general theories received in the mail or in submissions. The real testing grounds for such critiques and theories are public debate and professional analysis. I wish Mr. Fitzgerald well, but I doubt that the chances are very high that future finance ministers will be forced by the tide of public and professional opinion to formulate economic policy on the basis of his new theories.

The hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre alluded to certain specific proposals concerning tax bonds and reductions in the taxation on housing included in Mr. Fitzgerald's submission. Because of the time factor, I should like to refer to one of his proposals. According to the tax bond proposal, corporations would be given the option of subscribing to long term government bonds bearing an interest rate lower than current market rates in place of paying some fraction of their taxes. This proposal is put forward as a means of relieving pressure on firms to increase prices, and as a means of raising capital for government investment projects. Given that the bond issues are to replace receipts of tax revenues, it is hard to see how the measure increases the financial resources available to government for capital spending.

The measure would amount to a reduction in the effective rate of corporation taxation with the revenue loss financed by increased borrowing. The extent of the effective tax rate reduction would depend on the extent to which the interest rates on the bonds were below current market levels.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): I regret to interrupt the hon. member, but his allotted time has expired.

VETERANS AFFAIRS—DATE OF ESTABLISHMENT OF LOCAL OFFICE IN BRANDON

Hon. W. G. Dinsdale (Brandon-Souris): Mr. Speaker, the question I should like to raise tonight has been under discussion for almost two years now. It is a very important issue concerning the Department of Veterans Affairs. It will decentralize its service facilities and establish a network, in places like the good city of Thunder Bay, Ontario, and the great city of Brandon, Manitoba, of storefront operations manned by

qualified service officer personnel of the Department of Veterans Affairs in order more effectively to serve the populations living in those regions.

I have submitted questions from time to time to the Minister of Veterans Affairs (Mr. MacDonald) and he has acknowledged them positively, saying that a decision is just around the corner and that if I would rest my soul in patience, the announcement would be made. When the parliamentary secretary responded in a similar debate of this kind almost a year ago, he indicated that the decision was about to be made.

I regret that neither the minister nor his parliamentary secretary are present, but I trust that the spokesman who is representing the government tonight will be able to answer in specific terms to two questions. First of all, will the government proceed with this policy which will provide on the spot advisory and counselling services to the veterans, and will one of these offices be located Brandon; and second, when will the program be initiated?

The reason I have become involved in the matter is a letter that was circulated from the regional office of the Department of Veterans Affairs in the city of Winnipeg which serves Thunder Bay, from the area welfare supervisor on February 10, 1976. It was directed to the service officer of the Royal Canadian Legion in Brandon, Mr. John Heming. It reads:

> Dear Mr. Heming:
>
> Due to budgetary cutbacks our country travel has been curtailed until the beginning of the new fiscal year—April, 1976.
>
> I apologize for the inconvenience this will create to veterans in the area, but ask for your co-operation in forwarding full particulars of any veterans problems in your area with which I may be of assistance. Please include in your referrals full name, address, regimental number and nature of problem.
>
> I am looking forward to seeing you in April.

This letter is dated February, so I think he will agree that there was not too much service given at that time to a veteran population which is represented by almost 5,000 ex-service personnel in the Westman region who are active members of the Royal Canadian Legion. Based on percentage figures, that means that there must be a veteran population of over 15,000 because those areas of the country made a great contribution to enlistments in both World War I and World War II.

As a result of this letter the branches of the Royal Canadian Legion in the area conducted a write-in campaign and letters flowed into me and to the minister in great numbers. It was on the basis of this write-in campaign that the minister was persuaded, I am sure, that this was a good policy and an urgently needed one. The situation was reinforced by a statement of Mr. Bob Adams, the director general of veterans services, located here in Ottawa, in an article in the *Legionnaire*, the official organ of the Canadian Legion, when he indicated that this program was being contemplated and that it was going to be a storefront operation with as little in the way of support staff as possible and it would bring uniformity into the disbursal of the program's goodies, as Adams said, "Standards of counselling and social welfare will be set here in Ottawa" he said, and they will be uniform across the country.

● (2250)

I raised the question on May 31, and again the Minister of Veterans Affairs said:

> The study I initiated at that time in reference to this question is still under way. Brandon is under study at the present time. As far as giving the hon. member a definite date, I prefer not to do so now.

Another two months have passed, and I hope tonight that the spokesman will be able to indicate some specifics in this regard. It is much less expensive than the travelling involved and the long distance telephone calls involved. It is a program which is a part of the decentralization emphasis which has been announced by the minister.

We have the grandiose plan of taking the department to Prince Edward Island. I think even greater priority is demanded by the issue which has been brought forward in quite specific terms in hundreds of letters which have come from the veterans of the Westman area. The legion service officers are trying to fill in to the best of their ability. They have initiated an operation service, and they are to be congratulated for filling the gap which has to be filled. It is a vacuum of service which has to be met and I trust—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Order, please. I regret to interrupt the hon. gentleman, but his allotted time has expired.

Mr. Dinsdale: I am sure the spokesman will give us a positive response tonight.

Mr. Paul E. McRae (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member presents the problem very well. As the hon. member is aware, the minister has indicated that a review of the organization of the department is under way with the hope of improving service. The number of veteran clients is increasing. Those of us who are veterans are getting older and are going to require more services, so there is no question that there will be a need. The problem is the freeze on manpower but, as the hon. member has indicated, one way of improving service is to increase the number of offices. In order to improve service, some services in those offices must be combined.

The study is still under way. The data is not all in. I cannot give a date, but the study is under way, and there is no question that Brandon and Thunder Bay are two centres where this kind of service is necessary. One of the pressures will be the need for increased service. We all appreciate that. In my visits to veterans hospitals I find that the numbers are increas-

ing rather than decreasing. The minister has assured me that as soon as the data is complete he will be giving thorough consideration to this, and one of the things to be considered seriously is decentralization into small communities.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): The motion to adjourn the House is deemed to have been adopted. Accordingly, this House stands adjourned until tomorrow at 11 a.m.

Motion agreed to and the House adjourned at 10.57 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Friday, July 22, 1977

The House met at 11 a.m.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

GRAIN

PROPOSED DISCLOSURE OF EXPORT WHEAT PRICES—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Prince Albert): Mr. Speaker, under the provisions of Standing Order 43 I rise on a matter of urgent and pressing necessity. In view of the approaching end of the wheat crop year on July 31, wheat farmers are deeply concerned over falling wheat prices and they want to be assured that the export sales now and during the last year have not been at prices that will permit little or no return to them. Having the right to know, as Canada's competitors for wheat sales know at all times, the prices at which Canada is selling its export wheat, I would move, seconded by the hon. member for Edmonton Centre (Mr. Paproski):

That the wheat board officials should appear forthwith before the Standing Committee on Agriculture and furnish such information.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: In accordance with the provisions of Standing Order 43, the presentation of such a motion for debate requires unanimous consent. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

* * *

POST OFFICE

SUGGESTED MEETING TO SETTLE STRIKE AT OTTAWA—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Hon. W. G. Dinsdale (Brandon-Souris): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a matter of urgent and public necessity arising from the wildcat strike that is disrupting the movement of mail in the nation's capital. I move, seconded by the hon. member for Parry Sound-Muskoka (Mr. Darling):

That the Postmaster General or his representatives meet with representatives of the Canadian Union of Postal Workers in a co-ordinated and cooperative effort to resolve the issues causing the dispute and get the mail moving again.

Mr. Speaker: The presentation of such a motion requires unanimous consent. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

* * *

TRANSPORT

PROPOSED POSTPONEMENT OF SUBSIDIES TO PRIVATE SHIPPING COMPANIES SERVING NEWFOUNDLAND—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Robert Muir (Cape Breton-The Sydneys): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a matter of urgent and pressing necessity concerning applications that have been made to the Canadian Transport Commission for additional subsidies by the Clarke Steamship Line and further, applications have been made to the CTC for subsidies by the A. Harvey Shipping of Newfoundland, Federal Commerce and Navigation of Montreal and Newfoundland Container Lines Ltd. of Newfoundland. If these subsidies are granted, there will be a detrimental effect on the shipment of goods through the Port of North Sydney to Newfoundland, thus creating additional unemployment for the stevedores at the Port of North Sydney where the work force has been cut to less than half the normal number. Therefore, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Cumberland-Colchester North (Mr. Coates):

That in light of the fact that taxpayers' moneys are being used to subsidize private corporations while CN marine ships are often tied up, lying idle, all further consideration of subsidies to the aforementioned corporations be held in abeyance until a study has been made to determine what effect such competition in shipping may have on the work force of stevedores at the Port of North Sydney and also the crews of CN marine operating out of North Sydney to Newfoundland.

Mr. Speaker: In accordance with Standing Order 43, the presentation for debate of any such motion requires unanimous consent. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

● (1110)

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[*English*]

CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

REQUEST FOR CLARIFICATION OF PRIME MINISTER'S INTERPRETATION OF BOYLE REPORT ON ALLEGED SEPARATIST BIAS

Mr. Walter Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the right hon. Prime Minister and arises out of comments made during the question period yesterday when the Prime Minister exhibited a sense of clairvoyance. He said that the CRTC report which we talked about yesterday supports his contention, to quote him, that "the overwhelming majority of CBC employees are of separatist leanings". Yesterday the president of the CBC said—and I am quoting him now—that "the CRTC has not found the CBC guilty of a separatist bias". I want to ask the Prime Minister to tell the House who is right about what Mr. Boyle said about separatism in the CBC. Is Mr. Boyle right or is the Prime Minister right?

An hon. Member: You mean Mr. Johnson.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): I am sorry, I mean Mr. Johnson.

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member wants to know what Mr. Boyle thinks, he just has to read his report. All I said yesterday was that the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton should not be interpreting the report as he did in a false way.

Mr. Lalonde: You are using McCarthy-like methods.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): I am interested in the interpretation that the Prime Minister put upon the report. Mr. Johnson indicated quite clearly that as far as he was concerned—and I am now quoting him—the CRTC has not found the CBC guilty of a separatist bias. Yesterday and on other occasions the Prime Minister has indicated that he disagrees. I am simply asking the Prime Minister who is right, Mr. Johnson, on the one hand, or the Prime Minister?

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, the relevant question is what Mr. Boyle says, and the way to get the answer to that question is to read his report. If the hon. member reads the report he will see that Mr. Boyle's report said that the electronic media had been contributing to the division of Canada.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): That is quite a different thing.

Mr. Trudeau: Well, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the division of Canada means to separate Canada into parts, and to separate Canada into parts is called separatism in some quarters.

[Mr. Speaker.]

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, that is pretty fancy footwork even for the Prime Minister, who is digging rather deeply. The Prime Minister as the head of the government has expressed an opinion on the CBC. If the Prime Minister believes that and is using what his minister of health has just said are McCarthy-like tactics, could he tell the House why he is allowing to continue in office as president of the CBC a man who, according to the Prime Minister, is so blind that he cannot see the hordes of separatists that are around him?

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, I am afraid this is much too subtle for the hon. member to understand. I will try to give the answers that I gave in this House before we set up the Boyle inquiry. It was that there were a lot of active separatists in Radio Canada. This is the statement. The hon. member can quarrel with it if he wants; but Mr. Boyle does not pronounce on that, nor does Mr. Johnson. The relevant question is whether these separatists are subverting or whether they are doing their jobs properly. It is also whether they are guilty of malpractices as journalists and so on. Mr. Boyle says that there is subversion and that there is malpractice. These are facts, Mr. Speaker.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Trudeau: They are facts, Mr. Boyle says this. The hon. member can disagree with Mr. Boyle, if he wants; but I have made the assertion before that the point is not really the political beliefs of those who are working for the CBC or anyone else. It is whether they are doing their jobs honestly, conscientiously and properly.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Trudeau: The Boyle report indicates that they are guilty of malpractice and they are guilty of not uniting Canada.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that the Prime Minister has neither read the report, nor has he read the statement by Mr. Johnson, the President of the CBC. In his news release, the President of the CBC said the following:

> In commenting on the CRTC report today, let me deal first with that question of pro-separatist bias. I am pleased to see the CRTC has not found the CBC to be guilty of such bias.

Obviously, the President of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation takes issue with the statement made by the Prime Minister in February and the statement made once again by him here today. The important part is that there have been assertions made by the government. His Minister of State for Urban Affairs, who was later promoted to be the czar of Quebec, said that there were thousands of letters and thousands of inquiries.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Boyle did not receive one of them during his inquiry.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): How can the Prime Minister possibly say, in the face of what Mr. Boyle says, in the face of what Mr. Johnson says and in the face of the omission by his own minister, to supply those letters, that there is any truth whatsoever in the assertions made by the Prime Minister in the House today?

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, this is a somewhat repetitive debate. Perhaps Mr. Johnson does not agree with Mr. Boyle. That is something for the hon. member to reconcile in the way he wants.

An hon. Member: It is for you to reconcile.

Mr. Trudeau: I have read enough of Mr. Boyle's report to know that he says that the electronic media, and the CBC in particular, have not contributed in a sufficient way to their mandate, nor to the unity of Canada. He said also that they are guilty of malpractice.

An hon. Member: Do you agree?

Mr. Trudeau: Perhaps he uses the word "subversion" in a metaphorical sense in terms of not working toward Canadian unity. If these words have no meaning to the hon. member, I refuse to have any further discussion.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): What do they mean to you?

Mr. Hnatyshyn: You are the Prime Minister.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Yes, you are the Prime Minister. What do they mean to you?

Mr. Paproski: You have to answer that.

ADEQUACY OF BOYLE REPORT—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. David MacDonald (Egmont): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a supplementary question to the Prime Minister. Does the Prime Minister feel that Mr. Boyle's commission of inquiry was adequate in terms of the comments made by himself and some of his ministers? Does the Prime Minister know whether it gives a clear direction in terms of the necessary improvements or possible reforms which might be made within the sector of public broadcasting at the present time?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, as to whether the report was adequate or not, from the point of view of the government it was a good job well done. We did not give them much time to make a report. They made that report within time constraints with a great deal of competence. Thus, in that sense it is adequate. I do not think it is adequate in that it would have had to use pictures in order for the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton to understand it. For us it was adequate. It recommends several directions which we have not analysed. As I have said, the Secretary of State for the government will be reporting to Cabinet in a memorandum still to come concerning those directions.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): You are cutting a pretty sorry picture.

POSSIBILITY OF DISTINGUISHING BETWEEN SINS OF OMISSION MENTIONED IN BOYLE REPORT AND ALLEGATIONS OF SEPARATIST BIAS

Mr. David MacDonald (Egmont): Mr. Speaker, does the Prime Minister distinguish between the inability to function effectively referred to in the context of the report, or the sins of omission which have been mentioned regarding the provision of information, and his earlier criticism and that of his colleagues concerning a definite political bias—one directed toward a political solution or option for the province of Quebec? Does he distinguish a difference between Mr. Boyle's report and the original criticism by himself and others?

● (1120)

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): It appears to me that Mr. Boyle does not use the word "separatism" although I am informed that several of the cases he analyzes are cases of separatism in which some incompetence was shown. It seems to me it should be of sufficient concern to the opposition, if they want to rely on the report in any sense, that he is making a very severe criticism of the electronic media because they have not contributed, as the mandate would direct them, to national unity. To my mind this is a serious criticism. People on the other side of this House seem to be more interested in knowing whether he used or did not use the word "separatism". If they take the report at its face value I think they should realize there is a severe condemnation there and they should be more constructive as to ways in which the task of the media can be accomplished than in playing with words.

POSSIBILITY OF REFERRING BOYLE AND TOUCHSTONE REPORTS TO COMMITTEE

Mr. David MacDonald (Egmont): The Prime Minister seems to be caught on one note. He seems to have missed the thrust of the report which talks very much of the over-centralization of production, the heavy dependency on American programming and the loss of contact with both parliament and the public which are major issues and which seem not yet to have been recognized. Has the right hon. gentleman consulted with the Secretary of State to determine whether it might be useful to have this report and perhaps the recent Touchstone Report made orders of reference to the appropriate parliamentary committee when we return in the fall?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): I am not sure what the hon. member means when he says I have not recognized these important facets. It seems to me more relevant that not one of his colleagues on the other side of the House has asked questions about them. They have all been concerned about whether separatism had been discovered or not.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Oral Questions

NATIONAL DEFENCE

SUGGESTED RECONSIDERATION OF EXPENDITURE ON FIGHTER AIRCRAFT

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct my question to the Minister of National Defence. In view of the decision of President Carter against the production of B-1 aircraft and in view of the obvious fact that manned aircraft cannot now play a significant defensive or deterrent role, will the minister and the government reconsider the immense proposed expenditure of upward of $2 billion to be made on fighter aircraft?

Hon. Barney Danson (Minister of National Defence): One of the reasons for the decline in the use of the manned bomber is, of course, that it is vulnerable to air defences. If there were a general de-escalation it would be a different matter, but one of the other considerations is the need to maintain our first priority in national defence, that of ensuring national sovereignty, and fighter aircraft serve this role very well. Any nation which allows its air space to be intruded upon does so at its peril.

PURCHASE OF FIGHTER AIRCRAFT—ASSURANCE OF PROPORTION OF PRODUCTION IN CANADA

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): I must say I accept what the minister says about the need for the protection of Canadian Sovereignty. I wonder, though, whether a very large manned bomber and fighter aircraft fleet is necessary for that purpose, and I suggest it is not. When the minister made his announcement on this subject some weeks ago he assured us every effort would be made to ensure as much of the production was kept in Canada as possible. He referred to a number of firms. I think most of them were European. One or two were American. These firms were going to be asked to tender on this. I assume negotiations will be based on the hope that production will take place in Canada so that employment can be created here. Has any progress been made on this at all?

Hon. Barney Danson (Minister of National Defence): Yes, Mr. Speaker. First, I should point out in further answer to comments in the first question that the aircraft are used in our NATO role in Europe as well. With reference to the industrial benefits, there are negotiations going on now and proposals are being made by some of the six vendors who are tendering on the aircraft. The industrial benefits will be an exceptionally important consideration. First of all, it has to be a correct military decision. The price has to be right. That is another very important consideration. The bidders know about and are working on the question of industrial benefits. I use the term "industrial benefits" as opposed to offsets which might be offsetting on this procurement alone. I am delighted to see that some of those vendors are now making proposals which go quite beyond the contract involved. One is now talking in terms of a $1.5 billion to $2 billion investment in Canada. I think that is a good start. I hope the others will see that that is the kind of opener we are looking for and will improve on that.

[Mr. Trudeau.]

PURCHASE OF FIGHTER AIRCRAFT—POSSIBILITY OF USING MONEY EXPENDED FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, I am not sure whether I should address this question to this minister or to the Minister of Finance, but I think I will stick with the Minister of National Defence. If he can I would like him to tell us what percentage of production there will be in Canada. I would like him also to say whether it is not fairly obvious that there are socially useful projects such as cleaning up the Great Lakes and housing—which I know the minister has a special interest in—which require capital. Is this the time to be expanding military expenditures, one group of aircraft alone costing over $2 billion, when these other urgent things need to be done for the benefit of Canada?

Hon. Barney Danson (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman recognizes the priorities the government must have in terms of military expenditures as opposed to other social expenditures. Of course, this is a massive expenditure. It is not an increase in our effort. It is to replace older aircraft with newer ones to fulfil our commitment to NATO and NORAD and for our own security.

As far as the percentage of purchasing in Canada is concerned, I have not set a fixed percentage. When I announced that we were looking for tenders I suggested something like 125 per cent in Canada is what we are looking for. My colleague, the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce, is vitally concerned about this as well. We want industrial benefits which will have ongoing results. These may not necessarily be strictly military benefits but industrial benefits in the broader sense of bringing permanent jobs, permanent facilities, new technology, research and development into Canada.

* * *

TORNADO

INQUIRY AS TO REQUEST FROM MANITOBA TO HAVE AFFECTED AREA DECLARED DISASTER AREA

Mr. Jake Epp (Provencher): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct my question to the Prime Minister. On Tuesday of this week as recorded at page 7783 of *Hansard* I asked a question regarding the tornado which devastated parts of southeastern Manitoba. I would like to ask the Prime Minister whether the premier of Manitoba or the minister of finance of Manitoba have contacted either the Prime Minister or the Minister of Finance asking the federal government to declare the area a disaster area and thus to make relief moneys available. This would be very welcome, in view of the fact that some of us will be in the devastated area, and these people have been waiting now for a week.

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I have not as yet heard from the premier. The Minister of State (Multiculturalism) has already brought this to my attention. I remind the House that we have a procedure whereby we respond to a provincial request. If the province

needs assistance and meets the requirements, I would then be prepared to have the matter considered further within my department. As I indicated to the Minister of State (Multiculturalism), we are looking for further information in this regard, and he has undertaken to keep me advised.

* * *

• (1130)

GRAIN

REQUEST FOR SPECIAL DELIVERY PERMITS FOR PRODUCERS IN AREA AFFECTED BY TORNADO

Mr. Jake Epp (Provencher): First of all, I want to thank the Minister of Finance for that answer. Obviously I am disappointed that there has been no representation from the government of Manitoba, but I would like to ask a supplementary question of the minister in charge of the Canadian Wheat Board. I asked him on Tuesday whether he would urge the Canadian Wheat Board to give special consideration to granting special permits to persons who require them in order that grain, which is now exposed to the elements because of loss of buildings may be delivered. Can the minister give me an up to date report on whether this has been done and those special permits will be forthcoming?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): As I indicated yesterday to the hon. member, I have not had word on that as yet, but I do expect an answer very shortly.

* * *

[*Translation*]

AGRICULTURE

OTTAWA-QUEBEC AGREEMENT ON FEED GRAIN ASSISTANCE—REQUEST FOR PROGRESS REPORT

Mr. Adrien Lambert (Bellechasse): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Agriculture.

Last week I put a question to his parliamentary secretary about the signing of an agreement between the federal government and that of the province of Quebec concerning a subsidy of some $35 million for the transport of feed grains. Can the minister tell the House today whether that agreement has been signed between Ottawa and Quebec and, if so, when it will become effective?

[*English*]

Hon. E. F. Whelan (Minister of Agriculture): It has not been signed as of this day, Mr. Speaker.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Lambert (Bellechasse): Mr. Speaker, on a supplementary.

In a reply to the National Assembly, the Quebec minister of agriculture stated that he was ready to sign but that he was waiting for the signature of his federal counterpart. This is what he said: I don't understand why there should be so much dilly-dallying.

I know the expression is not very parliamentary but I am merely repeating what he said. Can the minister tell us whether there is some valid reason, or some difficulty or other to justify the fact that he has not yet signed that agreement?

[*English*]

Mr. Whelan: Mr. Speaker, the proposal is similar to one made to the province of Ontario where feed grain assistance was also discontinued in a big part of the province. That agreement was signed with the province of Ontario some time ago. I only use this as an example of how expeditiously we acted. When the province is willing to sign, we sign the agreement. Discussions took place between Quebec and myself, but the Quebec minister and the Quebec government were reluctant to sign the same kind of agreement as we made with the province of Ontario.

* * *

POST OFFICE

MEASURES TO IMPROVE DELIVERY—ALLEGATION MAIL ARRIVES IN DAMAGED CONDITION IN NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

Hon. W. G. Dinsdale (Brandon-Souris): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Postmaster General. It concerns allegations that were made by an angry northerner, Andy Peiffer of Nanisivik, Northwest Territories in a letter to the Postmaster General to the effect that mail takes three weeks to a month to arrive from southern Canada, and much of it arrives in a damaged condition. Arising from these complaints, what is the minister doing to improve the quality of northern mail service, and specifically in light of the humiliating defeat of the regular postal service by both bicycles and pony express in the great contest held in Manitoba this week, is the minister considering reintroducing mail delivery by dog sled into the north?

Hon. J.-J. Blais (Postmaster General): Not in the summer time, Mr. Speaker.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

An hon. Member: With your record, we are surprised.

Mr. Blais: First of all, I am not accepting defeat at all. The cyclists who went from Melita in the hon. gentleman's riding to Morris were bonded contractors of the Post Office who carried the mail in accordance with the rules of the game as they were set down for the pony express. The hon. gentleman knows fully well the system that is in place in his particular area. He has indicated to me that he is satisfied with the postal service in the Dauphin area, indeed in the Winnipeg area, and I have no reason to doubt his word in that regard. I am very proud and pleased with the service that the greater Winnipeg area is receiving.

I might indicate to him that I wish he could have been there in order to join in the fun, but unfortunately he could not be there. However, I can assure him that good fun was had by all. It was the proper way of showing the excellence of the postal service and, in effect, the ingenuity of postal officials and employees of that department.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Dinsdale: I think I have already made the point that the regular mail service was defeated by bicycles.

An hon. Member: And horses.

Mr. Dinsdale: But with reference to a very serious problem in the north, the allegation that mail bags have been tampered with, is the minister prepared to investigate this charge?

Mr. Blais: Of course, it has been drawn to my attention and I will be investigating it and reporting to the hon. member.

STRIKE AT OTTAWA—REQUEST FOR REPORT ON EFFORTS TO SETTLE

Hon. W. G. Dinsdale (Brandon-Souris): I have a supplementary question on an even more serious matter, Mr. Speaker, with reference to the wildcat strike in the Ottawa area. What action is the Postmaster General taking to resolve this difficulty?

Hon. J.-J. Blais (Postmaster General): Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to receive representations from the hon. member for Ottawa West, who also intends to ask me a question with reference to this matter. I would like to indicate to the hon. gentleman that at one o'clock this afternoon a meeting will be held with regional representatives of the union as well as local representatives of the Post Office, and I hope that in view of the nature or the motivations behind this particular walkout, service will be resumed immediately.

STRIKE AT OTTAWA—POSSIBILITY OF DISCIPLINARY ACTION AGAINST EMPLOYEES

Mr. Lloyd Francis (Ottawa West): Mr. Speaker, is the Postmaster General in a position to tell the House whether or not disciplinary action is being taken in the case of this serious illegal work stoppage?

Hon. J.-J. Blais (Postmaster General): I recognize, as does the hon. gentleman, that this is indeed an illegal work stoppage, a wildcat strike. However, I do not want to indicate what further action needs to be taken until such time as reasonably cool heads have met and have sought a solution to this particular impasse.

[Mr. Blais.]

ATOMIC ENERGY OF CANADA LIMITED

NAMES OF PERSONS ATTENDING WORLD ENERGY CONFERENCE IN ISTANBUL—CAPACITY IN WHICH DR. FOSTER WILL ATTEND

Miss Flora MacDonald (Kingston and the Islands): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources. Can he say what persons from Atomic Energy of Canada Limited will be attending the World Energy Conference in Istanbul in September?

Hon. Alastair Gillespie (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, I will be very pleased to make the inquiry and give the information to the hon. lady.

Miss MacDonald: I would like to ask the minister if he is aware of the fact that Dr. John Foster will be attending that conference as one of the representatives of AECL, and will he say, or will he find out, in what capacity Dr. Foster will be attending the conference? Will he also tell us whether or not he will be going there as a salaried employee of AECL and, if so, at what rate?

Mr. Gillespie: Earlier I described in the House the arrangements that I hope to be able to make with Dr. Foster, that is to say to enter into a contract with him or arrangement which would cover consultant services to the corporation. I indicated to the House that that conversation would take place towards the end of August or early September.

POSSIBILITY SALES OF CANDU REACTORS DISCUSSED AT WORLD ENERGY CONFERENCE

Miss Flora MacDonald (Kingston and the Islands): The minister cannot have it both ways, one week dismissing Dr. Foster for incompetence in his position and the next appointing him as a representative from AECL to the World Conference on Energy. I should like to ask the minister, in view of this flip-flop, whether he would also determine whether or not the question of further sales of CANDU reactors will be discussed at that conference in September.

Hon. Alastair Gillespie (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): I would draw to the attention of the hon. lady the statement I made on motions. If she were to re-read it, she would find out that at that time I made it very clear that I hoped the corporation would be able to retain the services of Dr. Foster and that he had contributed uniquely to the development of the CANDU system. I very much hope that it will be possible to work out an arrangement with him.

As to the question of whether CANDU sales, or possible sales of CANDU reactors, will be discussed at the conference, my information is that the World Energy Conference is not a marketing conference but a conference of experts in the field from all over the world who are looking at many aspects of energy. Undoubtedly, there will be people there who will be interested in talking to Canadians about the CANDU system. If Dr. Foster is there and receives inquiries, I am sure he will relay them back to Canada. I think there will be an opportunity to tell the world about some of the successes of the

CANDU system. I hope the hon. lady and her party will support the CANDU system, because some of the remarks she and her associates have made do not help the corporation to sell the CANDU reactor.

● (1140)

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): And you are not helping the country, either.

Mr. Gillies: How can you help the country if you lose money with practically every sale?

* * *

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

NEGOTIATIONS WITH UNITED STATES FOR AGREEMENT ON USE OF STRAIT OF JUAN DE FUCA BY OIL TANKERS—REQUEST FOR REPORT

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Secretary of State for External Affairs. Some weeks ago the minister indicated that Canada was close to agreement with the United States on the question of tankers which will ply the Strait of Juan de Fuca, a question of great interest to British Columbia since, at present, more than 550 oil tankers ply these straits. When the Alyeska line is completed and oil reaches Valdez, more tankers will bring oil down to Cherry Point. Has the agreement been completed? If so, what is the nature of the agreement, and what are its terms, particularly with reference to controls and to compensation for those who may have to bear the cost of oil spills?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, negotiations with the United States have moved along quite well and a vast number of issues leading to agreement have been settled. There are still six or seven outstanding issues, I think, being discussed by the two sets of negotiators. As of yesterday, when I discussed the point with the Canadian negotiating team, we determined the posture we will take with regard to those remaining items and I will communicate with the Secretary of State in the United States to indicate our proposals on those outstanding matters. We shall do this in an effort to have these matters cleaned up more quickly than might be the case if the conventional negotiating process were adopted. As to the actual date, I cannot inform the hon. member of that, although I can tell him this: Even after the agreement is completed it will take some time to ratify it before the American Congress. I am told that their procedure requires that. I am also told that the system can be used on a voluntary basis, as, indeed, much of it is being used at present.

As to specific matters, I am sure the hon. member will understand I would as soon not talk about certain elements to do with compensation and the like which are being discussed in the package until agreement, hopefully, is reached; but I can assure the hon. member that these matters, which I agree are of great importance, are being discussed and in some instances have been resolved.

REGULATION OF TANKERS FLYING FLAGS OF CONVENIENCE—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, I thank the minister for his answer but am sure he appreciates, as other members do, that oil will shortly begin to move from Valdez, Alaska, and those likely to be affected are extremely anxious to know what compensation provisions are being made to deal with the situation.

May I also ask the minister this question. Since there has been talk of oil being brought from Indonesia to Cherry Point, which would mean another 80 tankers bringing oil from various areas in addition to tankers now plying the Strait of Juan de Fuca, I ask, what provision is being made within the 200-mile limit to deal with ships flying flags of convenience, ships which will very likely transport oil from Indonesia or the far east? At present such ships have been the least subject to controls, the least subject to adequate precautions for dealing with oil spills, the least subject to regulations covering the pumping out of oil tanks in Canadian waters. Is the department taking steps, under some agreement, to protect as much as possible the people on the west coast of Canada and to make sure that the west coast will not be the dumping ground for oil pumped out or from vessels not adequately equipped to ply those dangerous waters?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, the question of non-United States or non-Canadian vessels which are not, as the House will understand, part of the bilateral arrangement with the United States is one of considerable difficulty, since there is difficulty in getting an international understanding. The Law of the Sea Conference which just concluded its most recent session in New York saw Canada assert a very strong position with regard to coastal state or port state control over the 200-mile zone. There is strong opposition to this by some countries. Therefore, no international agreement was possible at this current negotiating round. I do know that my colleagues in the Department of Transport and the Department of the Environment have in mind certain plans and activities relating to the zone, but I would emphasize that there is no international agreement and there may be some questions about enforcement beyond the so-called territorial sea out to the 200-mile limit.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, may I ask one short supplementary question?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member's exchanges have already taken up some ten minutes, which I think is generous enough.

Oral Questions

AIR TRANSPORT

POSSIBILITY OF STRIKE OF AIR TRAFFIC CONTROLLERS—DATE OF CONCILIATION REPORT

Mr. J. M. Forrestall (Dartmouth-Halifax East): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Transport or the Minister of Labour. I do not mind which minister answers. Since the air traffic controllers today sought a mandate to authorize a strike, if necessary, to back their current wage demands, may I ask, since I understand the conciliation report is to be handed down by Tuesday, next week, when exactly that report is to come down. Since the controllers will be in a legal position to strike in seven days, what contingency plans has the government made to offset the serious hardships which could be worked on some summer travellers?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I hesitate to comment on possible consequences of strike action, serious consequences with which we are familiar from our experience one year ago. While conciliation and discussion procedures are continuing, I do not want to intervene. The hon. member assumed correctly that the conciliation report is expected soon.

Mr. Forrestall: Mr. Speaker, am I to understand that the minister expects to see the conciliation report by Tuesday, next week?

Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, although I cannot say the exact date, the latest word I have is that it is expected towards the latter part of the month.

* * *

BILINGUALISM

RECIPROCAL ARRANGEMENTS BETWEEN PROVINCES FOR EDUCATION IN BOTH OFFICIAL LANGUAGES—POSSIBLE DISCUSSIONS BETWEEN PRIME MINISTER AND PREMIER LÉVESQUE

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Prince Albert): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister. I ask whether he has had correspondence or discussions with Premier Lévesque of Quebec in connection with a matter the Prime Minister dealt with the other day, reciprocal arrangements for education in French and English in the various provinces. Has there been any discussion between him and the premier?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): None whatsoever, Mr. Speaker. But the right hon. gentleman will remember the answer I gave the other day to the kite or balloon being floated in that direction by Minister Laurin.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, there was a degree of uncertainty about the Prime Minister's statement, which is why I asked my question. Was he consulted by Premier Lévesque in the last few days in connection with representations to be made, or being made, to the various provinces in connection with the point raised? I ask him this because I know the close relationship—they are like two peas in a pod—he enjoys with Lévesque. I wonder if that same spirit of co-operation still continues? Is he aware that the Premier of Quebec is going to communicate with the provinces and advance a proposition similar to that referred to by the Prime Minister?

[Mr. Speaker.]

● (1150)

Mr. Trudeau: No, Mr. Speaker. I think my answer was quite clear and still is quite clear. There has been no communication between Premier Levesque and myself or any of his ministers and myself on any subject remotely linked to the subject raised by the right hon. member. I made it clear when Mr. Laurin alluded to this possibility a few weeks ago. I stated unequivocally the government's position, as I would have if indeed this other pea in the pod had deigned to consult me on it. This is precisely what we proposed to the provinces at Victoria in 1971, that the rights of the linguistic minorities be recognized as a matter of right in the constitution of Canada.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Trudeau: I went on to say that it was not a bargaining point from our point of view, that two provinces could negotiate; if you do this, we will do that. We consider it as a right for minorities. Not only was this said and done at Victoria, but it was put to the provinces in a succession of meetings and letters with the premiers which culminated in my letter to all the premiers last January, including Premier Levesque, telling them if they were interested in the fate of the French speaking minorities of the other provinces as other provinces would be concerned with the fate of the English speaking minority in Quebec, we had an answer to that. It was to recognize these rights and entrench them in the constitution. It was not to bargain over the heads of the kids in the schools.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

PRIME MINISTER'S KNOWLEDGE OF LETTERS FROM PREMIER LÉVESQUE TO PROVINCES CONCERNING RECIPROCAL ARRANGEMENTS ON EDUCATION

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Prince Albert): Has the Prime Minister received a copy of the letters written by the Premier of Quebec to the various provinces in this connection? I ask him that because he goes back to the Victoria charter. An end was put to that charter because Premier Bourassa, a fellow Liberal in the province of Quebec, did not accept it. Has the Prime Minister been aware of any correspondence between the province of Quebec and the other provinces? If so, does he not think that Levesque has actually pulled the rug from under him?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I learned of the existence of such letters a couple of hours ago. I have not seen these letters. I probably learned in the same way as the right hon. gentleman. It is known that some of the premiers have received some of these letters by now or at least that Premier Levesque has tabled them in Quebec City. I have not seen the letters. I know about as much of the content as I

think the right hon. gentleman does. I hope that the other provinces will not fall for it in the sense that they feel this is a bargaining point to the effect, we will be just providing you are just. Justice is something which stands by itself.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Trudeau: When the right hon. gentleman says that Premier Lévesque has pulled the rug from under our feet, I am very sad to hear that. It obviously shows that the right hon. gentleman thinks that this is a proper course. It is one we disagree with. Therefore, it is not our rug that is being pulled. It is perhaps the right hon. gentleman's.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

* * *

THE CONSTITUTION

CONSTITUTIONALITY OF PROPOSED PROVISION FOR EDUCATION IN BOTH OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Prince Albert): The other day I listened to the Prime Minister describe the kind of legislation he is going to bring before parliament unless this is achieved. I wondered whether he had secured the opinion of the law officer of the Crown that the stand he was taking was unconstitutional and apparently this is just window dressing in order to build up the myth that he who did so much to destroy the unity of this country is to become the saviour.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I am puzzled by the statement of the right hon. gentleman about the opinion of the law officer of the Crown. The right hon. gentleman should know we were proposing a constitutional amendment. It was not a matter of acting within the constitution. It was a matter of going to Victoria and hopefully getting the provinces to agree to a constitutional amendment.

Mr. Diefenbaker: The Liberals didn't agree.

Mr. Trudeau: This has nothing to do with the law officer of the Crown. I wish the right hon. gentleman would clarify his thoughts a little bit.

* * *

TRANSPORT

SUGGESTED INVESTIGATION OF SUBSIDIES TO PRIVATE SHIPPING COMPANIES IN VIEW OF EFFECT ON EMPLOYMENT AT NORTH SYDNEY

Mr. Robert Muir (Cape Breton-The Sydneys): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Transport. It is in reference to the motion I raised under Standing Order 43 at the commencement of today's proceedings. I realize the minister has a tremendously large department and naturally would not have the facts before him today. Can he assure the House, the stevedores of North Sydney and the crews of CN marine ships that he will thoroughly investigate the question of subsidies to private shipping corporations that are going to compete with Crown corporations and discriminate against the stevedores of North Sydney and the crews of CN marine ships, thereby causing more unemployment. Will he let us know as soon as possible?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I have been giving attention to the question of the commercial viability of various services supplying Newfoundland. Obviously, as the hon. member will appreciate, this is a question of a subsidized service competing with another subsidized service. Therefore, the questions can be put in a very regional way by any member of parliament coming from one of the regions involved. Our task in trying to provide proper solutions from the point of view of the people in Canada in total is to attempt to achieve some balance. That is what we will do as we attempt to find a solution to this problem.

Mr. Muir: Will the minister agree that before taxpayers' moneys are used to subsidize private corporations which know before they start that their operation is not going to be profitable, that the option should be given to the Crown corporation in order to assist them to maintain a proper balance and be as economic as possible?

Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, the exact point I was trying to make to the hon. member is that in this somewhat peculiar case the use of taxpayers' dollars is justified only when it comes to saving far more taxpayers' dollars because the alternative service is subsidized very heavily indeed. If the hon. member is relying on saving taxpayers' dollars as the justification of his proposal, I am afraid he is working against his exact proposal.

* * *

CENTRAL MORTGAGE AND HOUSING CORPORATION

YORK PLACE, HAMILTON—USE OF FUNDS ADVANCED FOR PROJECT

Mr. Ray Hnatyshyn (Saskatoon-Biggar): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of State for Urban Affairs, I will direct my question to the acting minister. My question relates to the York Place affair. On Wednesday, the Minister of State for Urban Affairs indicated that he had followed up the inquiry begun by his predecessor into irregularities or ministerial involvement in the $5.9 million loan from CMHC to York Place. I am glad to hear that there was no improper action in the granting of these funds. My question is simply this. Will the acting minister tell us more about those funds advanced by the CMHC to York Place but which, according to the minister, were not in fact used to build that project specifically. Where, by whom, and for what purpose were they actually used?

Mr. Jean-Robert Gauthier (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of State for Urban Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I think most of these questions have been answered. I repeat that, subject to clearance by our legal agent, these funds are given to the entrepreneur. He then disperses them in accordance with work inspected by CMHC and other inspectors and approved by his lawyer. Subsequent to that, CMHC has no way of ensuring that the moneys expended by the contractor are going to that particular project. It would be impossible to have an auditor general for every contract in every place where CMHC operates. We have to rely on the reports from our lawyer and our inspectors that the physical plant exists. We do that. We do a lot of this work across Canada. We are satisfied in this case. We cannot make a firm statement that all the funds were expended on that particular project. However, we are satisfied that funds were advanced in accordance with our system of inspections, follow-ups and checking our accounts. I do not see anything that needs to be added to that.

• (1200)

Mr. Hnatyshyn: There have been allegations that a part of the $5.9 million allocated by CMHC to York Place was actually used to finance another Hamilton project known as Main Place. In view of the fact that CMHC rejected the Main Place application for a mortgage, would the acting minister or whoever is answering assure the House that these allegations are completely without foundation and that no CMHC funds whatsoever were used in the construction of Main Place?

Mr. Gauthier (Ottawa-Vanier): I would like to take notice of that aspect, Mr. Speaker. My information is that the name of Main Place was changed to York Place and that there was no CMHC money given to Main Place.

YORK PLACE, HAMILTON—ALLEGEDLY MISLEADING INFORMATION FROM MINISTER CONCERNING CONVICTION OF OFFICIAL

Mr. Ray Hnatyshyn (Saskatoon-Biggar): In relation to the minister's answer to part 16 of question 812 on the order paper asked by my hon. friend from St. John's East, I would simply ask why the minister sought to misinform the House by saying that no official of CMHC had been charged in connection with improper activities in the construction of York Place when in truth a CMHC inspector named Clifford Shaw had been convicted of corrupt practices in a trial which the judge presiding said was of national importance.

Mr. Jean-Robert Gauthier (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of State for Urban Affairs): I say again, Mr. Speaker, that the charges which were laid were laid under section 110 of the Criminal Code. This had nothing to do with the York Place development project.

[Mr. Hnatyshyn.]

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

DISPOSITION OF BILL C-24

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Speaker, I wish to inform the House that there is agreement among the representatives of all parties to the following motion, pursuant to Standing Order 75A, which I would move as follows:

That the time spent on government orders commencing at 12 noon on July 26, 1977, except for one hour to be designated by a minister of the Crown, be allocated as required to the report stage of Bill C-24, an act respecting immigration to Canada, and that no later than 5.45 p.m. on July 22, Mr. Speaker shall interrupt any proceedings then before the House and shall put, without further debate or amendment, all questions necessary for the disposal of report stage of said bill; and

that proceedings on the third reading stage of the said bill shall commence upon the completion of the report stage, and that no later than 5.45 p.m. July 27, 1977, Mr. Speaker shall interrupt any proceedings then before the House and shall put, without further debate or amendment, all questions necessary for the disposal of the third reading stage of the said bill.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: This motion, being put forward pursuant to Standing Order 75A, is to be decided forthwith, without debate or amendment. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Motion agreed to.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, the following questions will be answered today: 1,571, 2,235, 2,417, 2,452, 2,453, 2,732 and 2,081.

[*Text*]

DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS—CHARLOTTETOWN

Question No. 1,571—**Mr. Herbert:**

1. Will costs for the land acquisition and the building required by the Department of Veterans Affairs in Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island, be charged to the Department of Public Works and, if so, for what reason?

2. What amount of land acquisition and construction costs, if any, will be charged by the Department of Public Works to the Department of Veterans Affairs?

3. How will these amounts be shown in the estimates of the Department of Veterans Affairs?

4. For how long is it anticipated that the Department of Public Works will carry the costs of the new facilities?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): I am informed by the Departments

of Public Works and Veterans Affairs as follows: 1. Yes. DPW is responsible for costs of land acquisition and office space for many departments, including the Department of Veterans Affairs, under the Public Works Act.

2. None.

3. Not applicable.

4. Under current policy, costs of providing and maintaining office space will be carried in the budget of the Department of Public Works for as long as facility is required.

QUESTION NO. 1

Question No. 2,235—**Mr. Cossitt:**

Was Question No. 1, placed on the *Order Paper* on October 12, 1976, and previously placed on the *Order Paper* in the 1st Session of the 30th Parliament on November 3, 1975, forwarded by the Privy Council Office to the department and, if so (a) on what date (b) what persons forwarded it (c) who received it (d) who was assigned and what was his/her job designation to answer the question and on what date (e) is the answer ready and (i) if so, for how long and for what reason has it not been forthcoming (ii) if not, for what reason?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): The government takes responsibility for the answers it provides to questions and for the process involved in replying to such questions. It is not appropriate therefore to provide information about internal administrative arrangements. See reply to question No. 1 answered July 12, 1977.

TREES FOR INTERIOR LANDSCAPING

Question No. 2,417—**Mr. Howie:**

Is the Department of Public Works buying trees for interior landscaping at the new Bank of Canada Building in Ottawa and Place du Portage in Hull valued at approximately $50,000 and $80,000 respectively and, if so, are the trees to be imported from Florida?

Hon. Judd Buchanan (Minister of Public Works): The budget for interior landscaping on Phase III of Place du Portage is $80,000.000. To date a contract has been awarded in the amount of $69,500.00 to Fines Flowers Limited, Ottawa. The contract provides for miscellaneous plants, shrubbery and palm trees. The palm trees and some of the schrubbery were imported from Florida. The Bank of Canada building is not a Department of Public Works project.

QUESTION NO. 1

Question No. 2,452—**Mr. Cossitt:**

Is the Prime Minister aware that Question No. 1, requesting information on government business dealings with Mr. William Teron and associated companies, remains unanswered and will the Prime Minister take steps to expedite the answer and (a) if so, on what date can an answer be expected (b) if not, for what reason?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): The government takes responsibility for the answers it provides to questions and for the process involved in replying to such questions. It is not appropriate therefore to provide information about internal administrative arrangements. See reply to question No. 1 answered July 12, 1977.

QUESTION NO. 1

Question No. 2,453—**Mr. Cossitt:**

Is the Minister of State for Urban Affairs aware that Question No. 1, requesting information on government business dealings with Mr. William Teron and associated companies, remains unanswered and will the Minister take steps to expedite the answer and (a) if so, on what date can an answer be expected (b) if not, for what reason?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): The government takes responsibility for the answers it provides to questions and for the process involved in replying to such questions. It is not appropriate therefore to provide information about internal administrative arrangements. See reply to question No. 1 answered July 12, 1977.

COMPETITORS FOR DESIGN OF NATIONAL GALLERY

Question No. 2,732—**Mr. Caccia:**

What is the name of (a) the winning competitor (b) each of the finalists who participated in the competition for the design of the new National Gallery of Canada and what was the energy consumption expressed in kilowatt-hours per square foot per year by each?

Hon. Judd Buchanan (Minister of Public Works): (a) Parkin Architects and Planners, Toronto, Ontario. (b) See following list. As the energy consumption was not specifically requested by the competition requirements, this information is not available. National Gallery Competition—Finalists: Arcop Associates/Jodoin Lamarre, Pratte, Montreal, Quebec; Bregman and Hamann/C. Blake Millar, Architects, Don Mills, Ontario; Gustavo Da Roza Architect/Number Ten Architectural Group, Architects and Planners, Winnipeg, Manitoba; Arthur Erickson/David Boulva Cleve, Associated Architects, Toronto, Ontario; Raymond Moriyama Architects and Planners, Toronto, Ontario; Parkin Architects and Planners, Toronto, Ontario; Victor Prus Architect and Urbanist/Bland Lemoyne Shine Lacroix Architectes et Urbanistes/Longpré Marchand Goudreau Doboush Stewart Hein Architects/Hebert Lalonde Architecte, Montreal, Quebec. The Webb Zerafa Menkes Housden Partnership Architects and Engineers Toronto, Ontario; Wiens and Associates Ltd./Marani Rounthwaite and Dick, Architects and Engineers; Regina, Saskatchewan; Zeidler Partnership, Architects, Toronto, Ontario.

EXPENDITURES—SAULT STE. MARIE

Question No. 2,801—**Mr. Symes:**

What was the total amount spent in Sault Ste. Marie from October 1972 to date by the Ministry of State (Small Business)?

Hon. Len Marchand (Minister of State (Small Business)): In so far as the Minister of State (Small Business) is concerned: neither he nor the Small Business Secretariat has spent any money in Sault Ste. Marie. The position of Minister of State (Small Business) was created in September, 1976.

Subsequently, the Small Business Secretary was established within the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce to work with the Minister of State. The role of the Minister of State and the Small Business Secretariat has been policy development rather than program administration. Therefore, neither the Minister of State nor the Small Business Secretariat has authorized or made any program expenditures, anywhere.

* * *

[*English*]

QUESTION PASSED AS ORDER FOR RETURN

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, if question 2,761 could be made an order for return, that return would be tabled immediately. The reason for answering in this fashion is the complicated and lengthy nature of the answer.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

[*Text*]

MILK—ANNUAL PRODUCTION

Question No. 2,761—**Mr. Laprise:**

Since 1962, by province, what was the annual production of (a) natural (b) industrial milk?

Return tabled.

[*English*]

Mr. Coates: Mr. Speaker, for some time now a number of questions have been standing on the order paper in my name, and I believe I am entitled to expect answers to them prior to the close of the session. I would draw the attention of the parliamentary secretary to the fact that I have had ten questions standing on the order paper since October 19, 1976. One was placed there on December 19, 1976, and nine others on January 27, 1977. Two have been there since April 5, 1977. This seems to me to be an absolutely inexcusable period in which to have to wait for answers to questions. While some of these questions are complicated, it should not have been necessary to have delayed answering them for so long. I specifically refer the parliamentary secretary to two questions which have remained unanswered since April 5 with respect to Air Canada agreements with the government of Cuba, because they relate directly to the movement of troops from Cuba to Angola and the use of Canadian air space.

I believe the Canadian people are entitled to have some knowledge of these circumstances in order to determine whether or not Canada was involved in any direct way in the movement of Cuban troops to Angola, a country engaged in a civil war. I ask the parliamentary secretary to do his very best to obtain answers to these questions before we recess, hopefully on July 27.

Mr. Goodale: Mr. Speaker, I certainly give the hon. member my assurance that I will do my very best to see that the questions he has referred to and, indeed, all questions on the order paper at this moment, are answered before the end of the session.

Mr. Beatty: Mr. Speaker, I, too, would like to remind the parliamentary secretary again about the questions I have on the order paper, some of which have been there for over a year and have not been answered despite my bringing them to his attention before. I specifically wish to bring to his attention question 1,246 which I placed on the order paper on December 3, 1976. It is the first time I have raised this matter because I recognize that the question is lengthy and requires some time to answer. However, I feel that since December 3 the government has had ample opportunity to get the answer. The question asks about the patronage machinery set up by the government. While I do not expect to get a perfectly straightforward answer, I hope to see the parliamentary secretary light a fire under the Prime Minister's office to get them moving on some sort of answer.

Mr. Speaker: Shall the remaining questions be allowed to stand?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

IMMIGRATION ACT, 1976

AMENDMENTS TO IMPLEMENT CHANGES IN IMMIGRATION POLICY

The House resumed, from Thursday, July 21, consideration of Bill C-24, respecting immigration to Canada, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration.

● (1210)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Serge Joyal (Maisonneuve-Rosemont): Mr. Speaker, in the notes that you tabled in the House yesterday concerning the regrouping of motions, you mentioned that a vote on motion No. 29 could also dispose of motions Nos. 31 and 32.

I would like to point out, Mr. Speaker, that these three motions deal with different aspects of the bill. Indeed, motion No. 29 concerns the procedure in case of deportation of a non-permanent resident, while motion No. 31 deals on the contrary with the procedure in the case of a permanent resident. All members agree that these procedures must be different.

Since both motions aim at amending the bill, the first for non-permanent residents and the other for permanent residents, I respectfully submit, Mr. Speaker, that it would be appropriate to take the votes separately on motion No. 29 and

on motions Nos. 31 and 32, so as to recognize that these provisions provide for different judicial systems for applicants.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. As always, the Chair has only suggested that the motions be grouped for the purpose of debate or voting. In this respect, motions are always better understood, I am sure, by the members who move or support them.

If the members prefer to group this motion with others for the purpose of discussion and to vote on each motion separately, I would find this acceptable. We should therefore change the arrangements so that we may debate together motions Nos. 29, 30, 31 and 32, but vote on each one separately. Is it agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker: Is the parliamentary secretary rising on the point of order?

Mr. Goodale: No, Mr. Speaker, on a separate point of order having to do with the business of the House later today, particularly during the hour which would have been set aside for private members' business. There have been the usual discussions among representatives of the parties this morning and I think there is a disposition in the House to use the hour between four and five o'clock this afternoon for continuing the discussion of Bill C-24, rather than devoting it to an item of private members' business.

Mr. Speaker: Is that agreed?

Mr. Paproski: That is so, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: Agreed, and so ordered.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Marc Lalonde (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Before the House proceeded to vote last night, I was making a few comments on the motion put forward by the committee as well as the amendment of the Minister of Manpower and Immigration (Mr. Cullen) concerning the medical reports required from potential immigrants to Canada. Before concluding these comments, Mr. Speaker, I wish to draw the attention of the House to some corrections that were made to the speech I delivered yesterday, as reported on page 7899 and 7900 of *Hansard*.

[*English*]

In the answer last night, I am reported as having said:

> However, I believe there are serious grounds for concluding that the new wording proposed by the hon. member is incapable of achieving the control which was intended, and, further, that it will not be virtually impossible for my department to continue to operate an immigration health service in support of Canada's immigration program.

Obviously, that should read "that it will be virtually impossible"; the "not" should not be there. Secondly, at page 7900 there is a statement which reads as follows:

> It is estimated that for approximately every 2,000 immigrants there might be as many as 50,000 cases where it would be appropriate to have a consultation with a medical specialist.

The figure is not "2,000", but "200,000". That makes the statement clear.

[*Translation*]

As fas as motion No. 13 is concerned, I indicated last night that the proposal made in committee would not achieve the purposes suggested by the hon. member for Provencher (Mr. Epp). It would result in considerable administrative problems. In addition, it would be extremely difficult and even impossible in some countries to follow the procedures suggested by the hon. member for Provencher; second, it would involve considerable additional costs for those who wish to come to Canada; and, third, it would also entail considerable costs for the federal program administration, as a result of possible litigation and disputes of all kinds brought before the courts.

The Minister of Manpower and Immigration has therefore moved an amendment recognizing the concern expressed by the committee members over the fact that one medical officer could for all practical purposes decide upon the eligibility of an applicant. To meet this concern of the committee, the Minister of Manpower and Immigration has moved an amendment, motion No. 13, which would ensure that the decision concerning the medical condition of a potential immigrant could always be confirmed or challenged by another medical officer. This solution would assure the applicant that his case would be reviewed by someone with the authority and ability required at no cost to him. Therefore, no additional burden would be borne by the Canadian taxpayer in terms of considerable legal costs.

I commend strongly to the House the proposal put forward by the Minister of Manpower and Immigration which, in my view, meets the concerns expressed by the committee and which will still ensure adequate services to those who wish to come to Canada, without saddling them with useless costs which might amount each year to several million dollars, as I said last night.

Those are the few remarks I wanted to make about Motion No. 13. I would not want to take unduly the time of the House in that respect but I would like to raise another point made yesterday in the debate by the hon. member for Provencher. He said that the Department of National Health and Welfare was creating unnecessary difficulties in cases of children up for adoption by Canadian citizens. I want to give the lie direct to the assertion by the hon. member for Provencher. Every year we admit a very large number of children for adoption. My department has no objection about that procedure—on the contrary. In practice, if there were some administrative difficulties in those adoption cases they are perhaps more related to provincial governments which have the administrative responsibility for adoption programs in Canada.

However, I should say that in the past year we received outstanding cooperation from the provinces in the area of international adoption. That matter was debated on two occasions during federal-provincial conferences of welfare ministers

and it was following those discussions that we set up in my department a special office in charge of international adoption matters whose role is to ensure better coordination and control of administrative procedures followed in Canada and abroad in the area of adoption.

So, Mr. Speaker, I recommend very strongly that the House support the proposal of the Minister of Manpower and Immigration (Mr. Cullen). I think it is an eminently reasonable proposal which meets the concerns of the committee. Moreover, it will make for an effective and least expensive possible administration of immigration services, particularly as regards the health aspect of immigration services.

● (1220)

[*English*]

Mr. Robert Young (Niagara Falls): Mr. Speaker, I should like to join in the debate at this time with particular reference to motions Nos. 14 and 15. In view of the time element last evening, I deferred from raising a question of privilege which I wished to clear up. Some aspersions were cast on my service in the committee when studying this bill. If the House would indulge me for a few moments, I should like to comment on some of these aspersions. The hon. member for Winnipeg North (Mr. Orlikow) pointed out that I attended only two committee hearings. In fact, I attended many more than that. I should like to indicate that he did not attend any.

Mr. Orlikow: I was not a member of the committee.

Mr. Young: You do not have to be a member in order to attend committee hearings.

Mr. Orlikow: But I read the evidence.

Mr. Young: The hon. member has the happy faculty of squeezing the largest number of words into some of the smallest ideas possible. Most of what he said last night did not pertain to the remarks I made, nor the comments I made to the hon. member for Greenwood (Mr. Brewin). Most of what he said referred to the draft bill, not to the amended bill which is now before this House for debate. To do what he did takes things greatly out of context.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): I am sure he will apologize.

Mr. Young: The hon. member for Greenwood accused me of coming into committee with a platoon. He indicated that I walked in and steamrollered him. I appreciate his commenting on some of my efforts during the afternoon and evening sittings of the committee hearings. Although he was a member of the committee, he was not present when we amended the particular clause he referred to last night. I am referring to clause 19(1)(d). The hon. member was not in his place at committee, but I was and the record will show that. The understanding that the hon. member for Greenwood was presenting regarding the particular clause of the bill that he takes issue with was untrue and incomplete. I maintain that because the hon. member said last night that clause 19(1)(d) at present contains no right to trial and that it denied the right to be tried before punishment. He indicated that a person will be barred from entering or visiting Canada merely on a suspicion.

I should like to indicate that that is not true. If he knew as much about this new bill as he maintains, he would know there are clauses in it indicating that anyone who is turned back or detained at the border can cause a special inquiry to be held and can cause the immigration officer at the border to relate the reasonable grounds for believing he will commit an indictable offence—and not "may" or "likely to". There have to be reasonable grounds on which to base the ruling that a person will go out and commit an indictable offence.

Mr. Orlikow: What are the reasonable grounds?

Mr. Young: We are talking about a hypothetical case. Let me refer to some practical ones. If the hon. member wants to know what the reasonable grounds are, hon. members from the New Democratic Party over the last few months have champed at the bit regarding how members of the Five Dragons immigrated to this country and are now residing on our west coast. The hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Leggatt) has asked questions on how these people came to be in our country. That is one reason the government wishes to have this type of amendment in the bill.

Therefore, if there are reasonable grounds to suspect that people will come into this country to commit an indictable offence, immigration officers can say "No". In one breath, members of the New Democratic Party are saying to the government, "Why did you let these people in?" In another breath, the hon. member for Greenwood and the hon. member for Winnipeg North are saying, "Let them all come in". In committee, the hon. member for Greenwood said, "Let everyone come in. Let them do what they please. If he is going to commit a criminal act, let him do that". He indicated also that it was up to the government to go out and catch him, convict him and then try to deport him. That is a rather asinine way of going about it; it is rather ridiculous.

The clause which is presently in the bill is a good one. The amendment proposed by the hon. member for Greenwood would prevent the department from keeping out, or removing persons about whom there is credible information that they are engaged in organized criminal activities although no convictions may have been registered against them. That clause was amended in committee, after long discussions, along lines originally proposed by the hon. member for Provencher (Mr. Epp). The present clause attempts to deal with the fact that those involved in organized crime all too rarely come before the courts. Without it, the government would be seriously hampered in its efforts to safeguard the Canadian public against the menace of organized crime.

The hon. member for Greenwood suggests that the border should be open and that anyone, regardless of his intentions, criminal or otherwise, should be able to come into the country. If he commits a criminal act, it is up to the government to catch him, convict him and then try to deport him. If we are going to devise an immigration act asking border officials to

carry out a job on behalf of the government and the people of this country, we should give them the tools and the powers to do the job. I am not referring to a wide-ranging, discretionary clause which would give them the power to look into the eyes of someone and say, "I do not like you. I think you are going to commit an offence".

The act requires that the immigration officer must have reasonable grounds to believe that a person will commit an indictable offence—not just any offence. To do anything else would weaken the efficacy of the act and would impair situations at the border and airports. It would seriously emasculate the bill, and emasculate immigration officers in the carrying out of their duties.

The hon. member for Fundy-Royal (Mr. Fairweather) has put forward an amendment which touches on an issue discussed in committee. I am sorry he is not here today. However, last night I informed him that I would speak against his amendment today and told him what I would be saying. His proposed motion refers back to subclause (c) of the draft bill. It would give power to border officers to turn back or detain someone whom he believes might commit an indictable offence, but only if that indictable offence was subject to a penalty of at least ten years imprisonment. That verges on being somewhat ridiculous, because if one peruses the Criminal Code he will find a great number of serious offences which do not have ten-year minimum penalties.

● (1230)

If that amendment were passed, a person could come to the border and an immigration officer could have a reasonable belief: he could even be told by the person wanting to come in that that person has the full intention of committing any one of a number of different crimes. It could be indecent and harassing telephone calls, bookmaking, corrupting justice, keeping a gaming house or cattle rustling, which I am sure interests hon. members from the west. It could be blowing up somebody's property or animals. It could be that that person might come here to print or tender a counterfeit proclamation of parliament. All of those are indictable offences, but not subject to at least ten years imprisonment. Therefore, even if the immigration officer has reasonable and probable grounds to believe the person would commit that type of offence, he could not keep that individual out if we passed the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Fundy-Royal.

Perhaps I could break it down into a very easily understood example. If we were to accept the amendment of the hon. member for Greenwood, the hon. member would be quite happy to invite someone into his house even though he might have a reasonable suspicion that that person would set fire to his living room or to his house. The hon. member for Greenwood would say, "Come on over to my house; light your match; set my rug on fire". He would then go to the trouble of calling the fire department and the police department and trying to catch the fellow and have him convicted. He would go to the trouble of trying to get damages and then have the fellow deported.

The hon. member for Fundy-Royal, being a little more sensible, since arson can bring more than ten years, would not invite that fellow into his house, believing on reasonable grounds that the fellow would set fire to his living room. However, if the fellow was just going to blow up the house, he would invite him in because he would not get ten years for that. That is how ridiculous some of these amendments are.

I think border officials have to have some power and discretion. They are reasonable people. If a person is denied entry, he has the right to ask the border officer to divulge reasonable grounds at a special inquiry. In any event, a report is made to a senior immigration officer. The detained person might appear, after just a few minutes, before a senior immigration officer and convince the officer that he is a totally reasonable and proper person to come into the country. I think immigration officers need the tools necessary to do the work they are called upon to do.

We need the type of legislation which is in this bill as unamended in order to take care of the public in this country, to keep us at peace and to prevent those people we reasonably suspect of having criminal intent from coming into Canada. I do not think we have to open our borders and allow criminals, those with criminal intentions and those whose design is to engage in organized crime, to come into this country.

Mr. Stanbury: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege. I noticed just now, in yesterday's *Hansard*, a reference on page 7889, by the hon. member for Hamilton West (Mr. Alexander), to multicultural policy. The hon. member said:

On October 8, 1971, the government announced its multicultural policy, which had hitherto been under the aegis of then secretary of state, Gérard Pelletier.

To set the record straight, I simply want to state that as minister responsible for citizenship I had full responsibility for that area of government administration, for the development of the policy of multiculturalism and its articulation as national policy, and I accept responsibility for it with pride.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The point raised by the hon. member is, of course, not a question of privilege. I would call it a point of clarification. That is truly welcomed by all hon. members, so I think the matter is settled in this way.

Mr. David MacDonald (Egmont): Mr. Speaker, I want to speak about two or three of the motions which are up for debate at the present time. Two of them stand in my name, and the other one, which was discussed both last night and today, stands in the name of the Minister of Manpower and Immigration (Mr. Cullen). I am indeed sorry that the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Lalonde) did not stay to listen to any further responses to his comments, and in particular that he did not stay long enough to hear the hon. member for Niagara Falls (Mr. Young). Because I thought if there was any difficulty the Minister of National Health and Welfare was having in understanding the purpose of the amendment, which had been accepted by the committee, the hon. member for Niagara Falls might have helped a great deal, for in the context of his remarks—while I do not agree with the conclu-

sions he reached in a number of instances—he kept referring to reasonable grounds, and of course that is the sum and substance of the attempt which is being made by the minister today in removing that particular section from clause 19.

I think there has been a bit of a snow job here, quite frankly, and I know that the hon. member for Provencher (Mr. Epp) is well aware that it is taking place, because he referred to it last night. There is an attempt to talk about the question of possible expense. There is the so-called compromise of the minister. Instead of having a medical specialist, there will be another medical officer.

Mr. Epp: Same department.

Mr. MacDonald (Egmont): That is right. Surely, if there is a question of expenses, the expense is going to be incurred similarly with the second medical officer as it would be with a medical specialist, unless it is found that there are two different rates of pay.

With respect to possible litigation, I regard that as a complete distraction from the essence of the argument and the essence of the attempt which is being made here by the minister in this motion. Quite frankly, I am shocked that the minister would have the effrontery, having given the committee the responsibility of reviewing the bill—which is its parliamentary obligation—to call in the expert witnesses who were made available by the Department of Manpower and Immigration. It was not as if we did not have such expert advice offered to the committee.

I well recall the evening the medical officers came and testified in our committee with respect to this specific clause in terms of their own responsibility. I think members were well aware of all the implications of what was being done in the amendments which were moved and accepted in the committee at that time. One of the things which bothered me on that occasion—and, of course, it bothers me again today—is that I think we have developed a new kind of sacred deity, a new area of unquestioned authority. It used to be that people in my profession, the clergy, could make pronouncements which would simply go unquestioned because they spoke with the kind of mantle of authenticity which no one in his right mind would ever seriously question. We are now living in a much more modern period, and that is no longer the case.

Mr. Stanbury: Especially since you have been here.

Mr. MacDonald (Egmont): Perhaps. But whether one is inside or outside this place, having any clerical mantle does not add any sense of authority or infallibility to one's position. That is likely a pretty good thing; I have no hesitation in saying that. However, in this generation we have established a new system of infallibility. We have moved from the area of theology to medicine, so that now when somebody who comes out of medical school either as a general practitioner or, perhaps more significantly, some kind of medical specialist and makes a pronouncement as to what he can and cannot do as to the absolute accuracy and fairness of each and every pronouncement or decision he renders, no one in his right mind must question that. Quite frankly, I am not prepared to accept that. I have found that even medical specialists can make mistakes and that two highly trained medical practitioners can, on occasion, be in disagreement. I have found, also, that there is no absolute scientific conclusion in respect of each and every medical examination.

• (1240)

This is the reason that from time to time—all of us have experienced this—when we get a medical diagnosis which does not seem to explain adequately a certain condition, we look for a second and sometimes even a third opinion. Who in the chamber has not heard of cases of individuals who have gone first to one doctor, have not been satisfied with the diagnosis or recommendation of that doctor, and have moved on to a second one and then to a third one, finally, to get satisfaction? Perhaps the Minister of National Health and Welfare has not heard of it yet. Perhaps he is so much in awe of medical practitioners and those who reside in his department who practice the medical arts, that when they make a pronouncement, *ex cathedra,* so to speak, he thinks it must be accepted without question. Certainly he received that message very clearly from the medical specialists who were on hand the night we discussed this whole matter.

I am sure they were not happy, not because we were adding a burden to some extent but simply because we were allowing for the kind of human fallibility that can take place even in medical circles. That is what concerns me in this instance, and that is why I wish the Minister of National Health and Welfare had remained long enough to hear some other comments, particularly from his own colleague, the hon. member for Niagara Falls.

It is not even primarily the question of medical specialists. In my opinion it is the change of wording from "in his opinion" to "on reasonable grounds", because it becomes very clear, when we think about it for a moment, that with the words "in his opinion" which the minister would like to reintroduce, no mistake is allowed, no error, no need for a further review on the part of one who can adequately judge whether or not the medical diagnosis or medical report was totally accurate and correct.

My colleague has already indicated instances where it has occurred to the detriment of the individual applicant. I am sure the hon. member for Provencher or any other members of the House were not seeking to establish a regime that would produce the kind of litigation suggested by the Minister of National Health and Welfare for the Minister of Manpower and Immigration. If that is the problem, I do not think there was an attempt on the part of the minister, and I say this repectfully, to resolve that problem, then surely we could have a better amendment than the one he has currently proposed, because what he has done merely is again to allow—from my point of view and that of the committee, because of the motion that was approved there—the almost unappealable and unreviewable situation of a medical report jeopardizing or preventing a legitimate application going forward.

Therefore, I am quite dissatisfied and disappointed that the minister in this instance would act in this way, in view of the length of time the committee spent on the matter and in view of the importance of this particular section as it was amended and put in the revised bill that has come back to the House, and that he would have recommended this in view of the recommendation of the committee in its collective wisdom.

I want to say a couple of things more because, as you will note, we have ten motions that are currently before us for debate at present, two of which stand in my name, namely, motions Nos. 20 and 21. With respect to motion No. 20, I think you will realize that this motion would attempt to clarify a situation which was discussed in committee. It was discussed with respect to the kind of liability that would exist for those who would fall under the inadmissable category. It was generally agreed in the discussion that took place with the minister and his officials that it was not satisfactory that there be such a blanket inclusion that anyone who was convicted under any act of parliament would therefore be liable to exclusion or perhaps to deportation.

We discussed whether or not we could be more precise in terms of the definition of those acts under which one could not be convicted and still be accepted as a legitimate applicant. Indeed, as it is presently drafted in the bill—and, again, it shows the unwarranted powers and rather illegal approach of the minister and the department—it would mean that if an individual had been convicted of illegal parking on Parliament Hill, which I believe is a summary offence, he could be regarded as an unacceptable applicant. Or if, on the other hand, he had been caught twice fishing without a licence, again he might be convicted of a summary offence and not considered an acceptable applicant.

The same might be true if one were to give a cigarette to a person under the age of 16. These are the kind of ridiculous examples one can give which show that we have not drafted a precise bill, but have given tremendous and, I think, unwarranted powers to the minister. This will make his job not easier but more difficult. It would create, of course, a considerable amount of anxiety and suspicion on the part of those who come into contact with the immigration procedures.

Motion No. 21 is an instance where an individual who does not comply with the conditions or requirements of the Immigration Act or the regulations or any orders or directions would, in a sense, also come under the act. Here we have a situation where an individual might break a regulation or in some way inadvertently defy an order or a direction and would immediately find himself in jeopardy. When we discussed this in committee, we were quickly assured by the minister and his officials that this would not happen, that the individual in question would not be in danger of breaking a regulation or defying an order or a direction of which he did not have knowledge.

But as you well know, it is one thing to have a verbal assurance in a committee from an official, or even from the minister, and another thing to have it clearly stated in the statute. My motion would say that this would refer to an act or regulation which had been made public. This would ensure that an individual could not inadvertently, or without knowledge, break a regulation. When we come to dealing with something as increasingly complex as immigration, it would be almost impossible to think of instances where individuals would not be, perhaps even only in a marginal way, in defiance of some regulatory obligation.

Again, I think the minister has not clearly defended, explained or provided in law protection against the growing number of regulations and orders in council which can jeopardize the individual applicant. That is why I think that not to allow for direct knowledge being made available to an individual is to infringe upon that individual's human rights. There are a number of other amendments to which I would like to speak, but time does not permit. However, I hope they will be given, each in their own way, serious study by the minister.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Louis Duclos (Montmorency): Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak a few minutes only on motion No. 18 in my name, amending clause 19(1)(g). As you know, under that clause an inadmissible class is established, that of persons that are likely, as the term occurs all through the legislation, as that are likely to or "*susceptibles de*" engage in acts of violence that would or might endanger the life or safety of persons in Canada or are members of an organization that is likely to engage in violence. I find that clause unacceptable because it enshrines both the principle of guilt by apprehension and that of guilt by association. In other words, the fact alone of being a member of rather than being active or being actively involved in an association that is likely to engage in violence puts a person in an inadmissible class.

My amendment proposes at least to eliminate guilt by association, a concept that is fully foreign to our law, by refusing or rather eliminating as a cause of inadmissibility the mere fact of being a member of an association that might endanger the life or safety of persons in Canada.

Mr. Speaker, I would stress that my amendment would still give immigration officers all the power they need to exclude persons who there are reasonable grounds to believe are likely to engage in acts of violence or that are likely to take part in illegal activities by an organization that is likely to engage in such acts of violence.

Mr. Speaker, the problem is that there exist a number of political movements, national liberation movements or other organizations of that type that often include two components, one that could be termed the politicial arm, the organization of a purely political nature very often urging changes through peaceful ways and means, and the other that is termed the fighting arm, that chooses to use violent means to attain its ends. It would therefore be possible that someone having joined in good faith a political movement, a national liberation movement, his name would appear on the membership list, and he or she would be denied entry into Canada for the sole reason that there would be a second component, the other one using violence.

Mr. Speaker, it will always be possible to refer to clause 19(1)(g) to exclude a group of really undesirable individuals who are not welcomed in Canada. I therefore hope that the amendment will be agreed to and thus the harmful principle of guilt by association will be rejected as otherwise it would be sanctioned by the legislation. Mr. Speaker, we cannot speak of equality before the law in this country if the principle of guilt by association must apply to some individuals, while the majority of Canadians would not be subject to it, since the notion of guilt by association is squarely rejected in our statutes.

● (1250)

[*English*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. Members: Question.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The question is on motion No. 13. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion? All those in favour will please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

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

Some hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): On division.

And more than five members having risen:

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. The recorded division on motion No. 13 stands deferred.

The next question is on motion No. 14 in the name of the hon. member for Greenwood (Mr. Brewin). All those in favour will please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

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

Some hon. Members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Accordingly, the recorded vote on this motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 15 in the name of the hon. member for Fundy-Royal (Mr. Fairweather). Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion? All those in favour will please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

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

Some hon. Members: Nay.

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

[Mr. Duclos.]

An hon. Member: On division.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion negatived on division.

Motion No. 15 (Mr. Fairweather) negatived.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The next question is on motion No. 16 in the name of the hon. member for Greenwood (Mr. Brewin). The vote on this motion will also dispose of motion No. 25, also in the name of the hon. member for Greenwood. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt motion No. 16? All those in favour will please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

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

Some hon. Members: Nay.

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

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): On division.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I declare motion No. 16 negatived on division, which means that motion No. 25 also is automatically lost on division.

Motions Nos. 16 and No. 25 (Mr. Brewin) negatived.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The next question is on motion No. 17 in the name of the hon. member for Greenwood (Mr. Brewin). Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion? All those in favour will please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

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

Some hon. Members: Nay.

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

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): On division.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I declare motion No. 17 lost on division.

Motion No. 17 (Mr. Brewin) negatived.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The next question is on motion No. 18 in the name of the hon. member for Montmorency (Mr. Duclos). Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion? All those in favour will please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

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

Some hon. Members: Nay.

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

An hon. Member: On division.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I declare motion No. 18 negatived on division.

Motion No. 18 (Mr. Duclos) negatived.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The next question is on motion No. 19 in the name of the hon. member for Greenwood (Mr. Brewin). Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion? All those in favour will please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

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

Some hon. Members: Nay.

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

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): On division.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I declare motion No. 19 lost on division.

Motion No. 19 (Mr. Brewin) negatived.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The next question is on motion No. 20 in the name of the hon. member for Egmont (Mr. MacDonald). A vote on that motion also disposes of motion No. 21, also in the name of the hon. member for Egmont. The question is on motion No. 20. It is the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion? All those in favour will please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

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

Some hon. Members: Nay.

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

An hon. Member: On division.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I declare motion No. 20 lost on division and motion No. 21 lost on division.

Motions Nos. 20 and 21 (Mr. MacDonald, Egmont) negatived.

• (1300)

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

DISPOSITION OF CERTAIN BILLS

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. We have had consultations, and I believe there is agreement among the representatives of the parties that I put a motion at this time, under motions, to dispose of a number of items of business, not to pass them but to arrange that they be dealt with in a later session. I move, seconded by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Macdonald):

That the Standing Orders be amended by adding, for the remainder of the present parliament, the following:

117. Notwithstanding any Standing Order, in the third session of the thirtieth parliament, the following bills of the second session of the said parliament shall on the opening day of the third session, be deemed to have been read a first time, ordered to be printed and dealt with as follows:

(i) Bill C-7, an act respecting the administration and development of certain fishing and recreational harbours in Canada, shall be deemed to have been read a second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Fisheries and Forestry;

(ii) Bill C-17, an act respecting the reorganization of Air Canada shall be deemed to have been read a second time, referred to and reported from a committee and ordered for consideration at the report stage;

(iii) Bill C-40, an act to amend the Aeronautics Act shall be deemed to have been read a second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, it is correct that we have agreed to this. One point has just occurred to me. Perhaps it should be understood that in the next session these three bills will probably have different numbers.

Mr. MacEachen: Yes, Mr. Speaker, we will note that.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Hon. members have heard the proposition of the President of the Privy Council (Mr. MacEachen). Is it agreed that the minister shall have leave to put the motion at this time?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. Members: Question.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It being after one o'clock, I do now leave the chair until two o'clock p.m.

At 1.06 p.m. the House took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 2 p.m.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*Translation*]

IMMIGRATION ACT, 1976

AMENDMENTS TO IMPLEMENT CHANGES IN IMMIGRATION POLICY

The House resumed consideration of Bill C-24, respecting immigration to Canada, as reported (with amendments) from

the Standing Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Order please!

Mr. David MacDonald (Egmont) moved:

Motion No. 23.

That Bill C-24, An Act respecting immigration to Canada, be amended in Clause 27

(*a*) by striking out line 9 at page 20 and substituting the following therefor:

"of any democratic government,";

(*b*) by striking out line 20 at page 20 and substituting the following therefor:

"any fraudulent or improper means or intentional mis-";

(*c*) by striking out line 29 at page 20 and substituting the following therefor:

"such information, but no such report shall be made pursuant to paragraph 27(1)(*b*), (*d*)(ii), (*e*) or (*f*) if that permanent resident has resided in Canada as a permanent resident for more than five years."

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood) moved:

Motion No. 24.

That Bill C-24, An Act respecting immigration to Canada, be amended in Clause 27 by striking out lines 19 to 21 at page 20 and substituting the following therefor:

"pertaining to his admission or was granted landing by any willfully false and fraudulent misrepresentation of any material fact, wheth-"

Mr. David MacDonald (Egmont) moved:

Motion No. 26.

That Bill C-24, An Act respecting immigration to Canada, be amended in Clause 27 by striking out line 14 at page 21 and substituting the following therefor:

"lent or improper means or intentional misrepresenta-".

[*English*]

Mr. David MacDonald (Egmont): I should like to speak briefly to the amendments in my name to which Your Honour has referred, and deal with three aspects, especially, which I believe to be of importance but which unfortunately were not regarded favourable by the committee.

In the first place, there is an issue here which I believe to be of considerable moment concerning the acceptability of those who have been involved, or, as it says in clause 27(1)(*c*), are engaged in or instigated subversion by force of any government. The addition of the words "by force" has, of course, considerably improved this clause. The situation in the world community is such today that parliamentary institutions, freedom of public expression, freedom to take part in assemblies, and so on, are becoming increasingly rare. Many people must, therefore, regard the situation in this country with considerable envy. It is for this reason we must be very concerned, when passing an immigration act, to distinguish between governments which are supported by the will of the people and those which have secured power by force in order to establish some form of dictatorship. All too frequently we read in newspapers or hear on the broadcasting media of some democratic regime or institution which has fallen in the face of some totalitarian power.

● (1410)

In immigration law which is going to deal with hundreds of thousands of people who often come from many such countries and who, while taking up residence and perhaps even citizenship here, will feel quite strongly about the freedom or possibility of freedom of their own home country, we would not want in some way, in the context of our own Immigration Act, to defeat the purpose of our own society, which is to uphold the notion that people should be allowed to participate and act responsibly in their own country, and that they should have elemental respect for human rights and the dignity and sanctity of the individual.

When this does not occur, I am sure that for those who take an interest in seeing that their former homeland is returned to some form of democratic institution it must not be beyond their opportunity so to participate. This is why I have included in the first part of this amendment, (a), the word "democratic".

The second part of motion No. 23 refers to intentional misrepresentation as against simply misrepresentation. The minister and his officials will recall that we discussed this matter at very considerable length at committee and it forms part of both motion No. 23 and motion No. 26. Again we move into an area where we are going to be dealing substantially with people who, not familiar with the rules as they apply with respect to presentation of evidence or the validating of themselves as individuals in terms of correct immigration procedures, may innocently provide some kind of information which is not wholly or totally accurate.

I think the minister will recall a good deal of the conversation in committee which concerned the accuracy or credibility of the translation services and the translated records which are sometimes used in examining the legitimacy of an applicant. Of course, it is just not in the area of translation, which I think the minister took very seriously and promised to improve to the best of his ability; it is in the whole area of dealing with people coming from different cultures and societies, in many instances having perhaps been under the authority of administrations and bureaucracies which are not inclined to treat them with any great degree of fairness. Something which we would not accept in our own country is very often traditionally the case in the homelands of these people.

Therefore, people who are in the nature of being immigrant applicants often approach the bureaucracy with fear and anxiety, unsure both of the nature of the bureaucracy itself as well as the general cultural situation of the country to which they are coming. For us not to include this provision for the inadvertent, unintentional misrepresentation which might occur with respect to information seems to me to be overly narrow and legalistic when dealing with people whom we hope will enjoy and assume the benefits and responsibilities of Canadian society. Therefore, for that reason I have included this amendment on these two occasions in motions 23 and 26.

The final part refers to the concept of domicile, but not the language of domicile. This is to be found in (c) of motion 23, which reads as follows:

—such information, but no such report shall be made pursuant to paragraph 27(1)(b), (d)(ii); (e) or (f) if that permanent resident has resided in Canada as a permanent resident for more than five years.

I point out at the outset that while it introduces in general terms the concept of domicile, which I believe, indeed, to be an important one and worthy of retention in an immigration bill, it in no way has the scope that is presently enjoyed by those who have domicile in Canada. Indeed, I am really taking the minister at his word when he testified in committee; I believe that this will be an adequate provision to include in a responsible and reformed Immigration Act. Certainly it provides for and allows all the latitude which I believe is required for the minister to deport people of criminal intent or criminal activity with whom the minister was considerably concerned in committee. However, it seems to me that people who have resided in Canada for a period longer than five years should not be deported unless serious criminal offences are involved. This is certainly a great deal weaker than the previous domicile provision.

Under the law as it presently stands and under the bill now before the House, quite frankly we are in a situation where people, perhaps through no fault of their own but in the process of adjustment to a new country, could end up for a brief period of time on welfare or in receipt of social security assistance, whereupon they would then be liable to deportation. I do not think that the occasional dependence upon the state of an individual who comes here is reason or cause enough for the minister to want to exercise, under the bill as it presently stands, the right of deportation.

I know the minister has said that the aspect that concerned members was adequately covered under the new citizenship act, but I think there is very little difference between the provisions of the citizenship act as it presently stands and the exercise of the right of deportation. In the present situation, without the provisions I have outlined in motion No. 23, clearly an individual who came here for one day would have just the same legal rights as the individual who has resided here for ten years and who has participated as a responsible member of our society. I do not think that the minister realistically feels that that is a fair way to deal with those who will be residents in Canada for a considerable period of time, and this is why I have introduced this concept but not, of course, the designation, of domicile in this particular motion. Therefore, I ask hon. members to give these provisions very serious re-consideration.

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, before I move on to deal with this particular amendment may I say something I omitted, by mistake, to say yesterday or the day before in the great heat of the moment and the asperity which characterized our debate at that time. I made some reasonably caustic remarks about some of the committee members, but I exempted from my strictures the hon. member for Davenport (Mr. Cacccia) and the hon. member for Montmorency (Mr. Duclos). However, I intended—I see she has just walked out—also to include the hon. member for Trinity (Miss Nicholson) who was chairman of the committee, an extremely fair and patient chairman.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Brewin: I certainly do not want any remarks of mine to cast any reflection upon what she did in this respect.

Motion No. 24 is in my name and it is fairly simple. It is an amendment to clause 27. The clause presently provides that a person may be deported who came into Canada or remained therein with a false or improperly obtained passport, visa or other document pertaining to his admission, or by reason of any fraudulent or improper means or misrepresentation of any material fact, whether exercised or made by himself or by any other person. My amendment would have the effect of striking out lines 19 to 21 of the clause and substituting therefor the words "pertaining to his admission or was granted landing by any wilfully false and fraudulent misrepresentation of any material fact".

● (1420)

As has been interpreted by the Supreme Court of Canada in the Brooks case, if one gets into Canada by reason of a false misrepresentation, the act would apply without any proof whatsoever of intent to deceive. Those who are familiar with immigration matters realize that the situation is highly complex. People who are unfamiliar with the procedures are required to fill in forms, answer questions and are excited by the circumstances under which they find themselves. A person should not be subject to deportation, unless what he said was wilfully false or fraudulent.

The minister added the words "misrepresentation of any material fact". That reference is entirely proper and is indicated in my amendment as well. He would not accept the amendment to include the word "wilfully". I think it should be included. The United States immigration act is in exactly the form I am suggesting. It refers to "wilfully false and fraudulent misrepresentation of any material fact." The Americans have been able to make their system work. We should include that wording in the act in order to avoid striking out a person who unintentionally makes a mistake. Some members of this House do not appreciate that to be deported from Canada, after investing money to come to this country and looking forward to making one's way here, is a very traumatic and a very penal exercise. One must realize that these people told their friends they were going to Canada, and then they have had to return home. If it were wilful, I agree they should not stay. If it was an innocent misstatement of fact, they should not be deported.

I approve of motion No. 23 in the name of the hon. member for Egmont (Mr. MacDonald). I am not entirely sure about motion No. 26. I will have to study that further. The basic ideas in motion No. 23 are excellent. They refer to democratic governments and the motion seeks the same purpose I am seeking by referring to "intentional misrepresentation." That would be a great improvement over what we have at the present time.

Hon. Bud Cullen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, it is incumbent upon me to make my comments at third reading stage, but I should like to join the hon. member for Greenwood (Mr. Brewin) in the tribute he paid to

the chairman of the Standing Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration. That committee was dealing with a very important piece of legislation with myriad amendments, and not only those proposed by the government and by parties opposite in advance. Many amendments came up during the course of the discussions. Given the varying views and attitudes of the members of the committee, that particular member of parliament performed her task in an admirable fashion. Ske kept control of the committee meetings. When the meeting seemed to be out of control, we recognized she was allowing us to splutter on until we finally reached a better bill as a result of the committee hearings.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Cullen: I dissociate myself from the hon. member for Greenwood when he took the odd potshot at members who attended only a few of the meetings. In many instances I received representations from both sides of this House indicating interest in particular parts of the bill. Hon. members wanted to be present when the committee was dealing with particular areas of the bill in which they were interested. They would say, "I am busy with six or seven committees, but when these issues come up I very definitely want to be there". Thus, members only appeared for two or three meetings when we were dealing with specific sections. They had very important roles to play.

The hon. member for Nickel Belt (Mr. Rodriguez) performed his task on the unemployment insurance bill. When he could not be present for some meetings, he sent the hon. member for Timiskaming (Mr. Peters). The hon. member for Timiskaming was present for only two or three meetings, but he did a great job when he was there, putting forward views he was required to put forward. It was not necessary for him to be present at every committee meeting in order to put his view across. It is unfair to criticize members who were present for some of the meetings but not all of them.

I should like to comment on the motions put forward by the hon. member for Egmont (Mr. MacDonald) and the hon. member for Greenwood. The first part of motion No. 23 and all of motion No. 25 have the same effect in that they would restrict the removal of persons who, while in Canada, engage in or instigate subversion by force of democratic governments, and not just any government, as the bill now proposes. The bill does not preclude lawful and peaceful activity against any form of government. It attempts to prevent the use of force in carrying out those activities.

We have a responsibility to protect the lives and property of Canadian citizens against the violence of others, even though we may not condone the particular government against which that violence is aimed. We do not want to have in Canada a counter part of the recent bombing of the Yugoslav consulate in New York which was carried out by emigré groups.

Motions Nos. 23 and 24 would require fraud or misrepresentation relating to entry into Canada, as referred to in clause 27(1)(e), to be intentional, in the one motion, or to be done wilfully, in the second motion. This would require the department to prove that a permanent resident who gained landing by misrepresenting a material fact did so intentionally or wilfully, before his removal could be ordered. This would pose probably an impossible burden of proof upon the department. The false statements would have been made overseas, and the individual's conduct would have to be assessed as of that time in order to determine whether the fraud or misrepresentation was intentional or wilful. For that reason, I cannot support the proposals in these two motions.

Motion No. 23 in the name of the hon. member for Egmont would restore the domicile protection of the present act, which prohibits the deportation of permanent residents for the commission of certain offences if they have resided in Canada for more than five years. Although I respect and admire the integrity of the hon. member for Egmont trying to get this particular idea back into the act and passed, I basically disagree as to whether it is necessary. The paragraphs referred to in this part of the motion relate to the offences of knowingly contravening terms and conditions of landing, conviction of an offence carrying a maximum imposable penalty of more than five years, obtaining landing fraudulently, or wilfully failing to support himself or a dependent member of his family.

• (1430)

The first of these is totally unnecessary, since terms and conditions cannot continue in effect for more than six months and so could not be contravened by a person with more than five years' permanent residence. The others can be applicable at any time, but they are serious offences, indicating that the person is unwilling to carry out his legal and moral obligations, or is a danger to public safety or order in Canada.

Clause 27(1), dealing with removal of permanent residents, has been shorn of all the removable classes in the present act which cover matters outside the control of the individual or which are not indicative of serious character flaws or criminal behaviour. The whole clause, therefore, permits removal of permanent residents only for very serious reasons and leaves ameliorating or compassionate factors such as length of residence in Canada to the discretion of the Immigration Appeal Board to which permanent residents have a right to appeal. For the reasons I have cited I am not prepared to accept this part of motion No. 23.

Motion No. 26 is very similar to the motion put forward by the hon. member for Provencher (Mr. Epp) at the committee stage. Surely, if there is a reason for the committee stage, it is to look at the various amendments which are put forward, to determine if they are acceptable to the government or if they might be acceptable to the government drawn in a different form or perhaps with certain changes made. That is what we agreed to at the committee stage, and I think that is what the hon. member for Egmont was saying when he made, I believe, his first intervention at the report stage.

Mr. Epp: "Provencher", not "Egmont".

Mr. Cullen: Surely there is a time when we use the committee stage, and it is really wrong, when motions have been

discussed, when we have accepted changes and when hon. members who introduce amendments agree to withdraw them on the basis of the government's response, to bring in amendments which we have already agreed at the committee stage should be withdrawn. That seems to me to be an abuse of the process. This is not a motion which was defeated at the committee stage. It was introduced at the committee stage. There was discussion around the table by members from parties of every political persuasion, and finally the individual who moved the amendment saw fit to withdraw it because he felt the amendment which had been proposed by the government adequately covered the position he maintained. If that was not the case, the hon. member could say, "No, I do not like the compromise. We will vote on my amendment. If we cannot get my amendment, then we will look at the one introduced by the government". However, in this case agreement was reached and we came up with the wording "misrepresentation of material fact be proved to have been intentional". So I think that kind of amendment really has no place if the committee stage is to have any importance at all.

For the reasons cited, I feel we have gone a long way to meeting the concerns of hon. members opposite and, quite candidly, of hon. members from this party as well. This is the kind of bill which crosses party lines. People have very strong feelings in particular areas, and that is why there is no argument with hon. members in this party or with hon. members opposite about the interventions they have made. Those interventions have been made because of a strong feeling of conscience, and for that I frankly congratulate and commend hon. members. I do not feel angry with them or ashamed of the fact that there are some hon. members in my party who do not agree with everything that the government is trying to do. I welcome the interventions, but in this case I do not feel these amendments are acceptable, given the changes we have already made.

[*Translation*]

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

Some hon. Members: Yes.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

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

Some hon. Members: Nay.

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

Some hon. Members: On division.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): I declare the motion negatived on division.

Motion No. 23 (Mr. MacDonald, Egmont) negatived on division.

Motions No. 24 (Mr. Brewin) and No. 26 (Mr. MacDonald, Egmont) negatived on division.

Mr. Steven E. Paproski (Edmonton Centre) (for Mr. Fairweather) moved:

Motion No. 27.

That Bill C-24, An Act respecting immigration to Canada, be amended in Clause 29 by striking out lines 16 to 24 at page 22 and substituting the following therefor:

"(2) At the request of the person with respect to whom an inquiry is to be held, or of the immigration officer representing the Minister, an adjudicator may allow an inquiry to be held *in camera*.

(3) Except as provided in subsection (2), an inquiry by an adjudicator shall be held in public."

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

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

Some hon. Members: Nay.

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

Some hon. Members: On division.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): The motion is negatived on division.

Motion No. 27 (Mr. Fairweather) negatived on division.

[*English*]

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood) moved:

Motion No. 28.

That Bill C-24, respecting immigration to Canada, be amended in clause 37 by striking out line 35 at page 26 and substituting the following therefor:

"time, but the minister shall not make such an order without granting a hearing at which the applicant may be heard and represented".

Mr. Epp: What about motion No. 26?

Mr. Cullen: Motion No. 26 was taken care of by the last vote.

Mr. Brewin: Mr. Speaker, I am a little puzzled by this. I have been furnished with a list of the motions which were to be grouped together. It includes motions Nos. 23, 24 and 26. It does not include motion No. 28, and when I was—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Order, please. For the benefit of all hon. members, motions Nos. 23, 24 and 26 were grouped for debate and a vote on motion no. 23 disposed of motions Nos. 24 and 26. We have had a vote on motion No. 23, and that disposed of motions nos. 24 and 26. We are now, therefore, considering motion No. 28.

Mr. Brewin: Mr. Speaker, if we are on motion No. 28, I would like to state very briefly why it is presented. This deals with the cancellation of a permit. As the house knows well, the minister is entitled, in special cases, more particularly on compassionate grounds but not necessarily on compassionate grounds, to grant a permit even though a person would not otherwise be admissible under the ordinary rules. Then the minister is granted, under this bill, the right to cancel a permit. The purport of my amendment is that the minister should not make such an order without granting a hearing in which the applicant may be heard and represented.

If a person has been allowed into Canada—the right to stay here is a very important right to certain individuals—I think it is wrong that a minister, without being accountable to anybody, should be able to cancel the permit. He should be willing to grant to a person whose permit he is permanently cancelling, the right to make his side of the case known before he acts. I am sure the minister in practice frequently does exactly that, and so he should, but I think it should be in the act. Some people argue about whether immigrants have rights. They certainly have privileges conferred upon them by this parliament, and they have the right to have a permit if the minister sees fit and confers a status. If it is to be taken away, it should be taken away after a hearing, and not before.

It may be very convenient for the minister to cancel permits if he feels like it, but the fact that it is convenient is not a good reason. The right to a hearing is part of our basic judicial system and part of our whole system of dealing with people. Therefore, I am glad to recommend that this amendment be accepted. I do not suppose the minister would have to conduct the hearings himself. I am sure he can, under other sections of the act, delegate many of these powers. I am not trying to overburden him with work, but whoever actually makes the decision should grant a hearing to the person concerned.

● (1440)

Hon. Bud Cullen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, I disagree with the proposed amendment which the hon. member moved at the committee stage. Quite candidly, I looked at it very carefully because I know that motions put by the hon. member for Greenwood (Mr. Brewin) are not put lightly but come from a strong sense of what is appropriate. He feels that the issuance of a ministerial permit confers a particular status on an individual once he comes to Canada. This motion would require the minister or the department to grant a hearing to a person whose permit has been cancelled or who has been required to leave Canada.

I disagree in principle with the intent of the amendment. A person who received a permit and entered Canada as an exercise of executive clemency and discretion has no right to come into or remain in Canada; indeed, he is by definition an inadmissible or removable person, and he has no right to the issuance of a permit. That he should suddenly acquire rights after he has benefited from the clemency, and the period has expired, would be totally incongruous.

The effect of the passage of this amendment would mean a drastic decline in any minister's willingness to issue permits in the first place. Apart from these considerations, the proposed amendment is no indication of the nature of the proposed hearing, its subject matter or its possible results. I am not too concerned, because I know how I, in this particular portfolio, would respond to a request for a ministerial permit and the effect of an appeal would not influence me personally, I think. But I have to think of incumbents who may subsequently come and fill this role who would say, "I don't need that kind of harassment. I am not going to issue a ministerial permit and be put in that invidious position". So I think it would defeat the purpose that the hon. member has in mind. It is for that reason that I am opposed to this motion.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

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

Some hon. Members: Nay.

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

Some hon. Members: On division.

Motion No. 28 (Mr. Brewin) negatived.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Serge Joyal (Maisonneuve-Rosemont) (for Mr. De Bané) moved:

Motion No. 29.

That Bill C-24, An Act respecting immigration to Canada, be amended in Clause 39 by striking out lines 33 to 45 at page 27 and substituting the following therefor:

"dent, a certificate issued at the discretion of a judge of the Federal Court of Canada upon application of the Minister and the Solicitor General, which application shall contain all the particulars of security or criminal intelligence reports, stating that the person is a person described in subpara-

graph 19(1)(*d*)(ii), or paragraph 19(1)(*e*), (*f*) or (*g*), or in paragraph 27(2)(*c*), may be filed with an immigration officer or an adjudicator and the certificate is evidence of the matters therein without proof of the signa-".

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood) moved:

Motion No. 30.

That Bill C-24, An Act respecting immigration to Canada, be amended by deleting Clauses 39, 40, 41 and 42 and substituting the following therefor:

"39. The Minister and the Solicitor General may issue certificates setting out that in any case before the Adjudicator or Immigration Appeal Board that such a case involves security or criminal intelligence and the Adjudicator or the Immigration Appeal Board shall conduct the hearing *in camera* and shall not furnish to the applicant the sources of the information but shall give to the applicant a summary of the basis of objections, and shall otherwise hear and determine any claims or allegations that security or criminal intelligence is involved in the same manner as other cases."

and by renumbering the subsequent clauses accordingly.

Mr. Serge Joyal (Maisonneuve-Rosemont) (for Mr. De Bané) moved:

Motion No. 31.

That Bill C-24, An Act respecting immigration to Canada, be amended in Clause 40 by striking out lines 19 to 26 at page 30 and substituting the following therefor:

"section (8) and where the report made pursuant to subsection (9) has determined that the person concerned is a person described in subparagraph 19(1)(*d*)(ii) or paragraph 19(1)(*e*) or (*g*) or 27(1)(*c*), the Governor in Council, after having considered the reports referred to in subsections (1) and (9), may make a deportation order against that person."

Mr. Serge Joyal (Maisonneuve-Rosemont) (for Mr. De Bané) moved:

Motion No. 32.

That Bill C-24, An Act respecting immigration to Canada, be amended in Clause 41 by striking out lines 31 and 32 at page 30 and substituting the following therefor:

"Council, which Members shall be retired judges of a superior court."

Mr. Serge Joyal (Maisonneuve-Rosemont): Mr. Speaker, I had the opportunity to speak on the amendment proposed by my colleague, the hon. member for Montmorency (Mr. Duclos), to expand the concept of "political refugees". I pointed out that some particularly important provisions in Bill C-24 should be made crystal clear in the minds of all members, essentially because they put into question basic concepts in our society and the type of Canada we want for the future.

I will not come back to the meaning of the amendment proposed by my colleague from Montmorency, since hon. members already had the opportunity to vote at this stage. However, I would like to deal in more detail with sections 39, 40, 41 and 42 as these sections question assumptions by the government, Parliament and the public on matters of national security and appropriate legislation to be passed by the House to ensure its preservation. Sections 39, 40, 41 and 42 of the bill apply to two particular groups of immigrant non-permanent residents, i.e. visitors, tourists, students, occasional workers and refugees who are not yet permanent residents, and holders of a permit issued by a minister. That is a first category of non-permanent residents, and sections 40 and 41 deal mostly with national security as far as permanent residents are concerned, which means persons we all feel should enjoy more extensive rights and wider protection than are available to non-permanent residents.

However, sections 39, 40 and 83 are related to section 119 of the bill which provides that secret reports which would be used by the ministers will not be made available to any court of the country and consequently in no judicial procedure. So, section 119 is a provision which deprives our civil courts of their jurisdiction, and challenges our ideas of reliance on the courts to enforce the law, and above all ensure security in Canada. I would like to mention that this problem of relationship between the courts and national security is rather new in parliamentary democracy, and especially in North America, and I would like to draw a comparison with the situation prevailing in the United States.

Last year, in April 1976, the American Senate tabled a report which dealt precisely with the relationship between security operations, i.e. aiming at the protection of territorial integrity, and the survival of democratic institutions, such as the Constitution, and civil rights and their relationship with the courts, that is the judicial power to ensure that the role or the rights recognized by the constitution of the country can be reconciled with the more general powers of the courts in matters of national security.

Obviously, there is always the same element involved in matters of national security, that is the need for confidentiality and in camera proceedings. Of course, if the security system operated in the open in the market place, it would lose any real measure of efficiency. It is therefore accepted practice that security matters are dealt with in a confidential environment for efficiency reasons. This does not mean however that the judiciary should lose all control over security activities.

I am referring to the American situation. Hon. members are fully aware that scarcely 15 days ago, the Solicitor General of Canada (Mr. Fox) announced here in this House a royal commission to define control procedures available to the Canadian government in the special area of freedom that must apply to our security institutions.

Clauses 39, 40 and 41 were discussed at length at the committee stage. I was not present at that time, being involved in legal proceedings against a Crown corporation. I am aware of the amendments put forward by some official opposition members, which were discussed at length by New Democrat members, and also of certain arrangements that may have been reached by the Minister of Manpower and Immigration (Mr. Cullen) and the movers of various amendments.

● (1450)

I suggest, however, that it might be useful at the report stage to bring back some amendments that are aimed in my mind not at reducing the degree of security, but neither at ensuring that it will be maintained within the framework of judicial control. The first amendment in particular involves clause 39, this is amendment No. 29 tending to obtain that a judge of the Federal Court of Canada issue the security certificate that the minister and the Solicitor General can sign themselves. Various objections were raised against that

amendment, namely that a judge would not always be available, that this would over burden federal courts and that in the final analysis confidential matters would be debated in public. Upon analysis, I do not think either of these arguments would stand up. On the one hand, we have often seen judges of the Federal Court issue orders in the evening or during the night. Similarly, judges of the Federal Court have made themselves available to the government, for instance during the strike of air traffic controllers, last summer.

We have also seen some judges direct that hearings be held *in camera* in special cases where public interest and security were at stake. Therefore, the arguments that were made against this amendment No. 29 do not seem to take into account the availability of the Federal Court judges, nor the confidentiality which can be assured by the courts; finally, the usefulness and the essential part that the courts play in the matter of people's basic rights have not been recognized either. This first amendment, Mr. Speaker, is to me but another trade-off which seems to be the minimum that can be granted if we want to provide to non-permanent applicants a basic right that we would recognize as citizens of a free and democratic country, which gives a high priority to the rule of law and the involvement of courts in the supervision and control of the power of discretion, with the essential significance that they must retain throughout these security activities.

I do not want to prejudge the recommendations of the Royal Commission set up by the hon. Solicitor General, which we will discuss. I simply want to emphasize that the recommendations of the U.S. Senate report are very conclusive. They recommend that security activities be subject to the supervision and control of American courts, and that the spending power of security agencies be subject to the control of the Auditor General. Again, I do not want to go beyond the recommendations of the Canadian Royal Commission but members of parliament may have eventually to amend the law of the land if they want to give effect to those recommendations which will enable the courts to exercise a tighter control over the security activities performed by the RCMP.

Clause 40 includes certain provisions which, as I pointed out at the outset, refer to applicants who are permanent applicants, who have the status of permanent applicants. The amendment to that clause is an amendment which I think gives the advisory board a power that once again would tend to give it the status of a court of justice. The advisory board as set up in clause 40 is strictly an advisory body and its recommendation which could be in favour of an applicant could be dismissed by the governor in council. In other words, the favourable aspect of the decision which might be made by the advisory board could always be disregarded in a decision of the governor in council, without any right of appeal. We all recognize that the rights of a permanent applicant are and should be a lot more extensive than those of a non permanent applicant.

The proposed amendment to clause 40 basically provides that decisions in favour of an applicant which could be made by the advisory board would be mandatory and could not be quashed by the governor in council. Again, that seems to me to be the minimum compromise which could be sought to try and give that body the power of independence and inquiry that would normally make it look more like a court of justice. Otherwise, it would be a purely intermediary stage that has no effect on the rights for which protection is sought. Once again, that amendment to clause 40, amendment No. 31, appears to me to be a minimum.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to remind the Minister of Manpower and Immigration (Mr. Cullen)—and I know he is aware of it—that in 1969, the commission presided by Mr. Mackenzie, of which former Air Canada president Yves Pratte was a member, recommended that in the area of security, a permanent applicant would not be denied his rights before he has been allowed access to the due judicial process.

If one reads the recommendations of the Mackenzie commission of 1969, one realizes that these recommendations were extremely strict and extremely tight vis-à-vis the rights of citizens as regards security. Now the Mackenzie commission itself recommended in 1969 that the case of permanent applicants be subject to a complete legal process. It is therefore unnecessary, Mr. Speaker, to take exception to or dismiss at once the proposed amendment to clause 40, since it is aimed at establishing a procedure which remains well within the suggestion made by the Mackenzie commission in 1969.

I would also like to point out, Mr. Speaker, that in the case of section 41, amendment No. 32 is aimed at having three retired judges on that advisory board instead of only one. Several objections have been raised to those proposals. Finally, an arrangement was concluded by the Minister of Manpower and Immigration, an arrangement which has finally allowed us to obtain that one of three positions be filled by a retired judge. Once again, several objections were raised: few judges available, courts are overburdened, security files would be made public. Looking back at the statements which have been made, Mr. Speaker, it is to be regretted that as legislators we are not favourably disposed towards the courts when it comes to national security. And as I said earlier, the U.S. Senate has already had the opportunity to vote more specifically on the role of courts in the context of national security. And once again, perhaps as legislators, we will have to reconsider during the months to come some bills whose object will be to extend the control of courts in the context of national security. I think that we are overly eager to associate the role of courts with the public character of court operations.

Court action does not necessarily mean public hearings. My colleagues who have experience with the Criminal Code and related statutes, know that in some cases it is possible to ensure confidentiality of the debates. I believe it is fair to state that in the past, the vast majority of judges have always fulfilled this responsibility in the most exemplary way, and there is no ground to fear that security files may get lost in court.

Unfortunately, as we found out in the last few months, files sometimes get out of police hands much more readily than out of courts of justice and magistrates' Chambers. Therefore, I do

not believe that the points raised against the presence of three judges on the advisory council would jeopardize national security.

Mr. Speaker, this is why it seems basic to me that the compromise proposed by the hon. Minister of Manpower and Immigration (Mr. Cullen) who, to a certain extent, has taken fifty steps forward in this area, be pursued and that we may reach a point of further refinement of the role that we want to give courts and the importance that we want to recognize in the rule of law in the area of national security.

[*English*]

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, I propose to speak on motion No. 30 standing in my name. The motion proposes to delete clauses 39, 40, 41 and 42 of the bill, and substitute therefor the proposed clause 39 as set out on the order paper. I submit that in place of the elaborate, confusing phraseology of the four sections, you would have a much simpler, more straightforward provision as set out in the amendment. It deals with security, and nothing is more difficult than squaring security with justice and fairness to people affected by legislation of this kind.

In this case we are considering the Immigration Act. I propose, and I shall tell the House later where I got the idea for the amendment, that the minister and solicitor general may issue certificates in the normal course of any proceeding in connection with deportation before the adjudicator or the Immigration Appeal Board. Their certificate says that the case involves security or criminal intelligence. It then provides that, and I quote:

● (1500)

—the Adjudicator or the Immigration Appeal Board shall conduct the hearing in camera and shall not furnish to the applicant the sources of the information but shall give to the applicant a summary of the basis of objections, and shall otherwise hear and determine any claims or allegations that security or criminal intelligence is involved in the same manner as other cases."

That differs from the clause which I seek to delete which provides various hearings. It provides for the setting up of a security advisory board which, incidentally, is given no authority at all except to report.

Mr. Nystrom: The Conservative party is now united.

Mr. Brewin: I don't know if I feel very united at the moment. The present clauses provide for the special advisory board. Then they provide that the cabinet may order the deportation of a person whether or not it has a report from the security board. That is clause 40(10).

The basis of my recommendation is what was done in the last world war. At that time the government, in its wisdom, found it necessary to use the defence of Canada regulations to detain people who were thought by the Minister of Justice to be a security risk, and to intern them at his pleasure. This was to be in the regulations which in turn were passed under the War Measures Act and it was acted on. Many people of German or Italian origin, and perhaps some of Japanese origin, were interned under this procedure and detained without hearing and trial.

At that stage a group of civil libertarians, many of them businessmen from Toronto, and I happened to be associated with them, came together in what they called the Civil Liberties Association of Toronto. They said it is basic, even where security is concerned, that there be a public hearing. They devised a formula which was accepted by the government of the day. The Minister of Justice at that time was Mr. St. Laurent, a distinguished name in the Liberal hierarchy. He accepted this proposal whereby, when security came into question and a person who was interned wanted to question it, he could do so by making application to a county or superior court judge, who was required to do what I suggest here. He was required to proceed with the hearing, listen to what the applicant had to say, and no doubt hear from the Department of Justice why the person was detained. He did not disclose sources of confidential information, but he did give particulars so that the person being interned would know in general terms at any rate what was the alleged reason.

As a result of that process, very large numbers of people were released from internment camps. As far as I have been able to determine, none of them proved a danger to the security of Canada. None of them were in trouble. They secured their freedom through this process which kept confidential sources secret but nevertheless granted a hearing.

If that can be done in wartime in respect of people whose liberty had been taken from them by reason of suspicion that somehow or other they might help the enemy and thereby be damaging to Canada, why can it not be done now? If the Liberal party is able to show such liberality in the midst of war, why not in the Immigration Act when we are not at war?

I admit there are such things as security risks. We are talking about a means of granting a fair hearing on the one side and keeping confidential information from disclosure on the other. It worked then. It could work now. It would be a sensible compromise. There is no reason why these things should be taken entirely away from the adjudicators in the Immigration Appeal Board. They are the ones trained to deal with this subject. If they receive this certificate their obligation is not to have the case publicly held, but hold it in camera and give limited particulars to the persons concerned. That is a reasonable compromise.

Security is always a difficult matter to deal with. I would like to read from the abridged version of the Report of the Royal Commission on Security, June, 1969. As most members will recall, Max Mackenzie was the chairman and Yves Pratte and M. J. Coldwell were members. They submitted a lengthy report. This is what they had to say about deportation and appeal in relation to security:

Our views on one important aspect of deportation and appeal procedures have already been outlined. We feel that the deportation of an immigrant who has been formally landed in Canada is a most serious matter, and that it is right that any such order should be subject to formal judicial due process—

It is not political due process through the cabinet, but judicial due process. I put those last few words in to clarify the matter.

—and appeal before a body such as the Immigration Appeal Board. If the government is unwilling to produce acceptable and satisfactory evidence, we feel that deportation should not be ordered. Such situations should not often arise, if reasonably effective immigration screening procedures exist.

It will be noted that my proposed amendment does not go as far as the royal commission recommended. It said if there was not adequate evidence they should not proceed with the deportation. I am prepared that they should proceed, but only after some due judicial process and appeal before such a body as the Immigration Appeal Board. I have inserted a formula which will provide for confidentiality.

If these very distinguished gentlemen were entrusted with this job by Mr. Pearson and could recommend what they did, then what was done by Mr. St. Laurent in the middle of the war can also be done here. Instead of doing violence to either side, and instead of doing violence to the confidentiality of secret sources of information so as to provide for a full judicial process hearing, the amendment I propose will serve that purpose. I have very little hope with the present attitude that this amendment will be adopted. It is much too sensible. The tendency these days is to try to use the word security, wave it around like a magic wand, and let the cabinet decide these matters. We do not need such a strict division as the Americans have, but it makes sense to let the judiciary body do its work and to let the cabinet do its work. I certainly do not approve the sort of thing set out in these proposed changes.

● (1510)

Hon. Bud Cullen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, many hon. members as well as many representatives of non-governmental organizations have expressed concern about Clauses 39 and 40 and to a lesser extent about Clauses 41 and 42. These clauses were discussed at some length in the committee, and as a result of interventions there by the hon. member for Fundy-Royal (Mr. Fairweather), the hon. member for Davenport (Mr. Caccia) and others, substantial amendments were made in committee. I believe members who were able to attend the committee sessions now have a better appreciation of the purpose of these clauses and the manner of their implementation, but I think it might be helpful to the House in considering these motions if I were again to review the intended application of the clauses in question.

Bill C-24 describes several classes of persons who may be inadmissible or deportable because of engagement in criminal or subversive activities. I would refer hon. members in particular to paragraphs 19(1)(d) to 19(1)(g) inclusive, as well as to 27(1)(c) and 27(2)(c). Where the evidence of such engagement can be freely disclosed in public, we would proceed against the person concerned by way of a full and proper inquiry before an adjudicator. This is what is done now, and what would be done in most cases in the future.

There are some cases, however, where the evidence cannot be freely disclosed, and consequently an inquiry cannot be held. The evidence may contain elements whose disclosure would endanger national security; it may have been provided in the strictest confidence by an agency of the government of another country, or it may have been supplied by an important undercover agent whose usefulness would come to a quick end if his existence were revealed. These cases are a minority, but unfortunately they are usually the most serious ones.

At present the department finds itself in rather a difficult position. The minister can take action against non-immigrants in Canada by declaring that they have ceased to be non-immigrants and making deportation orders against them under sections 7(4) and 7(5) of the 1952 act. But there is no comparable power to deal with people seeking admission to Canada or those who have been admitted as landed immigrants, no matter how grave the danger to Canada or Canadians. We have no choice but to let such people come into or remain in Canada, as the case may be.

This has long been recognized as a serious problem, and was mentioned as such by the Royal Commission on Security some years ago. It all boils down, of course, to a conflict between the right of the individual to fair and just treatment and the right of Canada to defend its legitimate interests and those of its citizens and residents. It is a difficult decision to make, but we believe that in this area the right of the state must be paramount. Clauses 39 and 40 attempt to secure the state's interests without taking away from the individual any more than is absolutely necessary.

Clause 39 deals with people who are not permanent residents, that is, visitors in Canada, people not yet admitted to Canada, and people who are in Canada unlawfully. We feel Canada owes these classes rather less than it owes its permanent residents, but even so clause 39 does not give the minister the absolute power he has under the 1952 act. Although the minister and Solicitor General would be entitled to issue non-contestable certificates, the person concerned would still have the right to an inquiry before an adjudicator, and in some cases to a hearing by the Immigration Appeal Board at which he could seek to establish that he and the person named in the certificate were not one and the same. This is a significant improvement over the 1952 act.

Permanent residents are a different matter. We do owe them more consideration, no matter how serious the evidence against them. Under the provision proposed in Clause 40, the opinion of the minister and of the Solicitor General would not be conclusive. Rather, it would have to be submitted to a panel of distinguished citizens for review. This panel—the special advisory board—would not only have access to the minister's evidence, but would be authorized to pass on selected items to the person concerned, and would give the person a hearing at which he could present a defence. The board would then report its conclusions to cabinet, which would in turn review all the evidence before making a decision. The permanent resident would thus receive consideration at three very high levels.

Motions Nos. 29 and 30—and I might also mention motion No. 46, which is on the same topic although not included in this group for debate—appear to agree with the necessity of protecting sensitive information, but suggest that the decision on sensitivity be placed elsewhere. This is a decision which cannot be made casually or out of context. We are convinced it

must be made by persons who have regular access to and involvement with secret information, and who are thus better able to appreciate its signficance, its reliability, and its ramifications. It is internationally recognized that security matters must be dealt with by the executive rather than the judiciary. The same observation applies to motion No. 32; although we agree with the presence of one retired judge on the special advisory board, we do not think that a board consisting solely of judges could bring sufficient experience and expertise to bear, having regard to both the board's functions specified in Clause 42.

The hon. member for Greenwood (Mr. Brewin) constantly reminds us of security cases under the Defence of Canada regulations, but I would point out that in those cases the information was domestically generated whereas much of the immigration material comes in trust from foreign sources. Furthermore, immigration security cases do not appear to be a fit subject for judicial proceedings since none of the usual court rules can apply—I am thinking primarily of the ability to cross-examine witnesses, for example. National security is generally regarded in all countries as a matter for the executive branch, not for the judiciary.

In conclusion I repeat that we understand and appreciate the sentiments which have inspired the movers of this group of motions. Nevertheless, I am convinced that the scheme set out in the bill, especially as it was modified in committee, comes as close as we can hope to get to an appropriately balanced protection of the rights of both the individual and the state, and I respectfully urge the House to defeat these motions.

Mr. David MacDonald (Egmont): Mr. Speaker, I shall not prolong the debate unnecessarily. I am grateful for the minister's intervention because it clarifies the nature of the difficulty we have encountered this afternoon with respect to these amendments. The hon. gentleman said at the outset that all kinds of safeguards were needed with respect to this situation. The very fact that confidential material is being brought forward and used against individuals creates a delicate situation.

These provisions are certainly intended to apply to those said to have been engaged in criminal or subversive activity, and I realize that from time to time information might be forthcoming which it would not be in the interests of the security of the state to make public. Nevertheless, I feel the minister has failed in his argument on two points.

In the first place it seems to me there is an assumption that the information which is made available by security and intelligence agencies is almost without question accurate, full and fair. This is an assumption we encounter at the outset. If there were any way in which we as members of parliament could be sure that the kind of information made available to the department in these cases involving the suggestion of criminal activity or criminal conspiracy was not to be questioned, those who have raised this matter would feel a great deal more comfortable. The difficulty is that we are dealing with a whole variety of sources of information. The minister knows, because he is experienced in the law, that much of the information obtained by way of the creation of a file with respect to criminal or subversive activity may not be hard information but in fact hearsay evidence, or the evidence of prejudiced witnesses, those with a particular axe to grind.

● (1520)

In the case of agencies operating in other countries, we have no way of ascertaining the veracity or accuracy of information made available to our own government. There have been very sorry experiences indeed on occasions when we have acted upon the assumption and in good faith that information provided to us was accurate, only to find subsequently that it was misleading and in fact sometimes downright untrue. In situations like that one must be doubly sure there is sufficient protection for the particular individual involved. There is therefore a major weakness in what the minister said today. He has given us no indication how he or of the officials of his department can be protected against information which is incorrect or unfair to an individual who stands accused. In those instances, of course, any individual can stand in jeopardy.

The other point that concerns me even more is what I think is a false proposition which the minister conveyed to the House this afternoon, which I suppose creates a difficulty for the minister in taking the position he does, or it gives him the basis for taking a position which I think is unwarranted. The minister said something like this—I do not want to misquote him: "The real issue, Mr. Speaker, is the question of the right of the individual to a fair and just treatment as against the right of Canada, the state, to be paramount".

If the choice is between the individual in terms of receiving a fair and just treatment and the survival, the integrity or the legitimacy of the state, surely we have a false notion of what our society is all about. There can be no Canada worth preserving, to put it bluntly, unless the right of the individual to a fair and just treatment is preserved.

I really do not think the minister wants to push this very far. If he is saying that we will have to begin sacrificing certain rights before the law to have a fair and just hearing in order to protect the sanctity and survival of the state, then surely he is saying something that is not in the best tradition of a liberal democracy. Therefore he will want to reconsider, if not today I hope before the time comes for us further to revise the bill in amendments which will come in years to follow. It seems to me that we must be very certain, when establishing the methodology and procedures for dealing with certain situations, which I realize are very often complex and difficult, whether they be of a criminal or subversive nature, to create responsibilities on the part of government and the bureaucracy to deal with innocent people who may be detrimentally affected through the forfeiture of their right to a fair and just hearing.

There is no justification in my estimation for accepting the proposition that there must be some kind of trade off between the survival of the state and the right of each and every individual who is a resident of this country to a fair and just

treatment. I share with the minister the sentiment that the committee made considerable progress in alerting members of his staff and of the committee generally to the difficult situation confronting them. I think that substantial improvement was made on this aspect of the bill in committee, but quite obviously it does not go far enough.

Mr. Cullen: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, the hon. member suggested—I know he did not mean this—that we always take evidence provided as full, fair and accurate. With respect, that is not the case. There is a problem I have at the present time whereby the minister has to make a decision as to the weight to be given to any evidence. We now have two ministers who will look at the evidence and then we refer it to a special advisory board to decide how fair, full and accurate the evidence is and what emphasis or weight should be given to it. I think this is one of the big improvements made to this bill during committee stage.

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

Some hon. Members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): The question is on motion No. 29. All those in favour will please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

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

Some hon. Members: Nay.

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

Some hon. Members: On division.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Negatived on division.

Motion No. 29 (Mr. Joyal) (for Mr. De Bané) negatived.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Motion No. 30. All those in favour will please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

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

Some hon. Members: Nay.

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

Some hon. Members: On division.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Negatived on division.

Motion No. 30 (Mr. Brewin) negatived.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Motion No. 31. All those in favour will please say yea.

[Mr. MacDonald (Egmont).]

Some hon. Members: Yea.

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

Some hon. Members: Nay.

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

Some hon. Members: On division.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Negatived on division.

Motion No. 31 (Mr. Joyal) (for Mr. De Bané) negatived.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Motion No. 32. All those in favour will please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

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

Some hon. Members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Division deferred.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Joyal: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): The hon. member for Maisonneuve-Rosemont on a point of order.

Mr. Joyal: Mr. Speaker, would it be possible to have a recorded division on motion No. 32?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): This will certainly be a recorded division if I may answer the hon. member for Maisonneuve-Rosemont. This is only a vote which has been deferred under Standing Order 75(11) which says that the vote will be held at a predetermined period.

Mr. Louis Duclos (Montmorency) moved:

Motion No. 33.

That Bill C-24, An Act respecting immigration to Canada, be amended in Clause 45 by striking out lines 25 and 26 at page 32 and substituting the following therefor:

"with respect thereto, the accuracy of which transcript attested to by the person claiming, shall be referred to the Minister for determination."

He said: Mr. Speaker, I should like to say a few words in support of Motion No. 33, which aims at amending Clause 45(2). The purpose of this amendment is essentially to make sure that the accuracy of the stenographic notes of the examination to which is subjected the person claiming refugee status is attested by this person. This is a somewhat minor amendment which I feel would give the runner an even break. This amendment, if adopted, would close one of the loopholes which

exist throughout this bill and which open the way to bureaucratic abuse.

In fact, if this amendment is important, it is only because it is on the basis of this transcript that the advisory committee on refugee status advises the minister who is responsible for deciding whether a person qualifies as a political refugee and, therefore, whether this person will be granted this status.

Under the existing law, a person who claims to be a Convention refugee cannot even see the transcript unless of course he is eventually heard by the Immigration Appeal Board. From that point of view, Mr. Speaker, Bill C-24 is an improvement to some extent, since a copy of the transcript is forwarded to the potential refugee, i.e. the person who claims to be a Convention refugee. However, he cannot ask for corrections before the transcript is brought to the attention of the Refugee Status Advisory Committee or before the Committee has read it with the result that, to all practical purposes, this is an insignificant improvement in view of the fact that the inaccuracies or errors which could have slipped either during the translation, interpretation or transcription cannot be corrected. Now, it is obvious that the slightest error of translation or transcription may give a totally different meaning to someone's evidence and, therefore, ruin his credibility in the eyes of the Advisory Committee. Obviously, such control would have to be made by a translator selected by the person who claims to be a Convention refugee since the transcript is written either in English or French and therefore cannot be understood by the applicant.

Of course, one can argue that making it mandatory for the Department of Immigration to have the stenographic notes certified by the person seeking refugee status could be a waste of time. But I think, Mr. Speaker, that it would be better to take more time and avoid situations where, because of an inaccuracy or a mistake, the applicant is refused entry into Canada while in fact, had such details been accurate, he would have been entitled to come into Canada.

Mr. Speaker, others could also argue that certain applicants might change their testimony while revising those stenographical notes. To this, I answer that this problem could easily be solved by recording the testimony which would stand as unassailable evidence in case of conflict between the stenographic notes and the changes that could be required by the person seeking political refugee status.

Mr. Speaker, as I said at the beginning of my speech, I think the minister will agree that the amendment I moved is quite small and that he will want to give a chance to everybody, to individuals in very hard conditions, to people who are uncomfortable and nervous and who may give, under the pressure of the examination which is sometimes very hard and in some cases I think, a bit cruel, to check the accuracy of their testimony. So I leave this amendment to the consideration of the House with the hope that it will agree with it.

● (1530)

[*English*]

Hon. Bud Cullen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, in the interests of answering the concern of the hon. member, this was discussed at some considerable length in committee. The amendment would have a claimant to refugee status certify the accuracy of the transcript of his examination by a senior immigration officer. Since the bill requires that the examination take place under oath, the suggested addition seems superfluous and will provide only an opportunity for the person concerned to change his answers. Additionally, it is unclear how a claimant, unable to speak either official language, could certify the accuracy of the transcript in English or French interpreted from the claimant's language. Even counsel would not be able to assist in that particular regard.

Those who do the translations swear to the truth of the accuracy of the transcripts. With respect, there is adequate protection provided under the terms of the act.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): The question is now on motion No. 33 in the name of the hon. member for Montmorency (Mr. Duclos). Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

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

Some hon. Members: Nay.

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

Some hon. Members: On division.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): I declare the motion lost.

Motion No. 33 (Mr. Duclos) negatived.

Mr. David MacDonald (Egmont) (for Mr. Fairweather) moved:

Motion No. 37.

That Bill C-24, An Act respecting immigration to Canada, be amended in Clause 51 by adding immediately after line 21 at page 35 the following new paragraph:

"(*e*) in any case where the person makes an application to the Federal Court of Canada pursuant to sections 18 or 28 of the Federal Court Act, to have the decision of the adjudicator or the Immigration Appeal Board reviewed, set aside, or otherwise considered, until the application has been heard and disposed of."

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): All those opposed to the motion will please say nay.

Some hon. Members: Nay.

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

Some hon. Members: On division.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): I declare the motion lost.

Motion No. 37 (Mr. Fairweather) negatived.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Louis Duclos (Montmorency) moved:

Motion No. 38.

That Bill C-24, An Act respecting immigration to Canada, be amended in Clause 55 by striking out lines 33 to 44 at page 36 and substituting the following therefor:

"(*a*) a member of the inadmissible class described in paragraph 19(1)(*c*) unless the offense in question is a political offense;

(*b*) a member of an inadmissible class described in paragraph 19(1)(*e*), (*f*) or (*g*);

(*c*) a person described in paragraph 27(1)(*c*) or 27(2)(*c*); or

(*d*) a person who has been convicted in Canada of an offense under any act of Parliament for which a term of imprisonment of five or more years has been imposed,

and the Minister is of the opinion that the person should not be allowed to remain in Canada."

Mr. Speaker, my participation in this debate will be about an amendment to clause 55 of Bill C-24. At the committee stage, I proposed an amendment to clause 55 of the bill which would have abolished outright the possibility of removal, that is sending a refugee back to his country. This amendment was of course in accordance with clause 33 of the Geneva Convention on refugees, where it is said, I quote:

However, a refugee will not be entitled to the benefits of the present clause, if there are any serious grounds for considering him as a threat to the security of his country of residence or if, having been sentenced for a particularly serious criminal offence, he is considered as a threat for the community of the said country.

Mr. Speaker, does that mean that Canada, as a signatory to the Geneva Convention, has the obligation of resorting to removal in some cases? No, for in to the same clause of the convention, we find the following. I quote:

No clause of this convention will affect other rights or benefits granted to refugees, irrespective of the convention.

As I said before the standing committee, I recognize that there can be some cases where we have to deal with distasteful characters, as the minister knows, but I submit that it is morally unjustifiable to send back to their country people who risk torture or death, whatever the seriousness of their offences, especially if these offences were polically motivated. In fact, we shall have very strange legislation on this subject. Since clause 56 allows the non-implementation of a removal order if the refugee has not been able to obtain the authorization to remain in any other country, removal will only take place in the case of the people on whom their country of origin wishes to avenge itself. For instance, since Vietnam does not especially want to settle its account against General Quang, he will be able to ask to stay in Canada under clause 56. On the other hand, a Chilean who will have been a member of a popular unit under the Allende regime could not make use of clause 56 since the Pinochet administration would be only too happy to let him come back to Chile to torture him and possibly have him executed.

Mr. Speaker, what is ridiculous is that, basically, a decision taken by a foreign government will determine if an individual will come under clause 56 or under clause 55. We could always punish in Canada the refugees who might constitute a real danger for our country—even though there are very few of them according to what we heard in the standing committee—but nothing justifies the removal to his country of origin of someone who risks being mistreated, and this is an understatement since such people can even risk death in the case of certain Latin American countries.

The amendment that I have submitted to the House in motion No. 38 constitutes in fact a compromise and aims first of all at excluding the possibility of removal in the case of a political offence, such as provided in clause 19(1)(*g*). The part of my amendment found in subclause (2) therefore only aims at making our new Immigration Act in accordance with the Geneva Convention. Section 1(*f*) of the Geneva Convention explicitly provides that the refugee who has committed a political offence is entitled to the protection of the Convention while the one who has committed a non-political offence cannot claim this protection.

Mr. Speaker, it would be quite unacceptable for Canada, which has set as one of the objectives of this new law respecting immigration—and I quote clause 3(*g*) of Bill C-24, "to fulfil Canada's international legal obligations with respect to refugees"—to allow itself to act against the principles enshrined in the Geneva Convention by not making, in clause 19(1)(*d*), a difference between political offences and those which are not. This is why, Mr. Speaker, the first part of my amendment, subclause (*a*), must be adopted by this House if Canada is to abide, as the Minister of Manpower and Immigration (Mr. Cullen) so often reminded us, by the requirements set in the Geneva Convention.

As for the second part of my amendment, to be found at subclause (*d*), it simply aims at being in agreement with an amendment presented by the minister himself when this bill was studied in committee. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, subclause (*c*) of clause 55 originally concerned those persons who had committed an offence for which a term of imprisonment of 10 years or more may be imposed. At the very request of the minister himself, the committee amended this subclause which

now concerns those persons who have been found guilty of such offences.

Since we will now be dealing with persons found guilty, it is obvious that these persons will also have been sentenced. And it is precisely that sentence, Mr. Speaker, which should be used as a criterion in deciding whether a refugee should be deported to his former country. For, Mr. Speaker, it is quite frequent in Canada that persons who have committed an offence for which a term of imprisonment of 10 years or more may be imposed are only given a suspended sentence or even a probation period of some months or some years by the presiding judge at their trial. The judge who passes that sentence must take into account the type of more or less aggravating or mitigating circumstances that surrounded the commission of that offence.

Mr. Speaker, would it not be repugnant for Canada to remove a refugee to a country where torture or death may await him—for it is indeed the subject of clause 55—simply because he would have committed an offence for which a term of imprisonment of 10 years or more may be imposed, while the judge, taking into account the circumstances of the case, would only in fact have sentenced him to a light prison term? Besides, Mr. Speaker, the deputy minister of manpower and immigration, Mr. Manion, stated before the committee on July 8 that he personally was in favour of such an amendment. And here I quote Mr. Manion, as reported on page 48:36 of issue No. 48 of the minutes of proceedings of the committee: If you really want to know whether we should consider an effective term of imprisonment or a possible sentence, I do not think the department would be opposed to it. Of course, this clause only provides for removal for very serious reasons, and I do not think we would object to amend subclause (c) to comply with this objective.

And when the committee discussed the term of imprisonment to be imposed as a criterion for the removal of refugees under clause 55, Mr. Manion stated, and I quote from page 48:40: In my opinion, the purpose of this provision is to ensure that removal can only follow a very serious crime and we would agree to provide for a term of imprisonment of five years in this clause. Finally, Mr. Speaker, I wish to remind hon. members that European countries signatories to the Geneva Convention usually apply the imposed rather than the possible sentence criterion.

To conclude, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, because its only purpose, on one hand, is to make clause 55 comply with the requirements of the Geneva Convention and, on the other hand, to take into account the effects of the amendment put forward by the minister himself in committee. The amendment I am putting forward should therefore get the support of the minister since his deputy has assured committee members that the department had no objection to it.

• (1540)

[*English*]

Hon. Bud Cullen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Epp: Don't respond.

Mr. Cullen: The hon. member says I should not respond, but if I do not respond here I will have to respond in some other place, and I do not mean the other place.

This motion of the hon. member substitutes a five-year actual sentence for a ten-year potential sentence as the standard for determining that a Convention refugee who has committed a serious criminal offence in Canada should lose protection against deportation to a country where his life or freedom could be threatened. I commend to hon. members a close look at Clause 55 on page 36 where we make what I think is a significant improvement and provide the kind of protection about which we are all concerned. I refer to the addition of the words:

. . . and the Minister is of the opinion that the person should not be allowed to remain in Canada.

This amendment would also exempt political offences from the class of very serious offences which render a convention refugee inadmissible to or removable from Canada, even to a country where he would be persecuted.

On the first point, if the ten-year potential standard is retained, a refugee could be removed even though he received a relatively light sentence.

If the five-year actual sentence standard were adopted, a refugee could be removed for an offence not considered serious enough in Canada to warrant a ten-year potential sentence.

Court sentencing practices vary, so it is difficult to determine which standard best represents the Convention standard of a "particularly serious crime". On balance, we believe that the ten-year potential standard now in Clause 55 more often represents a particularly serious crime.

On the second point, there is really no need to exempt political offences because a truly political offence in another country is unlikely to be construed as any offence at all under Canadian law, so that the refugee would be neither inadmissible nor removable under the bill.

If, however, a person had committed murder, arson, kidnapping or any other such offence which would bring him within the very serious inadmissible class in Clause 19(1)(c), I question whether Canadians would feel secure with the person in their midst, even if the crime had been committed for political purposes.

On balance, this motion is unnecessary, in my view, since it adds little or no protection for Convention refugees and could conceivably endanger Canadians.

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, I support the amendment moved by the hon. member for Montmorency (Mr. Duclos). I disagree with the minister that adding a

specific reference to a political offence really makes no difference. He says a political offence would not be a serious offence here. My understanding is that this provision for the political offence is taken out of the Geneva Convention, which explicitly excludes political offences.

● (1550)

I know that it is not an easy job sometimes to determine whether an offence is really political or whether it is just a violent criminal offence, but I think this is something that has to be done and I think our action follows the convention. If that is the type of person who is not supposed to be sent back to his country of origin under the Geneva Convention then I think the act we pass should accept that distinction.

There is a lot of difference in paragraph (c). The minister is quite right in saying that paragraph (c) was much improved by reference to having been convicted, but the distinction is that it says "of an offence . . . for which a term of imprisonment . . . may be imposed". On the other hand, the amendment of the hon. member for Montmorency refers to a person who has been convicted of an offence for which a term of imprisonment of five or more years has been imposed. It seems to me that that is much better wording. Sometimes people commit offences for which there are extremely severe penalties but under conditions which palliate or ameliorate the offence and the courts decide what is an appropriate sentence. Yet here we are asking parliament to say that so long as you can get more than ten years—you may have only got a six months sentence imposed—you are not excluded from the class of refugees who can be deported. It seems to me that the amendment is a great improvement and, in my view, should be adopted.

I have never thought that these provisions were supposed to deal with political offences, yet we go on gaily, unwilling to accept a clear statement that a political offence is not the sort of offence for which a convention refugee can be deported. Then in the clause which deals with a sentence, we deal with a potential sentence and not with realities as dealt with by the courts. This is all part of a pattern. We push the courts out. We say we know better than the courts about what is a suitable sentence, but I do not believe we do. I think the amendment recognizes that fact.

[*Translation*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Order, please. Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. Members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

[Mr. Cullen.]

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

Some hon. Members: Nay.

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

Some hon. Members: On division.

Motion No. 38 (Mr. Duclos) negatived on division.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): The House will now proceed to motion No. 39.

[*English*]

We will now proceed to motion No. 39 in the name of the hon. member for Egmont (Mr. MacDonald).

Mr. David MacDonald (Egmont): Mr. Speaker, with respect to motion No. 39, this really should have been raised yesterday when Your Honour made a ruling with respect to the acceptability of motions. Motion No. 39 is consequential on a number of amendments I had on the order paper with respect to the refugee category, and since they were not acceptable to the Chair, this also will have no meaning and should be dropped. I would ask that the motion be dropped.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): The proper manner in which the hon. member can withdraw his motion is to ask for the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent to dropping motion No. 39?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion No. 39 withdrawn.

Mr. Walter Baker (Grenville-Carleton) moved:

Motion No. 41.

That Bill C-24, An Act respecting immigration to Canada, be amended in Clause 64 by striking out lines 27 to 34 at page 39 and substituting the following therefor:

"64. (1) The head office of the Board shall be in Ottawa and the Chairman and such other members as may be designated by the Governor in Council shall live in Ottawa or within reasonable commuting distance thereof."

He said: Mr. Speaker, just to set this motion in proper perspective I would like to indicate that it deals with Section 64 of the Immigration Act, and particularly Section 64(1) as it presently reads that the head office of the Immigration Appeal Board shall be in the national capital region as described in the schedule to the National Capital Act, and the chairman and such other members as may be designated by the governor in council shall live in that region or within a reasonable commuting distance thereof. The purpose of the amendment I am proposing, seconded by my friend, the hon. member for Edmonton Centre (Mr. Paproski), is to provide that the head office of the board shall not be in the national capital region as set forth in the statute but shall be in the city of Ottawa, and the chairman and such other members as may be designated by the governor in council shall live in Ottawa or within a reasonable distance thereof.

When I look across the floor of the House I am glad to see my friend, the hon. member for Hull (Mr. Isabelle), because I want to speak about a matter which is of particular importance to the areas which both of us represent, as does the hon. member for Ottawa West (Mr. Francis), who is also here, the hon. member for Ottawa Centre (Mr. Poulin), and the hon. member for Ottawa-Vanier (Mr. Gauthier). It has become a matter of considerable local concern and, I suggest to you, that the concern perhaps goes beyond the local area. There are very few opportunities in the House, short of the question period or perhaps an adjournment debate arising out of the question period, to discuss in this forum matters of this kind which are of some significance to the area.

It is for that purpose that I moved this amendment so that I might deal for a few moments with some of the problems that have been caused to Ottawa on the Ontario side of the river, and some of the allegations with respect to problems that might well be caused on the other side of the Ottawa river in Hull as a result of the construction and the attempt to fill buildings across the river which I have described on one occasion in the House as "Fullerton's fortress".

An annoucement was made a few days ago by the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Buchanan) that over the course of the next few years some 15,000 public servants would be moved across the river for the purpose of working in those buildings. We would be burying the matter under the rug if we did not say that this has caused tremendous concern in the national capital area, particularly in the city of Ottawa, but beyond that, in the residential areas which basically serve the national capital area on the Ontario side of the river. I am now referring to Gloucester, Nepean, Rideau, Goulbourn and Osgoode in which live the public servants who commute to work.

This has been of concern to the local business people in the city of Ottawa because the effect of it, which has not been denied categorically, is that some four million square feet of office space in Ottawa will be made vacant, and the attempts by the federal government to ameliorate the situation by taking down temporary buildings will in no way alleviate the problem. For the restaurateur, the shopkeeper and the small businessman, the backbone of Ottawa, in the area on the Ontario side of the river, the move will create difficulties. Its effects will ripple out to other municipalities in the way ripples spread out in a pond when you drop a pebble in it. Almost all local municipalities on the Ontario side of the river will be affected.

• (1600)

I am concerned about the timing of the move, about its magnitude, and about the lack of consultation with local authorities, local business interests, public servants, including Public Service employee organizations like the PSAC, in all its aspects, and the Professional Institute of Public Servants, in all its aspects. I complain of lack of consultation concerning traffic, transportation and related matters. Surely no member of this House will say it is a sin to place federal institutions in Hull but the government persists in its intention to move, desite warnings about the drastic effects of the move on employees and on the commercial interests I have mentioned. The government's conduct is deplorable. It should not happen this way anywhere in this country, particularly not in the national capital area.

The amendment before us seeks to retain the head office of the Immigration Appeal Board in Ottawa. I point out that the minister has announced the department is to move to Hull by 1980. If the amendment is accepted, it will not move. Critics may argue, "But we are talking about the entire national capital region." Of course we are. The head offices of various boards and organizations have been moved from one place to another in the national capital region. The right hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker) had this in mind when the government he led proposed the National Capital Act. But the right hon. member did not intend, as I am sure the hon. member for Ottawa West will agree, that the movement or relocation of offices would be such as to affect the city of Ottawa and the people who live and work in it and the surrounding area in the way the Minister of Public Works admitted would be the case when he made his statement.

People criticize my position and say, "You must have seen those buildings being erected on the other side of the river." Of course I did. Their erection was part of the great plan of 1969, when, so far as I can determine, not a dissenting voice was raised to criticize the government for its proposal. If anyone can show I am wrong, I will withdraw my remarks. Why do I make this point? Members of the government party overwhelmingly represented constituencies in the national capital region. Therefore there were no dissenting voices to criticize the government. If you will recall, Sir, the former minister of finance, Hon. John Turner, represented Ottawa-Carleton. The hon. lady, a member of the Progressive Conservative party, secured that seat in the recent byelection. If my memory is right, the member for Ottawa-Centre was Hon. George McIlraith, now Senator McIlraith. He occupies a place of distinction in the Chamber in which the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) seeks a place.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Order!

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): The constituency I now have the honour to represent was represented by Gordon Blair, now Mr. Justice Blair of the Ontario Court of Appeal. That member went to his just reward and, if I may say so, is serving that court with great distinction.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Is the hon. member preaching for a call?

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): I choose to ignore that remark, Mr. Speaker.

Going further afield in the national capital area, the constituency of Lanark-Renfrew-Carleton was represented by Murray McBride, who has gone to his just reward as vice-president, I think, in charge of one of the boards or agencies of government—the Farm Credit Corporation. It can be seen

that the political representation of constituencies in the national capital area was such that no voice was raised in protest against the government's proposal for relocation. Plans for relocation to Hull could have been proceeded with in a way consistent with Hull's development. Unfortunately, certain events intervened which anyone with half an eye could have foreseen, namely, some restraint was imposed on the growth of the Public Service. We had the grand scheme to develop Fullerton's fortress on the other side of the river. Unfortunately, or fortunately, the government suddenly instituted restraints of growth in the Public Service; but, at the same time, the erection of the buildings on the other side of the river proceeded apace.

Having made a glaring error in its commitment of 1969, what did the government do? It chose not to leave the buildings empty. Therefore the only alternative was to fill those buildings, in anyway it could.

I am appalled at the government's failure to co-ordinate its various policies and programs, and disturbed by the effects on morale in the Public Service. Mr. Speaker, all this should not have happened.

Mr. Paproski: It's incredible.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): If I may say so, you cannot move some branches of the Canadian Penitentiary Service, some parts of the Secretary of State's department, some parts of the National Parole Board and the Canadian Commercial Corporation without amending the law. It is important for us to know, when we deal with these matters, how and when the government proposes to change the law. The proposal to move the head office of the Immigration Appeal Board to the other side of the river is an attempt to put flesh on the policy the government has put forward. Mr. Speaker, we are discussing an extremely important matter.

The removal of these boards, or the relocation of the Immigration Appeal Board which is likely to move when the Department of Immigration moves, could create a host of administrative problems. As I have already said, there has not been sufficient consultation. Certain difficulties have already arisen about whether to allow public servants to observe as holidays, St. Jean Baptiste Day on June 21, or July 1. There was great difficulty.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): St. Jean Baptiste Day is on June 24.

● (1610)

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): There was some grave difficulty. The Public Service, and I am sure they were joined by employees of the Immigration Appeal Board who are affected by Section 64, wrote to the President of the Treasury Board (Mr. Andras) on July 5, 1977, making some reasonable suggestions. Those suggestions have been ignored. The developers of Ottawa, who face a real problem because they were enticed on the basis of government statements, have asked for some consideration from the ministry. No consideration is forthcoming.

Given the limited opportunities that there are to discuss these matters on the floor of the House of Commons; and given the fact that this whole movement seems to have been carried out a bit by the back door, and certain agencies cannot move out of the city of Ottawa in any event unless there is an amendment in the statutes, the government had better be put on notice that before many agencies move across the river it will have to come to this parliament for its consent. I have named some, and some of those are slated for a move.

There is no one in this House of Commons who is reasonable, and I hope that I am reasonable, who stands against development in the city of Hull. However, I hope that all members of this House will stand against the implementation and execution of a policy which is compounding one error of magnitude and lack of timing with another. I refer to the error of failure to consult and to take into account the difficulties that public servants, merchants, developers, land owners, business people and indeed the whole of the national capital region on the Ontario side of the river will face as a result of 15,000 public servants moving out. I assume it is only 15,000. The government has very seldom been right in its figures. I remember at one time getting a figure from the President of the Treasury Board that there would only be 25,000 positions designated bilingual, and today there are 63,000.

We have a problem in terms of honesty and directness. That problem is nowhere more evident than in this whole dreadfully mishandled matter of the relocation of public servants and the development of those buildings in the city of Hull on the other side of the national capital region.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gaston Isabelle (Hull): Mr. Speaker, I had no intention of speaking in this debate on Bill C-24, but in the face of the amendment to clause 64 moved by the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton (Mr. Baker), and especially after the statement he just made in this House, I feel I must express my views.

First, and without dwelling on the history of the area and more importantly on that of our national capital, I must say to the hon. member who felt he was not showing bad judgment but he should be told if he did, that the national capital is directly related to the choice made by Queen Victoria. When Queen Victoria chose Ottawa as the capital of Canada, certainly the present limits did not exist. It is also the right hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker) who decided to describe by statute the national capital area, and that area included both the Quebec and the Ontario parts in one entity called the national capital.

It is rather important to state that at a time when Canada is going through a crisis that can be termed a "national unity crisis", I feel that hon. members representing the constituencies involved should understand that national unity must start right here in the national capital region. It must be the laboratory, it must project the image the national capital

should have. A country's capital is the focus of its national spirit. If we are to start politicking with statements that one part of the national capital should not live as the other, there is no point in having a national capital area, and there is no point in having a national capital at all. Because Ottawa, whether we like it or not, will always be an Ontario town and does not reflect in any way the kind of Canadianism and federalism we would like to live and future generations will want to recognize.

The hon. member for Grenville-Carleton uses far-fetched arguments about numerous things, among others the Public Service Alliance. I understand he also said after the announcement that thousands of civil servants would be transferred to Hull that the Public Service Alliance was irresponsible, it should rather deal with the blatantly unfair situations of individual public servants rather than "embalming" itself in discussions about snow removal procedures on the Portage bridge or the Interprovincial bridge for the Ottawa civil servants who will soon be commuting to Hull. I find it appalling that such things should be said in this House where we should speak as one man on the question of national unity. It certainly is not with a speech such as the one we just heard and by putting down the city of Hull as the Public Service Alliance did, that we will promote national unity. In fact, little things such as those are the reason why we lose more ground than we gain in the matter of national unity.

I am against the amendment, and I trust that some day hon. members as a group will show enough sense to see to it that section 16 of the Constitution is amended so that the capital of Canada will no longer be Ottawa but the whole national capital area instead.

[*English*]

Mr. Lloyd Francis (Ottawa West): Mr. Speaker, I listened with a good deal of interest to the remarks of my friend, the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton (Mr. Baker). He seemed to argue the amendment with something less than a full heart. The amendment he is putting will introduce for the first time the principle of a statutory discrimination within the national capital region between the Ontario and the Quebec side. As far as I know, this is a principle which has not been considered since the days of the government of the right hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker) when he passed the National Capital Region Act.

The hon. member for Grenville-Carleton noted that the national capital region was created by a Conservative government in 1957. However, he did not call the attention of this House to the federal-provincial conference of 1969 in which all the premiers of all the provinces of Canada stated in a communiqué which was issued to the press that the capital of Canada would in effect be the national capital region. Premier Robarts of Ontario was most specific in that regard at that time.

We cannot be on both sides of this issue. I am going to vote against this motion should it come to a vote. However, I welcome the opportunity of making some observations.

• (1620)

The hon. member for Grenville-Carleton very carefully went through the political representation at the time and implied that some people had gone to what he called their just rewards. He kindly did not refer to me in any respect so I presume I have not had any just reward in his book.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Be patient.

Mr. Francis: Well, I have been patient, Mr. Speaker. That is one thing that I think those who have followed my career in politics would have to give me credit for.

I think we all have to recognize the very sensitive situation at the present time. My colleague, the hon. member for Hull (Mr. Isabelle) did not mention matters which are very obvious in the press. There has recently been taken into the cabinet for the Parti Québécois the representative of the city of Hull in the national assembly. What Jocelyne Ouellette has had to say about the National Capital Commission and the federal presence and all the rest of it is an appalling record. She simply says that the entire federal presence has to be chased lock, stock, and barrel out of the national capital region. The fact that her own home was expropriated to make way for the bridge may or may not have anything to do with her feelings, but one cannot but help suspect a personal vindictive note in her approach.

The move to Hull is an assertion of the federal presence on the other side of the river in an unmistakable way, and I give the hon. member for Hull and the minister responsible for the National Capital Commission, the Minister of State for Urban Affairs (Mr. Ouellet), full credit for standing up to the Parti Quebecois and saying "This is a federal state. We have certain federal rights; we will assert those federal rights; we will not be intimidated in the assertion of those federal rights and this is part of our policy of national unity." That is something I would entirely support, Mr. Speaker, without reservation.

But I would be less than honest if I said we had a very good record in managing these affairs. The federal government's record of management of three things; the relocation to Hull, the decentralization policy outside the national capital region of the Public Service, and the restraints on hiring in the Public Service were very badly co-ordinated, and that is no reflection on the present Minister of Public Works (Mr. Buchanan). He has inherited the situation and he is doing his best to correct these things, but the decisions which were taken were not carefully planned. They have had an impact on the city of Ottawa which is the most negative of all the communities in this area. Six million square feet of office space were vacated in Ottawa, or are about to be, over a period, two million of which can be demolished in temporary buildings, and four million square feet of privately-owned accommodation is coming on to the rental market. This represents a depression in this area plus a loss in federal grants in lieu of tax of something like $150 per household per year in the city of Ottawa.

But what is hardest for me as a local member to accept is the failure of the National Capital Commission to do its job. This was the instrument, a Crown corporation, independent, not reporting to a minister, directly reporting to parliament, all those great so-called virtues, able to offer free, independent advice, and it had the benefit of certain streams of information. In its Annual Report of 1975 the National Capital Commission talked about moving 25,000 jobs out of the national capital region into others parts of Canada. That was the one quarter of the total employment within the region it was going to move out. And it knew what the relocation from Ottawa to Hull involved, the 15,000 jobs.

If any body has access to the plans of the government with respect to its projection of growth in the public service, surely the National Capital Commission had its sources of intelligence. And in the face of these three streams of information the relocation to Hull, the decentralization outside the national capital region, the freeze on hiring policy, it still proceeded with the most outlandish schemes for satellite devolvement, a satellite community of 100,000 people in the Carlsbad area in Ontario and 100,000 people in the Aylmer area in the province of Quebec, linked by a transportation corridor. It was sheer folly, daydreaming and madness, in light of the total situation.

Within the National Capital Commission the right hand did not know what the left hand was doing. This Crown agency was grossly negligent in its advice to the Government of Canada regarding the planning and development of the national capital. Members of the agency do not have to get elected. And they really do not care whether the local members are elected or re-elected, and they say as much to us. It is very difficult, as a local member, to find my letters unanswered, to find that when I approach them there is this haughty disdain which suggests that I am somehow of a lesser breed of humanity. I am treated with contempt when I try to get elementary advice. I think I am entitled to receive information and courtesy.

The facts are that a good part of the bungling and the planning of these moves to which the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton has referred is the responsibility of that agency, those who are supposed to be the eyes, the ears and the brains, giving independent advice to the Government of Canada.

[*Translation*]

To my mind, Mr. Speaker, it is a pity that the National Capital Commission has been remiss in its duties. What the Commission did, as far as I am concerned, has nothing to do with its responsibilities in that regard.

[*English*]

I just think that this motion cannot be supported by hon. members in this House, and I hope that it does not even come to a vote because it is so contrary to the thrust and spirit of our times and the policy of national unity we are trying to develop. But if the intent of the hon. member was to provoke a debate on a matter which is of very real concern, one which has been a sore point with many of us, to focus attention on the lack of consistent policy in this area, for which the national capital has suffered and will continue to suffer in the period ahead, then I think to a certain extent it certainly served its purpose.

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

Some hon. Members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion? All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

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

Some hon. Members: Nay.

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

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): On division.

Motion No. 41 (Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton)) negatived.

Mr. David MacDonald (Egmont) moved:

Motion No. 42.

That Bill C-24, An Act respecting immigration to Canada, be amended in Clause 70 by striking out line 25 at page 41 and substituting the following therefor:

"refugee may, within such reasonable period of time as is"

Mr. Jake Epp (Provencher) moved:

Motion No. 44.

That Bill C-24, An Act respecting immigration to Canada, be amended in Clause 71 by striking out lines 7 to 11 at page 42 and substituting the following therefor:

"unless there are reasonable grounds to believe that the claim is fraudulent, frivolous, or unfounded, it shall allow the application to proceed, and in any"

Mr. Epp: Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to speak at length on motion No. 44 but it is my intention to set out briefly the arguments which were made during the committee stage. Much of the debate in this area, both here and in the committee, has been concerned with the manner in which a claim to refugee status is to be judged. Amendments have been put forward by hon. members on both sides of the House in a serious attempt to establish a procedure for judging such claims.

I have not felt able to support all the amendments; I believe the bill gives adequate protection as it stands to persons claiming to be refugees. Nevertheless, there is one area in which the processes suggested in the bill appear to be deficient. I refer to the provision for an oral hearing. This is the subject of motion No. 44—we are considering the general topic of redetermination and appeal procedure specifically for those claiming refugee status before the Immigration Appeal Board. What will happen, as I understand the legislation if it remains unamended, is that when a person comes to Canada or makes application for refugee status the evidence is taken down under

oath. The minister and I both have difficulty in that after the evidence is taken down under oath an appeal could result in the changing of that information.

• (1630)

My point is this. Throughout the discussions which took place—

Mr. Cullen: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to interrupt the hon. member but I believe he is talking to motion No. 44. As I read motion No. 44, it says "unless there are reasonable grounds to believe that the claim is fraudulent, frivolous, or unfounded". Is the hon. member addressing himself to that or to the fact of a public hearing?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Order. The hon. member can address himself to either motion No. 42 or No. 44; they are grouped for debate.

Mr. Epp: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I will be getting to the minister's intervention in a moment. According to the bill, a refugee will not have an oral hearing. It is true that under Clause 70 an applicant's declaration will be taken under oath, but an immigrant may come here and in the initial stages fail to give all the evidence, not because of any fraudulent intent but simply because, due to the new situation in which he finds himself, information which would assist in establishing whether his claim should go forward as a refugee cannot be properly adjudged. For that reason I strongly feel there should be some mechanism whereby an applicant is entitled to an oral hearing.

When we were debating this in committee there was much discussion about what could result at an oral hearing. We wondered whether a claim would be made which was fraudulent, frivolous or unfounded simply to buy time. The appeal process could be the means to buy time to remain in Canada for a longer period. I believe this amendment goes a long way to prevent claims going forward for people buying time, so to speak. After the initial evidence is in, a claim could be judged very quickly as to its validity. For this reason I bring forward the amendment, with a view to providing for an oral hearing based on strong evidence respecting the validity of any claim for refugee status.

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, I should like to support this amendment. When the amendment was brought forward we frequently heard it said that the board would be flooded with these fraudulent, frivolous of unfounded claims. It is strange that people on the outside say that, but those on the Immigration Appeal Board with many years of experience do not say it at all. It is perfectly true that some years ago there was a terrible backlog of cases, but that was under quite different circumstances from those pertaining now. At that time visitors were allowed to apply from within Canada. The board was new at the job and did not have as many members as it has now. When the chairman of the board comes to our committee and says that yes, they can handle the situation, then I suggest that depriving a person of the right is unwarranted.

Personally I think the board can be trusted to determine very quickly and without undue delay wether a claim is fraudulent, frivolous or unfounded. I think the amendment moved by the hon. member for Provencher (M. Epp) is sound. The reasons I have heard so far against it, unless the minister has different or better ones today, are in themselves unfounded. I would not say they were fraudulent. I would not even say they were frivolous. But in my view they are unfounded.

Mr. David MacDonald (Egmont): Mr. Speaker, may I speak briefly to both motion 42 and 44. May I first refer to my own motion, No. 42. Clause 70 provides:

A person who claims to be a Convention Refugee and has been informed in writing by the Minister pursuant to subsection 45(5) that he is not a Convention refugee may, within such period of time as is prescribed, make an application—

The amendment uses the words "within such reasonable period of time". I realize there may be a fine point of distinction here, but we are faced with the situation, as we were in a number of instances in committee, of wrestling with what kind of clear intent is put into the law which will carry over in effective procedures dealing with people in various circumstances.

The difficulty with this clause as it presently stands is that it says "within such period of time as is prescribed". We could find ourselves in a situation for a variety of reasons which could make it difficult to provide sufficient time for a person to make an application for review. In the proposed amendment there is put into law the very clear intent that there be a reasonable time so as to make it difficult, if not impossible, for such an application to be pursued.

With regard to the second motion, No. 44, I am delighted not only that my colleague from Provencher has brought it forward but that the hon. member for Greenwood (Mr. Brewin) has risen in support of it. It seems to me to strike at the heart of the whole process of dealing with those who apply for refugee status.

As the bill presently stands, Clause 71 says "is of the opinion that there are reasonable grounds to believe that a claim could, upon the hearing of the application, be established, it shall allow the application to proceed". That puts the burden, if you like, on the individual to prove that there will be a successful outcome. As members on all sides have learned with respect to a number of refugee applications, often the initial decision made on that basis is not the fairest, most just, or the one which relates to the actual facts of the situation. By using the words "fraudulent, frivolous, or unfounded" we are using the words which were discussed in the committee. If I recall correctly, the word "unfounded" was suggested either by the minister or his officials as a word that would protect against the kind of burdening I have described or against making it functionally impossible for the board to do its job effectively and fairly.

I think that those who have taken the time and the trouble to study the procedures by which people have their refugee applications considered believe that this is not an unwarranted situation. I believe it is a reasonable approach, one that is fair

and just. It seems to me that in the proposition put forward in motion No. 44 we are making sure that, in those cases where it is often difficult to arrive at a decision at the outset, the benefit of the doubt, if you like, will be on the side of the applicant. I think for an immigration program, and one specifically directed to those who apply for refugee status, we really can do no less. I hope the minister will give this very serious consideration.

● (1640)

Hon. Bud Cullen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, after 70 hours of committee hearings, I heard all the representations made from both sides of this House.

Motion No. 42 appears to be reasonable on the surface, but I consider it unnecessary, since it is a basic tenet of legal interpretation that anything done under a statute must be reasonable, and this would certainly include the making of regulations. More important, however, it could lead to a great deal of frivolous and fruitless litigation as individuals contend that in their particular circumstances the period prescribed was not reasonable. Thus another avenue of delay would be opened up as a result of that.

Dealing with motion No. 44, the hon. member for Egmont (Mr. MacDonald), speaking on behalf of the hon. member for Provencher (Mr. Epp), conceded that the onus of proof would be reversed. Instead of an applicant endeavouring to demonstrate the validity of his case in order to secure a hearing before the board, if we accept the amendment as drafted, the board would have to grant the hearing unless it could demonstrate that the claim was fraudulent, frivolous or unfounded. This would be next to impossible, since the board would have nothing before it except the claimant's own submission. The intended effect of the screening stage would be largely negated, with all too predictable results.

Although I have listened very carefully to the comments of hon. members and have read very carefully the amendments, I am in no position to accept them.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): The question is now on motion No. 42 in the name of the hon. member for Egmont (Mr. MacDonald). Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): All those opposed to the motion will please say nay.

Some hon. Members: Nay.

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

Some hon. Members: On division.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): I declare the motion lost.

Motion No. 42 (Mr. MacDonald (Egmont)) negatived.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): The question is now on motion No. 44 in the name of the hon. member for Provencher (Mr. Epp). Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): All those opposed to the motion will please say nay.

Some hon. Members: Nay.

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

Some hon. Members: On division.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): I declare the motion lost.

Motion No. 44 (Mr. Epp) negatived.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. It is with pleasure I point out to the House that not only have we done very well today but we are so far ahead of schedule we may have difficulties on Monday.

The mover of the next motion, the hon. member for Matane (Mr. De Bané), is not present in the House. In any event, if we were to call it a day at this time, that would leave us with only ten motions for Monday. Therefore I wonder if it would meet the wishes of the House to call it five o'clock.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) is seeking the unanimous consent of the House to call it five o'clock. Is it agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Therefore, it being five o'clock, this House stands adjourned until Monday at two o'clock p.m.

At 4.46 p.m. the House adjourned, without question put, pursuant to Standing Order.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Monday, July 25, 1977

The House met at 2 p.m.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

NATIONAL HARBOURS BOARD

SUGGESTED PROCEDURE FOR FILLING VACANCIES—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. J. M. Forrestall (Dartmouth-Halifax East): Mr. Speaker, I rise pursuant to Standing Order 43 on a matter of urgent necessity. In light of the growing concern among employees of the National Harbours Board of Canada, and Ports Canada, with respect to their future job security, and in light of widespread indications that some present employees of the National Harbours Board are not being invited to compete for job opportunities under the ports policy proposals, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Carleton-Charlotte (Mr. McCain):

That the government cease forthwith its present practice of filling vacancies under proposed legislation; namely, C-61, which at this point in time does not have approval in principle by parliament and instead these same employees be given firm assurances by the government that if and when a new ports policy is approved by parliament they will be given full and first opportunity to apply for the positions to be created by the new legislation.

Mr. Speaker: Under the terms of Standing Order 43 unanimous consent of the House is required before a motion can be put. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: No!

* * *

LABOUR CONDITIONS

PROHIBITION AGAINST POSSESSION OF FIREARMS BY SECURITY GUARDS DURING LABOUR DISPUTES—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby): Mr. Speaker, I, too, rise on a matter of urgent and pressing necessity concerning the deplorable use of violence by security guards at Robin Hood Mills in Montreal on Friday. Considering that the possession of firearms by security guards at the time of an industrial dispute can lead to the destruction of human life, or even to the serious injury of working people, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles):

That this House instruct the Minister of Labour to immediately contact the president of Robin Hood Multifoods Limited to make it clear that such practices must be discontinued immediately; and, further, to take immediate steps to ensure that this policy of the non-presence of firearms be established across the country in all areas of federal jurisdiction.

Mr. Speaker: Hon. members have heard the motion. Is there unanimous consent pursuant to Standing Order 43?

Some hon. Members: No!

* * *

[*Translation*]

CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

REQUEST THAT LIST OF ALLEGEDLY BIASED REPORTERS BE SENT TO COMMITTEE—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. René Matte (Champlain): Mr. Speaker, under the provisions of Standing Order 43, I ask for the unanimous consent of the House to move a motion of pressing necessity.

Since the CRTC report did not substantiate allegations to the effect that CBC employees were altering information to promote the constitutional option of sovereignty and association; since the Prime Minister and some of his cabinet colleagues had lodged rather specific charges because they even had in their possession, so they said, a list of the names of those reporters working to destroy the country; and since the Prime Minister maintains that the report confirms his comments, thus leaving some suspicions about the integrity of those employees, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Cape Breton-East Richmond (Mr. Hogan):

That the Prime Minister make official apologies or table a list of suspected individuals before the standing committee on broadcasting so that the said committee be in a position to investigate and judge those allegations.

Mr. Speaker: Order. Under the provisions of Standing Order 43, such a motion requires the unanimous consent of the House. Is there such consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

* * *

● (1410)

[*English*]

THE SENATE

SUGGESTION SENATORS BE RELIEVED OF POSITIONS AND NO REPLACEMENTS APPOINTED—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, under the provisions of Standing Order 43, I ask leave to

move, seconded by the hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby (Mr. Broadbent):

That this House, noting that certain Senators feel that they cannot live on the $31,100 a year they now receive, recommends that they be relieved of their positions so that they can spend their full time dealing in stock options, sitting on boards of directors and in other pursuits that will enable them to make the kind of money they feel they must have, and that no one be appointed to fill the vacancies created by their removal from the other place, thus hastening the day when the Senate will be extinct.

Mr. Speaker: I have some very severe reservations about the urgent and pressing necessity of that motion.

* * *

HOUSE OF COMMONS

PRESENCE IN GALLERY OF PRESIDENT OF NATIONAL ASSEMBLY OF CAMEROON

Mr. Speaker: I know all hon. members would want to join with me in calling attention to the presence in our gallery of a very distinguished visitor in the person of the Honourable Tandeng Muna, President of the National Assembly of Cameroon.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[*English*]

CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

PROPOSAL TO ESTABLISH PRESS COUNCIL TO IMPROVE ACCOUNTABILITY AND AUTOMATIC REFERRAL TO COMMITTEE OF ANNUAL REPORT

Mr. R. Gordon L. Fairweather (Fundy-Royal): Mr. Speaker, I thought that the House and perhaps even the country would be edified if we had another go at the pejorative CRTC report. I should like to ask the Prime Minister whether he would respond to the suggestion of the president of the CBC that, as a way of improving the CBC's accountability, and presumably that of the, as they say, electronic media, a press council be set up. Would the Prime Minister respond to this suggestion of the president of the CBC?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): I will certainly study it, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Fairweather: That is good news. I have a second suggestion which I hope will be studied, too. I am being assisted by certain others who are would be speakers, Mr. Speaker. As a suggestion, would the government led by the Prime Minister consider the automatic referral of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation annual report to the standing committee on broadcasting so that its tattered accountability might be remedied?

[Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre).]

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, I believe I have dealt with this question before, simply by responding that automatic referrals would put a burden on the committees and that perhaps members of parliament themselves would find it took time from them to which they might spend going into other matters, such as departmental estimates, in detail. The House leader on this side in specific cases, perhaps like that of the CBC, would be prepared to discuss with the opposition House leaders the conduct of business in committees, which would permit this committee to start such a report; but the hon. member for Fundy-Royal knows that in the past two or three weeks we have had many suggestions for referral of all kinds of annual reports, and my answer was that obviously we cannot refer them all, otherwise the committees will not have time to do their other business.

Mr. Fairweather: A final supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. How does the Prime Minister expect that the reorganization of the CBC, as suggested by the president of the CRTC, will affect those verging on subversion in the other electronic media who are also indicted by Mr. Boyle's report?

Mr. Trudeau: I do not know, Mr. Speaker. Perhaps that is what Mr. Johnston and the hon. member have in mind when they talk of a press council. Certainly it is a good course to be taken if the media, electronic or otherwise, could have some form of self-discipline. That is always the preferred course, failing which, of course, discipline has to be imposed upon them, which nobody likes.

* * *

INFORMATION

PROPOSAL TO ESTABLISH NEW INFORMATION SERVICE—REQUEST FOR NAMES OF PERSONNEL AND COST

Mr. Allan Lawrence (Northumberland-Durham): Mr. Speaker, my supplementary is directed to the Prime Minister as well. In another classic case of the government wanting to shoot the messenger, the Prime Minister's Secretary of State on Saturday is reported to have reacted to instructions from the right hon. gentleman in regard to setting up a task force so that there may be a new study done on setting up a new mini Information Canada. He is reported as saying that the reason for setting one up would be that the only news about the government these days is bad news.

I wonder if the Prime Minister would mind telling the House what has changed in the last year to permit the reviving of a new form of Information Canada only one year after it was killed off. The reason it was terminated at that time was to save taxpayers $7 million a year. What has happened in the last year to change the Prime Minister's mind?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, this is not so much a question of shooting the messenger as making sure there are enough messengers around so that all messages can be conveyed by the Canadian government.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Hnatyshyn: Who is your joke writer, Pierre?

Mr. Trudeau: The Secretary of State has been setting up a group, within his jurisdiction and within his authority, of ten people borrowed from other departments whose sole purpose would be to distribute material on the subject of Canadian unity. It has nothing to do with the much broader functions of the previous Information Canada.

In answer to the precise question as to what has happened in the past year, there was an election in the province of Quebec of a government dedicated to the separation of that province from the country. There have been approximately 10 or 15 offices set up by that government across the province to convey information favourable to separatism. The hon. member should join me in approving the setting up, at the federal government level, of an information centre which would counteract that subversive propaganda.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lawrence: Mr. Speaker, I am glad the Prime Minister has now taken us into his confidence. He has now let us know one of the purposes, and perhaps the only purpose, of this task force. If he expects to get our endorsation, our support and our co-operation, surely he would not mind telling the House or tabling some time soon the terms of reference so that we may be assured that they do not exceed what the Prime Minister has just told us. We should like to know who are on it, what it is going to cost and what the eventual object, procedure and form of this new propaganda machine may be.

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, the general concern of the hon. member is legitimate. It seems to me we already anticipated it by ensuring that the so-called Tellier group in the Privy Council office would consult with the various opposition parties as to the work they were doing. I should be very surprised if Mr. Tellier has not already indicated to the Leader of the Opposition the intention of having him work with Mr. Tellier and the intention of setting up a group which would be concerned with making available to Canadians information and facts favourable to Canada rather than to separatism.

Mr. Lawrence: Mr. Speaker, apart from any general consultations that the members of the opposition may have had with the Letellier group, I return to my question once again. Would the Prime Minister mind taking us into his confidence and telling us exactly who is on the task force? We should also like to know what their terms of reference are or might be, if those terms of reference have been laid down.

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, I just answered that this particular group is under the authority of the Secretary of State for reasons of financial administration, but it is to work with the Tellier group. The Tellier group has already met with the opposition parties. If they forgot to ask them the right questions, perhaps they can think of them the next time.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Alexander: We are asking you.

* * *

● (1420)

BILINGUALISM

PROPOSAL FOR COST-SHARING MINORITY LANGUAGE PROGRAMS—SUGGESTED DISCUSSION BY PROVINCES

Mr. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister. The Prime Minister said in the House on Friday that minority language rights of the country are not matters for bargaining. I agree with the Prime Minister, as I am sure most thinking Canadians do.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Broadbent: The serious question is this: How can we achieve the most speedy implementation of this ideal? For this reason I ask the Prime Minister if he or the Secretary of State requested the provinces to discuss at their meeting next month proposals the Secretary of State put forward in this House on June 21 which include proposals for federal cost-sharing in the implementation of minority language programs?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, as the leader of the New Democratic Party knows the federal government has no *locus standi* to suggest items for the agenda of the meeting of provincial premiers. But I could say that I discussed informally these matters with some of the premiers at a meeting I had with Liberal leaders of the ten provinces which was held in this capital one week ago. I hope the premiers will do some of the things the hon. member is suggesting but of course I cannot ask the chairman of that conference to inscribe anything in particular on the agenda. I believe the leader of the New Democratic Party has some connection with some premiers. Perhaps he would put a suggestion to them.

Mr. Broadbent: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Strange as it may seem, I understand the Prime Minister as well has some connection with some premiers. I ask him my question in a most serious and non-partisan way. Given the importance of minority language rights, an importance which the Prime Minister correctly told the House transcends provincial jurisdictional authority since it has national implications at this point in our history, and considering that almost all the provinces agreed in Victoria in 1971 that something should be done about this important matter, would the Prime Minister now follow the course his own logic dictates, get in touch with Premier Hatfield and request that at the meeting which is to take place in one month the provincial premiers put on the agenda of the meeting proposals the federal government made in the House of Commons last month.

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, I am not sure if the hon. member grasped my previous answer. He made some quip

about my having some contact with provincial premiers. That was my answer—that at a meeting I had last Monday, which included some provincial premiers, I suggested such a course to them. I suggested it publicly and expressed the hope they would do that. I cannot do more than that to make sure they put a specific item on their agenda. Let us put it that I have suggested this informally and in other ways.

Mr. Broadbent: To Premier Hatfield?

Mr. Trudeau: Not to Mr. Hatfield directly, Mr. Speaker. But the hon. member should gather from my answer that I have expressed the hope that the premiers would do that, and I have talked to at least two premiers to that effect.

Mr. Broadbent: A final supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. To ensure that the proposal is given the seriousness it merits, does the Prime Minister not agree that at this point in our history it would be desirable for him, as head of the national government, to get in touch with Premier Hatfield, who will be chairman of the conference, and ask him to consider consulting with the other premiers on the desirability of their discussing that important matter at the conference next month? I say this as during the past 48 hours provincial premiers of different provinces representing different political parties in Canada have shown an openness and serious approach to this issue.

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, I feel the leader of the NDP means to be constructive in his suggestions and he, in effect, is seeking the same result as I indicated I was seeking. It is really a matter of knowing whether the proper way to achieve those results is for the federal Prime Minister to request that the provincial premiers put something on the agenda. It is my suggestion that it is not the proper way to go about these things. The important thing is that that type of discussion take place, and I have taken certain measures to ensure that it does take place if the provinces so desire. But the hon. member knows that the provinces are rather jealous of their jurisdiction in the area of education and I think it would not be productive for me to request, demand or suggest that the chairman of the conference do certain things. The important thing is that premiers who are participating in that conference do make such suggestions, and I invite the leader of the NDP to make that suggestion at least to Premier Schreyer and Premier Blakeney.

* * *

[*Translation*]

CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

INQUIRY WHETHER PRIME MINISTER MAINTAINS SOME REPORTERS SEPARATISTS AND SLANT NEWS

Mr. René Matte (Champlain): Mr. Speaker, my question is also directed to the Prime Minister.

Considering the serious charges laid by the Prime Minister and some of his ministers against CBC reporters in connection with their separatist leanings, and considering the denials contained in the CRTC report tabled recently, could the Prime Minister tell the House whether he himself and the members of his cabinet concerned continue to maintain that some CBC reporters are separatists and give biased information to favour their constitutional option?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I am not sure whether the hon. member for Champlain is asking this question for the purpose of getting some political credit, and I do not accuse him of that, but I can only remind him that on several occasions his lamented leader, Mr. Réal Caouette, did denounce in this House the separatist and other leanings of the CBC. I think the hon. member's memory is too short and that he should have more respect for the memory of his leader.

Mr. Matte: Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question.

I did not ask what the opinion of my former leader was, but that of the Prime Minister, so he should consider answering our questions. My supplementary question is this: does the Prime Minister admit that approaches to Canadian unity different from his own may exist?

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member really wants to know what I think, he need only read the answers I gave to the questions on the Boyle report which were directed to me every day of last week. I dealt also with this subject during my press conference. If the hon. member wants to be up to date, perhaps he should question me again tomorrow or the day after tomorrow.

Mr. Matte: Mr. Speaker, I have another supplementary question.

Mr. Speaker, I must insist in my supplementary question to the Prime Minister. Since Canadians in general and Quebeckers in particular are seeking a new type of constitutional agreement, does the Prime Minister feel that the CBC should normally reflect this search for a new identity?

Mr. Trudeau: Of course, Mr. Speaker, so what?

* * *

[*English*]

THE CANADIAN ECONOMY

INFLATION—LEVEL IN OCTOBER, 1978—POSSIBILITY OF CUT IN PERSONAL INCOME TAX

Mr. Sinclair Stevens (York-Simcoe): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Finance. Writing in the Canadian Tax Journal, Professors Jump and Wilson of the Institute for Policy Analysis of the University of Toronto have indicated that they feel the last federal budget will have no effect on current levels of inflation which they anticipate will run at approximately 8 per cent in 1978, and as the inflation target for the third year of the control program set by the government is 4 per cent, would the minister indicate if he is still confident that the Canadian economy will achieve a 4 per cent

inflation level by October, 1978, and if not, what is his new target?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I recently read the article but I do not seem to recall those figures. I think I had better check them to see if the hon. member quoted them correctly.

Mr. Stevens: My question is again for the Minister of Finance who is most selective in what he recalls in this House.

● (1430)

My supplementary is again based on what Professors Jump and Wilson have stated in their article, and this time for the minister's benefit I will quote it. Professor Jump and Professor Wilson have stated that a larger cut in personal income taxes would have been more effective in directly stimulating consumer spending and in bringing into play the economy's full multiplier and accelerator forces, which in turn would lower unemployment to a greater extent than the minister's present budgetary thrust is. Would the minister indicate if he is giving any consideration to such a budgetary thrust in the near future?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Speaker, I am not contemplating a budget at this time.

REASON FOR FAILURE TO ESTABLISH COMMITTEE TO STUDY DOCUMENT "THE WAY AHEAD"

Mr. Sinclair Stevens (York-Simcoe): The minister has once again reiterated that he is not contemplating a new budget. Would he indicate to the House why he has not pressed for the calling of motion No. 13, which was put on the order paper under his name calling for the establishment of a joint committee of this House and the other place? That committee would be designed to review "The Way Ahead" which the minister tabled in the House. Why is the minister not pressing to set up that committee so that we can have a more thoughtful review of the economy?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, principally because of the activities of hon. members of this House in other committees it was decided not to go ahead.

Mr. Stevens: What about the recess?

EFFECT OF UPTURN IN DISPOSABLE INCOME AND PERSONAL CONSUMPTION—POSSIBILITY OF CUT IN SALES AND INCOME TAXES

Mr. Lincoln M. Alexander (Hamilton West): Mr. Speaker, I have one short supplementary, and perhaps a second one, if Your Honour desires it. The OECD predicts that economic recovery could accelerate in the first quarter of 1978 if there is an upturn in real disposable income and personal consumption. Does the minister agree with that finding of the OECD, and if so, how does he hope to accomplish that end?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, one of the most important ways to have an increase in personal disposable income is to get the rate of inflation down, and it is for that reason that we have been directing our policies in that direction for the last couple of years.

Mr. Alexander: Another suggestion which has been made is that we should cut personal income taxes for low and middle income earners as well as cut federal sales tax, particularly as it relates to building materials. Is the minister now saying that he has thrown those suggestions out the window for the time being?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Speaker, I just indicated to the hon. member's colleague that I am not going to propose further budgetary measures at this time. I think it is fair to remind the hon. member again that we did indeed reduce federal income taxes in order to increase the minimum income on which tax is paid to $7,000 a year. Unhappily, the hon. gentleman voted against that.

Mr. Alexander: That is a lot of baloney.

Mr. Stevens: You should not mislead the House.

* * *

CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

ALLEGATION OF BIASED NEWS REPORTING—SUGGESTION GOVERNMENT CONTROL OF NEWS BE PROHIBITED

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): Mr. Speaker, I hate to interrupt the Prime Minister's discussion about external affairs, but I would like to pursue the question raised by the hon. member for Fundy-Royal. Having in mind that there is great unease in the country about the proposition contained in the CRTC report, about the way in which the Prime Minister and his friends incited the commission hearing to start with, about the report itself and about the Prime Minister's reaction to it, which seems to move very categorically and clearly toward a form of media control and management, will the Prime Minister assure the House—I see he is smiling, but this is much more serious in the mind of the Prime Minister outside this House than it is here.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Baldwin: Will the Prime Minister give a categorical assurance to the House that the terms of reference in the preamble of any form of further inquiry into this matter will clearly rule out any suggestion, discussion or recommendation about government control of the media, either broadcasting or written?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is certainly asking the question with some levity. I can see that by his smile. He knows very well that the government is as opposed to any form of censorship as he is.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Baldwin: Having in mind the movements of this government toward authoritarianism, I am not asking the question with any levity at all. Will the Prime Minister become serious about this and reassure the public, which is very concerned about the movements of this government, that there is no attempt on the part of the government and the Prime Minister in any way to try to secure media management or control?

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, when the opposition makes it quite clear in its party program that it is opposed to media control, then the hon. member can stand and ask that question.

* * *

PENITENTIARIES

IMPLEMENTATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS OF COMMITTEE ON REFORM—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Maurice Harquail (Restigouche): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Solicitor General. In view of the widespread support among Canadians generally for the recommendations contained in the subcommittee report on the penitentiary system in Canada, would the minister inform the House when we might expect a statement to be forthcoming with respect to the implementation of the recommendations contained in that report?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Francis Fox (Solicitor General): I thank the hon. member for his question, Mr. Speaker, and I wish to inform him that I have almost finished considering the most interesting recommendations made by the parliamentary subcommittee, and that I intend to table my answer in the House on Friday August 5.

* * *

[*English*]

INDIAN AFFAIRS

ALLEGATION OF DIVERSION OF FUNDS BY MANITOBA INDIAN BROTHERHOOD—GOVERNMENT ACTION

Mr. Ray Hnatyshyn (Saskatoon-Biggar): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development. I gave him notice of this question last week. Is the minister in a position today to report on the allegations made by Mr. Tony Walker, formerly employed by the Manitoba Indian Brotherhood, regarding certain irregularities relating to possible diversion of government funds given to the Manitoba Indian Brotherhood for research?

Hon. Warren Allmand (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): Mr. Speaker, officials in my department have been investigating this matter for about nine months now. They started the investigation long before the allegations were recently made. We see nothing of the nature of what was described by the person concerned, but there were some problems with financing, and we are working those out.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: Mr. Speaker, my information is that when Mr. Walker brought this to the attention of the assistant deputy minister, the department then referred the matter back to the Manitoba Indian Brotherhood. I wonder if the minister can explain why his department asked the brotherhood to investigate itself on this particular matter, and further, whether the minister is prepared to appoint an independent auditor to verify expenditures made by the brotherhood, as stipulated in the memorandum of agreement between the government and the brotherhood, especially in light of the fact that Mr. Tony Walker was fired from the brotherhood immediately after bringing this to the attention of the assistant deputy minister.

Mr. Allmand: Mr. Speaker, that is not correct. The matter was being investigated by officials of the department, including some from Ottawa, and not by the Manitoba Indian Brotherhood. However, the financial problems are being worked out between the officials of my department and the MIB. As I said earlier, the matters in question were not brought to light by Mr. Walker. They were known for some time. As a matter of fact, I met with the executive of the MIB several times long before Mr. Walker made his statement.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: Mr. Speaker, there is an agreement between the MIB and the department which provides for the appointment of an independent auditor to look into the affairs of the MIB relating to government funds. Will the minister now undertake to have an independent auditor investigate the records with respect to expenditures and with respect to the allegations raised by Mr. Walker?

Mr. Allmand: Mr. Speaker, if that has not already been done, I will look into that possibility.

* * *

INDUSTRY

SYDNEY STEEL—REQUEST FOR AID IN MODERNIZING PLANT—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Halifax): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Prime Minister, who will recall that last week I asked him whether the government of Nova Scotia or SYSCO made any specific proposal or request to the government of Canada respecting the modernization of the Sydney Steel plant which, of course, is of great concern to the people of Cape Breton and northern Nova Scotia. The Prime Minister said he would take the question as notice. Can he now give me an answer on this very important situation?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I may have received an answer. I have not read it yet, if I have received it.

Mr. Stanfield: Mr. Speaker, I do not know how long the House will be sitting, but in view of the importance of the question to a substantial number of Canadians, if the Prime

Minister is not able to give me an oral response before the House rises, would he inform me by telephone or by letter?

Mr. Trudeau: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I will see that somebody does that.

* * *

● (1440)

THE CANADIAN ECONOMY

UNEMPLOYMENT IN CAPE BRETON—REQUEST FOR MEETING WITH CABINET

Mr. Andy Hogan (Cape Breton-East Richmond): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister. The Prime Minister may have been informed that on the weekend in Cape Breton, where there is such heavy unemployment, many eminent people including those holding public office, clergy, professors and labour leaders, attempted to attract the attention of the nation to the heavy unemployment in that area. They want some action from the Prime Minister in order to correct an abnormal and heavy unemployment. They look to the Prime Minister for answers. Has the Prime Minister anything to offer? Is he or a group of his cabinet ministers prepared to meet with them?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, if such a group asks to meet with a group of cabinet ministers, we always react favourably to such a request.

Mr. Hogan: The Prime Minister knows that telegrams have been sent to his office for at least three weeks. He sent a Mr. Brian Fleming there. He has not yet reported to these people. This is the reason for the additional demonstrations. To date they have been peaceful, but we have no guarantee they will remain that way. How long are we going to be expected to be second class citizens in this country—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

* * *

AGRICULTURE

ALLEGED CHALLENGE BY MINISTER TO DEBATE MARKETING BOARD-SUPPLY MANAGEMENT ISSUE—ACCEPTANCE BY COLIN THATCHER

Mr. Frank Hamilton (Swift Current-Maple Creek): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Agriculture. In view of the minister's recent challenge to debate the marketing board-supply management issue with anyone respecting the Canadian cattle industry, and in view of the acceptance of this challenge by Colin Thatcher, MLA, a practical cattleman from Saskatchewan, will the minister assure the House and Canadian cattlemen that he will indeed carry out his personal agreement to proceed with this debate?

Hon. E. F. Whelan (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has changed some of the words. I can let him listen to the tape when I addressed the Saskatchewan Rural Municipalities Association when I said I would debate the merits of supply-management and marketing boards. I did not say one word about beef. The person who saw fit to cross the House in the Saskatchewan legislature is now trying to make some political hay. I am not going to change the commitments I have made for service to Canadians in order to give him a platform. I want to say one thing. I am not one bit afraid of him.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Hamilton (Swift Current-Maple Creek): Is the implication of the minister's answer that he had anticipated an easy-going Liberal to Liberal debate but now backs away from a hard hitting, no holds barred debate with a genuine western cattleman?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

* * *

[*Translation*]

BILINGUALISM

DATE OF NEXT MEETING WITH PUBLIC SERVICE ALLIANCE—POSSIBILITY OF PAYING BONUS TO BILINGUAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. Serge Joyal (Maisonneuve-Rosemont): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the President of the Treasury Board. Considering that in September 1969 the Laurendeau-Dunton Commission recommended in its third volume the payment of a bilingualism bonus to the categories of civil servants holding positions designated as bilingual; considering that a joint committee, the Treasury Board and the Public Service Alliance, have been sitting since January 3, 1973 to study the implications of the policy on official languages; and considering that the President of the Treasury Board acknowledged that the payment of such a bonus has been due since November 1, 1976, can the hon. gentleman inform the members of the House when the next meeting between his officials and those of the Public Service Alliance will be held to expedite the payment of this bonus, and whether he will consider the proposition providing the immediate payment of a minimum amount to all those holding positions designated as bilingual, even if it entails the adjustment of those amounts during the coming months considering that the discussions to this effect have been going on for four years?

[*English*]

Hon. Robert K. Andras (President of the Treasury Board): Mr. Speaker, I anticipate being in formal and detailed consultation with the Public Service Unions and the National Joint Council in a matter of days, probably next week.

Oral Questions

NATIONAL HARBOURS BOARD

ALLEGATION OF IMPROPER PROCEDURE IN FILLING VACANCIES—GOVERNMENT ACTION

Mr. J. M. Forrestall (Dartmouth-Halifax East): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the President of the Treasury Board. It arises out of a practice authorized by the Minister of Transport or his officials with regard to filling vacancies or job positions which will be created by legislation presently before this House. It has passed first reading stage, but has not yet received approval in principle, been before the committee or been passed. Will the President of the Treasury Board use his good offices to have this practice cease, not only because it is an affront to parliament but because there are widespread rumours of employees of National Harbours Board and Ports Canada not being offered jobs under the proposals presently before us?

Hon. Robert K. Andras (President of the Treasury Board): Mr. Speaker, I cannot accept the premise of the hon. member's preamble. I do not recognize his description of the placement policy as being the actual practice. I will certainly examine his question. I am sure the Minister of Transport will do so as well. In any event, I do not believe that is an accurate description of what is planned.

Mr. Forrestall: Mr. Speaker, I will direct my supplementary question to the Acting Minister of Transport. Will he draw to the attention of the minister that there is indeed some widespread concern? Also, will he suggest to the Minister of Transport that the other route be taken with regard to job security for employees of National Harbours Board and Ports Canada? Will he assure them that when this legislation is part of the law of Canada they will be given full opportunity to apply for jobs created under the new ports policy, if and when it is passed?

* * *

FARM CREDIT CORPORATION

AWARDING OF CONTRACT TO MANITOBA INSTITUTE OF MANAGEMENT—DISCLOSURE BY CHAIRMAN OF DIRECTORSHIP

Mr. Perrin Beatty (Wellington-Grey-Dufferin-Waterloo): Mr. Speaker, I gave the Minister of Agriculture notice of my intention to raise this question. It arises from the decision by the chairman of the Farm Credit Corporation to award an untendered $80,000 contract to the Manitoba Institute of Management, of which he was a director at the time. In view of the fact that the chairman sought the approval of the FCC's board only some months after awarding the contract, may I ask the minister whether the chairman in any way sought his approval prior to awarding the contract to MIM and did he at that time disclose to the minister the fact that he was a director of the consulting firm?

Hon. E. F. Whelan (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member's question is rather detailed. There has been a lot of discussion and insinuation with regard to what the chairman of the Farm Credit Corporation has or has not done. Under the authority vested in the Farm Credit Corporation, he can hire people to do studies and so on. I am told that the Manitoba Institute of Management is a non-profit organization. He did report to the board. In early May 1975, he reported to me that he was going to hire the institute. Some months after that, he asked for confirmation of the Farm Credit Corporation Board. He explained to them what he did. They condoned it at that time. As hon. members know, the Auditor General's report, which was handed to me within the past few days, clears the Farm Credit Corporation of any irregularities. The Auditor General certainly did not point out any irregularities to me. I have to go by what the board of directors say and what the Auditor General says. If the hon. member has any further information that is sound and factual, I would appreciate hearing it.

Mr. Beatty: Has the minister determined whether the chairman disclosed the fact that he was a director of the Manitoba Institute of Management at the time he asked the board to approve his decision?

Mr. Whelan: Mr. Speaker, the chairman of the Farm Credit Corporation informed me that he was a director of the MIM. He also submitted all his outside interests to the proper authorities in order to determine whether there was any conflict of interest. I take that for granted when I am informed that he has no conflict of interest. I do not have an investigation team that runs around and investigates everybody. I asked the present chairman to resign from a position in the province of Manitoba to accept this challenge. I did so because of his great ability. One of the finest books ever written on farm credit was done by him when he was an employee of the former Minister of Agriculture, the hon. member for Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain.

INTERNAL MANAGEMENT AUDIT BY SIBBALD GROUP—GOVERNMENT ACTION

Mr. Perrin Beatty (Wellington-Grey-Dufferin-Waterloo): The minister should know that the public declaration and public file by the chairman of the Farm Credit Corporation makes no reference to the fact that he was a director of the Manitoba Institute of Management. In view of the fact that the Sibbald Group report that grew out of the MIM study was highly critical of senior management of the Farm Credit Corporation and pointed out the serious deterioration in morale within the Farm Credit Corporation, can the minister tell the House what specific action he proposes to take to restore direction to this $306 million corporation?

Hon. E. F. Whelan (Minister of Agriculture): As far as I am concerned, Mr. Speaker, the board of directors and management took prompt action on a study that they asked to be undertaken on the corporation itself. If one checks the minutes of the Standing Committee on Agriculture, one will see that from time to time members from both sides of this House have

made strong representations for the Farm Credit Corporation to be more realistic. Some of these areas have been touched on by the new administration in the Farm Credit Corporation. There is some resentment. I am not saying that they are perfect in what they are doing. Some of the suggestions of the Sibbald report have been followed up quite rapidly. For the first time there has been a director of the Farm Credit Corporation appointed from outside the public service. He is a young farmer from eastern Ontario who is bilingual.

● (1450)

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Whelan: He has had past experience in the Farm Credit Corporation. He is an actual farmer. This is a new breakthrough, as far as I am concerned. I am concerned about the Farm Credit Corporation being operated in a proper fashion. We must have some real basic facts which indicate that something improper was done, rather than a rumour mill.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

* * *

POST OFFICE

STRIKE AT OTTAWA—REQUEST FOR REPORT ON PROGRESS OF NEGOTIATIONS

Mr. Lloyd Francis (Ottawa West): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Postmaster General. Can the Postmaster General tell this House what progress is being made in resolving the illegal and damaging work stoppage still continuing in the Ottawa Post Office?

An hon. Member: Good question, Lloyd.

Hon. J.-J. Blais (Postmaster General): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to advise the hon. gentleman that the backlog which was a built up last week is now being cleared. There are 400,000 CPP cheques coming in today which will be processed. Unfortunately, we have had to do that with the hiring of additional casuals, which was done after a great deal of hesitation. However, there are approximately 250 regular employees who are now clearing the mail. Hopefully, the meetings we are attempting to have with the local will take place within a short period of time in order for the matter to be regularized.

* * *

THE CANADIAN ECONOMY

MEASURES TO STOP EXODUS OF CAPITAL TO UNITED STATES—REASON REAL ESTATE DEVELOPERS WILL NOT INVEST IN CANADA

Mr. Dan McKenzie (Winnipeg South Centre): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Finance. There are continuing alarming reports of the mass exodus of individual and corporate investment money going from Canada to the United States, such as millions of dollars that Canadians are investing in Florida real estate, manufacturing and banking. The United States is openly encouraging businesses in Montreal and Toronto to move to the United States. They are meeting with some success, because industry and business just cannot survive in the current Canadian climate. I should like to ask the Minister of Finance if he is planning any meetings with the business communities to help this flow of money and businesses, or is he planning a new budget to try to stop this serious situation?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I have been meeting continuously with provincial governments and with leaders of the business community. The hon. member posed two questions. The first was with regard to budgetary changes. I remind him that something over $700 million of changes were made in favour of the corporate business sector in the March 31 budget. We believe it is a favourable climate, combined with the changes in the dividend tax credit for business investment in Canada.

On the question of the problem of inflation in Canada, indeed that continues to be a problem. The competitiveness of Canadian industry is a matter of grave concern, and it is for that reason we have continued to place very heavy emphasis on restraining the increase in costs in this country.

Mr. McKenzie: Mr. Speaker, unemployment is somewhere between a million and a million and a half. The construction industry has ground to a halt. Real estate developers in Canada this year have poured $2½ billion into real estate development in the United States. Canadian real estate developers are developing 17 major complexes in the United States. In view of all this, could the minister arrange some meetings with the real estate development industry in this country to find out why they will not invest in Canada?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Speaker, the obvious conclusion would be that at the present time,—and speaking only for my own community—there is a substantial excess of commercial capacity in this country. Obviously when there is that commercial capacity at the present time, it does not make sense to further invest.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: Just like the depression.

* * *

LABOUR CONDITIONS

PENSIONS FOR RETIRED RAILWAY EMPLOYEES—GOVERNMENT ACTION

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Labour. In view of the fact that three years have gone by since the minister commissioned Dr. Noel Hall to make a report on railway pensions, and in view of the fact that consideration of that report by management and the unions does nothing for the railroad workers already retired and on pension, will the

minister say when he intends to announce what the government proposes to do to see to it that those already retired get an increase in their pensions?

Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre is aware that a lot of the report puts some considerable pressure on the CPR with respect to upgrading pensions for those already on retirement. I am convinced this is something the union leadership is concerned about, even though they are not presently in the work force. I am hopeful the union leadership will intend to do something about this in the next round of negotiations.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that neither the CPR nor the CNR has provided any escalation of pensions in 1977, will the government put pressure on these two railways to take action to increase the pensions of their workers already retired without any further delay?

Mr. Munro (Hamilton East): Mr. Speaker, when we are involved with the railways and the unions, in order to keep a satisfied work force,—and the work force here is an excellent one—it is always our intention to try to do all we can to ensure that the working conditions are adequate. That should be a sufficient answer for the hon. member.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

* * *

● (1500)

[*Translation*]

SOCIAL SECURITY

POSSIBILITY OF RECIPROCITY AGREEMENT ON PENSIONS WITH UNITED KINGDOM—PROGRESS OF NEGOTIATIONS

Mr. Donald W. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): Mr. Speaker, I should like to put a question to the Minister of National Health and Welfare.

Seeing functionaries of the Social Welfare Department of Great Britain were present in the Speaker's gallery last week, can the minister tell us whether that visit took place in the context of the signing of a reciprocal agreement with Great Britain, which I so often advocated, providing the indexation of British pensions to recipients living in Canada?

Hon. Marc Lalonde (Minister of National Health and Welfare): The answer is no, Mr. Speaker. Still, I must indicate to the hon. member that the officials of my department did meet British functionaries about two weeks ago, and that negotiations were very encouraging. There will be further exchanges of documents in coming weeks and I think we can foresee another meeting early in the fall. I trust therefore that I shall be able to bring good news to the hon. member at that time.

[Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre).]

Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): Mr. Speaker, on a supplementary. Can the minister give us a set date, or even an approximate date, for the signing of such an agreement?

Mr. Lalonde: As far as Canada is concerned, Mr. Speaker, we are ready to sign an agreement tomorrow morning, but our British colleagues have run into financial difficulties they want to analyse. I hope we can reach an agreement in the fall, but I am unable to give a specific date. Again, I point out that the initiative in that regard lies in the hands of my British colleagues.

* * *

[*English*]

AGRICULTURE

INDUSTRIAL MILK—POSSIBILITY OF CUT IN QUOTA—GOVERNMENT ACTION

Mr. Fred McCain (Carleton-Charlotte): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture. In view of the hardships which the dairy farmers of Canada experienced as a result of quota reduction during the past year, and in view of the rumour that the Canadian Dairy Commission may recommend a further cut in quota, will the minister approve the quota cut if the dairy commission recommends it?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. By virtue of the terminology of the question, it is hypothetical.

INDUSTRIAL MILK—POSSIBILITY OF CUT IN PRODUCTION

Mr. Bill Jarvis (Perth-Wilmot): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Agriculture as well. It relates to the Canadian Dairy Commission and its proposed 4 per cent cutback in milk production which will exclude Canadian dairy farmers from a $7 million industry and will cost Canadian dairy farmers $7 million. Can the minister tell us whether on the agenda of the milk supply management committee, which will be meeting later this week, there is an item relating to a possible cut in production for the present dairy year?

Hon. E. F. Whelan (Minister of Agriculture): I know of no such item, Mr. Speaker. No information has been given to me about such a cut. I am meeting the Dairy Commission tomorrow, but no suggestion of a cut has been made to me. The latest documents I have seen were those available at the meeting of provincial ministers in Victoria and no suggestion of that kind was made then. I would be very surprised if such a course were contemplated—if it were, it would be because of something which had happened very recently. I would point out, however, that it is the supply-management committee which has the responsibility for making these decisions, and it would have to be pretty sure it was making the right decision before it took action along the lines suggested by the hon. member. It is not the Minister of Agriculture who makes decisions of that kind.

LANGUAGE COMMISSIONER

REPLACEMENT FOR KEITH SPICER—GOVERNMENT ACTION

Mr. Stephen E. Paproski (Edmonton Centre): I see the Prime Minister has just left the chamber. I was about to ask him if there is to be a replacement for Keith Spicer. Since the right hon. gentleman is not here perhaps one of the other ministers may be able to answer the question.

Mr. Baldwin: Is it to be Jack Horner?

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, tomorrow the right hon. Prime Minister will be in the House at which time he can answer that question. Had the hon. member been quick enough about it, he would have put it before three o'clock.

[*English*]

Mr. Paproski: Ten o'clock, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Gauthier (Ottawa-Vanier): Mr. Speaker, I should like to apologize to the House for possibly becoming confused as to names in my answer to the hon. member for Saskatoon-Biggar, and to correct *Hansard* at page 7916. There was a name change from York Place (Hamilton) Limited to York Place of Hamilton Incorporated. Main Place has nothing to do with York Place. They are two distinct and separate projects. Nevertheless, I maintain the rest of my answer to be substantively correct.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the fact that the parliamentary secretary has, though belatedly, corrected his response. I wonder if he is now in a position to correct his response with respect to Mr. Shaw's connection with the charges relating to the York Place project? He may wish to review that part of his answer, as well, to determine whether or not he has misled the House.

Mr. Speaker: Even if the parliamentary secretary were prepared to do that, he might find difficulty at this point in our proceedings.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, the following questions will be answered today: 2,152, 2,409, 2,734, 2,786, 2,815 and 2,838.

Order Paper Questions

[*Text*]

WHEAT—DOMESTIC AND INTERNATIONAL PRICES

Question No. 2,152—**Mr. Nystrom:**

1. (a) In regard to the 1975-76 crop year and the two-price system for wheat, did the Canadian Wheat Board receive money from the government in order to make up the difference between the domestic and international prices for wheat and, if so (a) in what amount (b) what was the price subsidy on a per bushel basis?

2. How many bushels of wheat were sold to domestic millers at $3.25 per bushel over and above the two-price system?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): In so far as the Canadian Wheat Board is concerned: 1. (a) Yes; (a) $82,523,-175.86; (b) Average price subsidy per bushel $1.49.

2. None reported.

PREVENTION OF POLLUTION FROM FOREIGN SHIPS

Question No. 2,409—**Mr. Howie:**

What steps are being taken to ensure that foreign vessels sailing in Canadian waters conform to Canadian standards of shipping safety in light of oil spills off the coast of North America, and considering that many of the vessels responsible for these incidents were registered in countries which encourage such registration by retaining lax safety regulations for their merchant marine fleets?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): All foreign oil tankers of 500 tons, gross tonnage and over are required to have on board a valid certificate to verify that the ship complies with Canadian regulations relating to the navigating appliances and pollution prevention. Also these tankers must comply with international conventions relating to the design and construction of the ship, its machinery, equipment and the assignment of load lines. The Canada Shipping Act provides for a penalty of up to $100,000 where a ship is found guilty of entering or navigating in Canadian waters without a valid certificate or where it is not in compliance with regulations. Where foreign ships are found to not comply with international standards, such ships can be detained until defects are repaired or remedied. With respect to navigating appliances, these ships are required to be provided with magnetic compasses of approved types, an efficient gyro compass, sounding apparatus, a marine radar, a V.H.F. radiotelephone facility capable of receiving and transmitting on designated frequencies and an additional radio capable of receiving navigational warnings. Oil tankers of 1,600 tons or more are required to be provided with two marine radars, an internal communication system, manoeuvring system indicators and appliances such as rudder angle indicators, propeller direction indicators and other devices designed to assist in manoeuvring and controlling the ship, and a radio direction finding apparatus. Other equipment required includes searchlights and signalling flags. Every ship must have on board the latest editions of charts and other publications such as tide and current tables, sailing directions, lists of lights, buoys and fog signals, Radio Aids to Marine Navigation, Code of Navigation Practices and Procedures and a copy of the Canadian Notices to Mariners for the area to be navigated. All of the foregoing equipment and publications must be maintained in an efficient manner and up-dated. Where necessary spare parts must be supplied. Foreign ships

navigating in Canadian waters are required to comply with regulations regarding deck watches in order to ensure that there are sufficient officers and crew members on watch particularly in areas where marine traffic may present danger of collision and accidents. The Oil Pollution Prevention Regulations, Garbage Pollution Prevention Regulations and the Pollutant Substances Regulations prohibit the discharge of oil, garbage and other designated pollutants from ships into waters under Canadian jurisdiction. Additionally, the Oil Pollution Prevention Regulations require all oil tankers built after January 1, 1974 to limit cargo tank sizes in accordance with international standards and require all ships to keep records of oil transfers. Regulations prohibit the discharge of oil from ships and where offences are detected, fines of up to $100,000 can be imposed when ships are found guilty of such violations. During the past three years the department was successful in 107 prosecutions for violations of the Pollution Prevention Regulations. A total of $321,575 was levied in fines. In many other cases minor infractions were dealt with by requiring the ship to rectify defects prior to proceeding. In order to enforce these regulations officers of the Department of Transport have been designated as pollution prevention officers under the provisions of the Canada Shipping Act. These officers have the power to require ships to provide information regarding the condition of the ship, its cargo, the manner in which the cargo is stowed and other information to ensure that the ship complies with the act and regulations. Such an officer may go on board ships bound for a place in Canada in order to carry out inspections, order a ship out of Canadian waters or otherwise direct it where he suspects that the ship fails to comply with the act or regulations, or where he is satisfied that such order is necessary to prevent a discharge or a pollutant such as oil or chemicals. Any review of existing regulations will be contingent upon the outcome of the UN Conference on the Law of the Sea and the development of international standards by other agencies such as the Inter-Governmental Maritime Consultative Organization. Vessel traffic management systems have been established and continue to be upgraded. The procedures provide for traffic separation, VHF radiotelephone communication between ships and a central regulating centre, ship to ship communication and, in some localities, radar surveillance. Ships report their positions and intended movements at specified reporting points and obtain clearance as required. The centre gives information on traffic, weather, navigational conditions, etc.

CANADIAN TRANSPORT COMMISSION—SALARIES

Question No. 2,734—**Mr. Robinson:**

What is the salary of the (a) Executive (b) Director (c) Chairman (d) Vice-Chairman (e) board members of the Canadian Transport Commission?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): The Canadian Transport Commission reports as follows: the question is answered on the basis that the term "Chairman" means "President"; that the term "Vice-Chairman" means "Vice-president" and that there is no position of "Executive" and a separate position of "Director". The president of the commission is paid at a rate with the range DM-3 ($54,000-$66,000); the vice-president (legal) is paid at a rate within the range DM-2 ($45,500-$60,500); and members of the commission are paid at a rate within the range SX-2 ($31,500-$41,500).

URANIUM EXPORT TO FRANCE

Question No. 2,786—**Mr. Jones:**

Are there any plans or agreements for France to import uranium from Quebec and, if so, were these agreements discussed at the three day meeting with President Valéry Giscard d'Estaing and Premier Raymond Barre on the Prime Minister's visit to France in May?

Mr. Fernand E. Leblanc (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State for External Affairs): While exploration activity has revealed significant deposits of uranium in Quebec, their development is still at a preliminary stage. There are no agreements or current plans for the export of this uranium to France.

EXPENDITURES—SAULT STE. MARIE

Question No. 2,815—**Mr. Symes:**

What was the total amount spent in Sault Ste. Marie from October 1972 to date by the Department of National Defence?

Hon. Barney Danson (Minister of National Defence):

Fiscal Years	Expenditure
1972-73	See note below
1973-74	See note below
1974-75	$ 443,000
1975-76	$ 595,000
1976-77	$ 810,000
	$1,848,000

NOTE: Data for 1972-73 and 1973-74 is not readily available. It could involve a research of a great many closed files and the department does not have the necessary resources to do this.

HIGHWAYS IN ATLANTIC REGION

Question No. 2,838—**Mr. Jones:**

1. Is it the intention of the government to spend $100 million on highways in the Atlantic provinces and, if so (a) on what basis (b) what amount will be spent in each province and in what centres?

2. Is there any connection between the cancellation of the greater part of Rail Transportation in the Atlantic provinces and the announcement of the proposed money to be spent on highways?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): 1. (a) and (b) On May 25, 1977, I announced that the federal government was prepared to spend up to $100 million in the Atlantic provinces over the 1977/78 fiscal years, jointly with each of the four provinces, for the purposes of assisting in the strengthening and improvement of portions of the primary highway system in the region. The precise terms of federal/provincial agreements, including the allocation of the federal funds

among the four provinces, and the specific highway links to be strengthened or improved, are under discussion.

2. No decision has been made to abandon any rail passenger service in the Atlantic provinces. The Canadian Transport Commission has held hearings related to these routes and has stated that a decision will be made by December of this year. The over-all objective of the government is to improve rail transportation services when such services make sense, and to this end is prepared to pay 100 per cent of any operating deficits when effective management has been demonstrated. Alternatives to upgrade the service will be evaluated after the CTC decision has been made.

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker: Shall the remaining questions be allowed to stand?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*Translation*]

IMMIGRATION ACT, 1976

AMENDMENTS TO IMPLEMENT CHANGES IN IMMIGRATION POLICY

The House resumed, from Friday, July 22, consideration of Bill C-24, respecting immigration to Canada, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration.

Mr. Serge Joyal (Maisonneuve-Rosemont) for (Mr. De Bané) moved:

Motion No. 46.

That Bill C-24, An Act respecting immigration to Canada, be amended in Clause 83 by striking out lines 24 and 25 at page 47 and substituting the following therefor:

"certificate issued at the discretion of a judge of the Federal Court of Canada upon application of the Minister and the Solicitor General, which application shall contain all the particulars of security or criminal intelligence reports, is filed with the Board".

He said: In resuming this debate at the report stage of Bill C-24, I would like to remind the House that motion No. 46 which seeks to amend clause 83 of this bill, under the heading of security which concerns the terms of reference of the Immigration Appeal Board, has the same effect as amendment No. 29 which sought to amend section 39 of the law which applied to permanent residents. The nature of section 24, contrary to clauses 39 and 40 which have been included in the bill at the request of the RCMP security services, is not a new point of law. Actually, it is a repetition of section 21 of the Immigration Appeal Board Act adopted by the House in 1967.

Clause 83 applies to permanent residents or those who claim the permanent resident status. Those are visa holders, those

who consider themselves as political refugees as well as people who hold a return permit.

● (1510)

I will not dwell on the nature of this returning permit. These are provisions dealing with new rights Bill C-24 is acknowledging for the first time, which certainly appears to me as an improvement over the provisions of the previous immigration act. Clause 83 provides that a security certificate signed by two cabinet members, the Minister of Manpower and Immigration and the Solicitor General of Canada, and filed with the Immigration Appeal Board has a determining effect on the terms of reference and jurisdiction of the Board. As a matter of fact, the filing of this security certificate, not to the effect that either one of the permanent claimants or permanent residents falls in any of the categories referred to in clause 39, but the simple fact of mentioning such a certificate to the effect that the presence in Canada of the designated person would be contrary to the national interest and security has a determining effect on the jurisdiction of the Immigration Appeal Board. As a result, the Immigration Appeal Board is deprived of its jurisdiction on humanitarian considerations or compassionate grounds.

As we all know, Mr. Speaker, the Immigration Appeal Board has been set up to meet two main objectives: first, to ensure the respect of judicial procedure in the case of hearings required by permanent residents; second, to bring within the Board's terms of reference humanitarian elements the consideration of which may determine its decision to uphold or reject a claimant's appeal. The Immigration Appeal Board takes favourable decisions in most cases when taking into account humanitarian considerations or compassionate grounds. Yet, the filing of that security certificate, as was mentioned previously, denies the Board such jurisdiction or responsibility as far as hearings are concerned. Therefore it is important to make sure that the security certificate is worded in such a way as to meet the security objectives the law is trying to determine and ensure within the general framework of national security.

As far as clause 39 is concerned, we had put forward an amendment which would ensure that this security certificate would be issued at the discretion of a Federal Court judge in Canada. During the debate in committee, many speakers have emphasized the very important role and responsibility that the judges of the Federal Court or the Supreme Court of Canada have in the judicial process which was designed to ensure the respect of law in the implementation of procedures for the national security. The hon. member for Fundy-Royal (Mr. Fairweather) said on this occasion that the Mackenzie-Pratte-Caldwell Commission, established by Prime Minister Pearson in 1969, said in page 53 of their report that the deportation of an immigrant who had been formally admitted to Canada was an extremely serious gesture and that this kind of order should be subject to an official judicial process providing for a right of appeal before an agency like the Immigration Appeal Board.

If the government refused to present acceptable and satisfactory evidence, the board felt that deportation should not be ordered. Such a situation, according to them, should not occur very frequently if the selection criteria of applicants were reasonably efficient.

The Mackenzie Commission was in favour of the creation of a tight judicial process in the case of deportation of an applicant with permanent resident status. Now, the amendment we are respectfully submitting to the consideration of the House today is designed to ensure that one of the Federal Court of Canada judges would have the authority to issue such security certificates. Many arguments have been put forward at the committee stage against the interference from the Federal Court or the Supreme Court judges in the administrative procedure relating to the deportation of a person from Canada or the issuance of a departure notice. I will not come back on any of these arguments. You just have to read the reports and the minutes of proceedings of the immigration committee to see that most of them are pointless.

The minister, through his deputy minister, stated that several judges of the Federal Court and even of the Supreme Court of Canada would not be granted a clearance if they had to go through the security selection procedure themselves, and rightly so, Mr. Speaker. Even if this reason should be retained, I do not think that it could be an acceptable argument to reject the proposal in motion No. 46. As a matter of fact, this security certificate might well be delivered by one of the judges of the Federal Court who would be granted a security clearance through the RCMP. We realize the absurdity of having our Supreme Court and Federal Court judges take these security tests or obtain these security clearances, which would result in enabling them to play a part in the responsibility designed to ensure compliance with a judicial procedure in the area of immigration.

I think it is extremely regrettable that such interventions should have been made during the debates in committee, and I do not believe that those are grounds that Parliament should maintain in implementing the system to ensure the upholding of the Immigration Act. Therefore, the purpose of this amendment No. 46 is not per se to take away from the Immigration Appeal Board its jurisdiction with respect to the law and the facts nor to make its jurisdiction more complicated with respect to humanitarian or compassionate considerations.

In fact, the only purpose of this amendment is to ensure that the security certificate is subject to examination or control by a judge of the Federal Court who could himself, even in the context of the odiousness of those security ratings, be subject to an inquiry by the RCMP security services. Therefore, it seems to me that the passage of this amendment would have the effect of showing very clearly the security objective that is sought under the provisions of clauses 39 and 40 are not per se incompatible with the intervention at the Federal Court in the area of the issuance of security certificates. In fact, it seems to me to be a quite acceptable compromise which I think represents the kind of minimum solution that people concerned with legality and the rule of law should accept in the context of a legislation whose purpose is not to create other classes of people or another kind of Canadian society for permanent residents but in fact to give them the same benefit of access to and protection from the courts that Canadian citizens have in the exercise of their normal responsibilities.

Consequently, it seems to me that the acceptance of this amendment would appear to me to be the minimum in the case of a board which is also entrusted with the upholding of the law and whose chairman recognized that the issuance of that security certificate appeared as one of the first signs to take away from the commission a jurisdiction that enabled it to put into decisions on permanent residents the minimum humaneness and equity without which this country on which we think we can build a democratic and free society would be greatly blemished from the start for those who believe that Canada still represents a hope of freedom.

[*English*]

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

Some hon. Members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

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

Some hon. Members: Nay.

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

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): On division.

Motion No. 46 (Mr. Joyal, for Mr. De Bané) negatived.

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood) moved:

Motion No. 47.

That Bill C-24, an act respecting immigration to Canada, be amended in clause 104 by striking out lines 11 to 28 at page 59 and by renumbering the subsequent subclauses accordingly.

He said: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this amendment is to delete subclause (2) of clause 104 of the bill. Clause 104 provides:

The deputy minister or a senior immigration officer may on reasonable grounds issue a warrant for the arrest and detention of any person—

And so on. Subclause (2) goes on to provide:

Every peace officer in Canada, whether appointed under the laws of Canada or of any province or municipality thereof, and every immigration officer may, without the issue of a warrant, an order or a direction for arrest or detention, arrest and detain or arrest and make an order to detain—

The subclause goes on to say a person may be detained for an inquiry, for removal from Canada, and so on. In effect, the amendment deletes the provision that quite junior officers do not have to get warrants in order to detain people and take their liberty from them. In my view, that would constitute an

invasion of what is otherwise a healthy situation. After all, Mr. Speaker, what is the purpose of a warrant? No one can arrest a person unadvisedly; they have to establish, usually by affidavit, good and sufficient reason for believing an offence has been committed before an arrest can be made. In other words, they have to consult a senior officer.

● (1520)

For many years we have regarded the limitation of the right to arrest as one of the great protections of our law. Indeed, without such limitation or restriction any police officer or immigration officer could walk into a house and arrest somebody. He could do it without needing any piece of paper giving him authority, or without prior consultation. The bill, as it stands would move us, willingly or unwillingly, in the direction of a police state. It is often said by officials that this power will not be abused. But that has not always been its history. I know many immigration officials whose good judgment and good sense I respect. But I have also known some who were not so restrained and would not have been sorry to exercise this wide power of arrest and detention. I therefore say that this provision in the bill is unnecessary. Officials could get a warrant from the deputy minister or a senior immigration official and, having obtained it, carry it out. The warrant should be obtained after they have discussed the matter with a senior official and filed an affidavit with a senior official or with the deputy minister.

Such provisions are not included in the law to protect people. It was said in committee that the legislation would enable officials to act promptly, that is to say, to bring people before an inquiry quickly after they have been detained. But that is small comfort to the person detained. I do not think members of this House would appreciate being detained 48 hours and not being given reasons for their detention. Therefore, this is a serious question.

People who immigrate to this country are uncertain of our customs and laws. They think we live in a society of law and freedom; therefore, many would be shocked if they underwent the experience of arrest without warrant. We cannot justify such provisions by saying they are convenient for the administration of the law. It is always convenient for police officers and immigration officials to exercise powers unhindered by too much red tape. It would be convenient for them, but it is not so convenient for those detained. We must consider their side of the question, as well as the so-called efficient operation of immigration policy. We do not need any law providing for arrest without warrant.

Hon. Bud Cullen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member tried to evoke the spectre of the police state. But such arguments are mere hyperbole when applied to the reality of the particular section of the act being considered. It was clearly stated during committee stage that this power of arrest would be used only in the case of those who fail to appear for an inquiry, those whom we wish to remove, and in the case of over-stayed visitors and ship's deserters. These are the groups of people who, with relatively few exceptions, will go to almost any lengths to stay out of the hands of immigration officials and who are most likely to disappear if an officer has to leave them while he seeks a warrant.

The power to arrest without warrant exists in the current Immigration Act, but I suggest that under Bill C-24, even when a person is arrested without warrant, the arresting officer must be satisfied that the person is dangerous to the public or is likely to go into hiding. The arresting officer must immediately inform a senior immigration officer, who is given the power to release the person if he is not satisfied that there would be a danger to the public or that the person would not appear when asked to do so. If detention is continued, it must be reviewed by an adjudicator in 48 hours, and he in turn can release the person if he is not satisfied that detention is lawful according to the same criteria.

These safeguards are not in the present act, but exist in Bill C-24. I think the bill fully protects the rights of persons arrested. If the motion is not defeated, the battle against illegal immigration will be immeasurably more difficult to wage.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Is the House ready for the question? Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion? All those in favour will please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): All the opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. Members: Nay.

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

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): On division.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): I declare the motion negatived on division.

Motion No. 47 (Mr. Brewin) negatived.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): The House will now consider motion No. 48.

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood) moved:

Motion No. 48.

That Bill C-24, an act respecting immigration to Canada, be amended in clause 111 by striking out lines 32 to 40 at page 62 and by renumbering the subsequent paragraphs accordingly.

He said: Mr. Speaker, this motion would strike from the bill power whereby an immigration officer could ask people to identify themselves satisfactorily. Usually, this means that such people are required to be fingerprinted. I do not know why such identification should so often apply to fingerprinting. I do not object to fingerprinting per se, but think that if some people are to be fingerprinted, everybody should be fingerprinted.

Mr. Epp: What?

Mr. Brewin: Everybody coming in as an immigrant should be fingerprinted.

Mr. Epp: Everyone?

Mr. Brewin: Yes, certainly. You should not choose among people. My friend, Mr. Epp, does not seem to grasp the point I am making.

Mr. Paproski: You mean, the hon. member for Provencher (Mr. Epp).

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Order, please. Would the hon. member please refer to hon. members of this House by riding, and not by name.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): It would be "in-Eppt" not to do so.

Mr. Brewin: Mr. Speaker, I apologize to the House and to Your Honour for that faux pas. My point is, although the power to fingerprint applies to people coming to Canada from overseas, it apparently does not apply to those entering Canada from the United States or Great Britain. Such people are hardly ever fingerprinted. I object to certain groups being discriminated against. If you come from Asia, say, you would be fingerprinted. I do not think we should have one law for one group of immigrants and another for another group. Most of them become Canadians, and they should be treated fairly and equally.

Hon. Bud Cullen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, the motion proposed by the hon. member would strike out the power to require people seeking an immigration privilege, or those who have been arrested or ordered removed from Canada under the immigration legislation, to identify themselves satisfactorily by means of photography or fingerprinting, as provided for in section 115(1)(n). I point out that clause 111(2)(a) was revised at the committee stage to state more precisely the classes of people who may be asked to submit to photography or fingerprinting.

● (1530)

For people seeking admission, authorization to work or to study, or an extension or change in their status as visitors, our intent is simply to ask them to provide us with photographs so that these can be attached to the document which grants them a privilege, to ensure that it is not used by someone else. If we have reason to suspect that they have misrepresented their identity or have a criminal conviction in their background, and only then, we may ask them to submit to fingerprinting.

For the second group, persons who have been arrested because they are considered dangerous to the public or likely to go into hiding, and persons who already have been ordered removed, we may ask the person to submit to photography or fingerprinting. The reason would be to verify identity when we have reason to believe the person is using an alias, to verify a criminal conviction when there are good grounds to believe one exists, to assist in controlling or deterring the person's return to Canada following removal, where he has a record of using aliases or returning illegally, or to facilitate procurement of travel documents for the person who is to be removed from Canada. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, members may be assured that this power is necessary for the proper carrying out of immigration officials' legal responsibilities, but that it will be used only when it is necessary, and not indiscriminately.

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

Some hon. Members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

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

Some hon. Members: Nay.

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

Some hon. Members: On division.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): I declare the motion lost. Motion No. 48 (Mr. Brewin) negatived.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. When his Honour, Mr. Speaker, grouped the various amendments now before us for debate he suggested that motions Nos. 49, 50, 51 and 52 could be grouped for debate. Then he said that a separate vote could be called on motions Nos. 49 and 51, but that a vote on motion No. 50 would dispose of motion No. 52. I may say that I had a personal conversation with His Honour a few minutes ago about the point which I wish to raise, and he thought perhaps there was validity to it.

My friend, the hon. member for Greenwood (Mr. Brewin), feels that there is sufficient difference between motion No. 50 in the name of the hon. member for Provencher (Mr. Epp), and motion No. 52 in the name of the hon. member for Greenwood, that although they could be grouped for debate they should be voted upon separately. I also make the point that motions Nos. 49 and 51 deal with quite different subjects than either motion No. 50 or motion No. 52. I would like to suggest, therefore, that motions Nos. 49 and 51 be dealt with separately, and that motions Nos. 50 and 52 be grouped for debate but be voted on separately. I think that makes more sense, in terms of the substance of the motions.

I see no other problems of this kind. As I have said, I think perhaps the initial reason for grouping them was that they are all amendments to clause 115 of the bill, but they amend it in different areas and in different respects. My suggestion is that motions Nos. 49 and 51 be debated and voted on separately, if there is any debate on them, and that motions Nos. 50 and 52 be grouped for debate but voted on separately.

Mr. Epp: Mr. Speaker, I rise on the same point of order. Although the grouping possibly was arrived at because of the general heading "regulations", I believe the topics are sufficiently distinct for the grouping as suggested by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) to be made more workable. Motion No. 49, standing in the name of the minister, has been discussed at some length in committee, and I think it is quite distinct from my motion No. 50 wherein I ask that the House agree to the tabling and the coming into force of regulations. So, with all due respect, I support the view of the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre.

Mr. Cullen: Mr. Speaker, I do not see any problem with that. There are some differences, and if it will make the House happier, let us proceed on that basis.

Hon. Bud Cullen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration) moved:

Motion No. 49.

That Bill C-24, respecting immigration to Canada, be amended in clause 115 by striking out lines 39 to 49 at page 65 and lines 1 to 3 at page 66 and substituting the following therefor:

"(*k*) requiring any person to deposit security with the Minister to guarantee the performance by that person of any obligation assumed by him with respect to the admission of any other person;

(*k*.1) where a person or organization seeks to facilitate the admission or arrival in Canada of a convention refugee or a person who is a member of a class designated pursuant to paragraph (*d*) or where a person seeks to facilitate the admission of an immigrant who is related to him, establishing the requirements to be met by any person or organization including the provision of an undertaking to assist any such convention refugee, person or immigrant in becoming successfully established in Canada;".

He said: Mr. Speaker, in the motion I am proposing to amend clause 115(1)(k) which is intended to fulfill my undertaking to respond, to the extent possible, to concerns expressed by members of the committee about the regulation-making power respecting people who may be authorized to assist the admission of certain immigrants and visitors. The amendment would restore the original paragraph (k) and create a new paragraph (k.1). The effects, compared to the amendment reluctantly passed in committee, would be as follows: first, the question of security deposits would be divorced from the matter of applications by people in Canada who want to assist the admission of refugees and other immigrants; second, organizations might be authorized to sponsor refugees and quasi-refugees, but not ordinary immigrants. Individuals might be authorized to assist the admission of relatives, but not non-relatives other than refugees or quasi-refugees.

I believe this amendment meets the main points made by members of all parties in committee and fulfills my commitment to the committee.

Mr. Jake Epp (Provencher): Mr. Speaker, committee members will recall the differences we had when the minister brought forward his amendment as he introduced it at the report stage. Now it is acceptable to us, but I think there are one or two points that should be stressed. First of all, I commend the minister for separating the security deposits for sponsorship applications. I think this was a very worth-while step. The question we have to answer concerns the so-called quasi-refugees. I think the very words give us some difficulty. What do they really mean? Is it just more verbiage which means nothing to anyone who has not been present at the committee discussions?

The way I understand this clause, a person who has left his country in eastern Europe, for example, and who would not be eligible as a convention refugee under the convention which Canada has signed as a member of the United Nations, could be sponsored by a group in Canada interested in his or her well-being. For example, multicultural groups in Canada which have attempted through the years to maintain their culture would be able to sponsor those individuals to help them in their admission to Canada. I believe that is a valid exercise under the Immigration Act, and I welcome that provision. However, I believe the minister is well aware of the difficulty we have with the definition of "organization". The minister's amendment provides, "to be met by any such person or organization". What is a bona fide organization which would sponsor a refugee under these limited conditions? I believe the words "limited conditions" should be stressed. The condition is satisfactory, but we have questions about the organizations.

As we said to the minister in committee, it is very important we ensure that the organization willing to sponsor such individuals be a bona fide organization, that it have the support of a fairly wide constituency of Canadian citizens, and that it not be, to put it colloquially, a fly-by-night organization created simply for the purpose of sponsoring people. We want to ensure that these people are sincere in their efforts and that they have the interests of the person, and of Canada, in mind. Under those conditions, we accept the amendment of the minister.

● (1540)

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, the minister is quite right, in my judgment, in saying that the amendments passed in the committee appear to improve considerably the first draft. Therefore, I am disposed to support this resolution. There are one or two things, however, about which I am a little unhappy. I wonder about the necessity of this kind of resolution. There have been persons or organizations assisting people to come to Canada. Many of them have been churches, ethnic organizations or people interested in immigration, and without the aid of legislation such as this they have been assisting people. This amendment just requires them to be ready to give an undertaking. I am not happy about that, because the word "undertaking" is vague. If we are going to legislate obligations to be assumed by people, we should either make available a copy of what they might be expected to fill in, or we should give some particulars. We should not just have a vague reference to an "undertaking". I think that is rather loose drafting.

When we discussed this matter in committee we were informed by officials that it was contemplated that if a person gave an obligation as required by this amendment, that might count toward the admissibility of the person that person was undertaking to assist. If that is the intention, I think it should

be spelled out. As it is, it is rather one-sided. It says a person must give an undertaking. Nowhere does it say what, quid pro quo, the government is prepared to provide.

I am very keen on the idea that organizations and persons should assist refugees into this country without being closely connected by marriage, or anything of that kind. I am very anxious that that be done. But I think if we are going to ask people to make obligations, we should spell out the whole contract and make it very clear that the person making the obligation—or his protege, her protege or its protege, as the case may be—is given an additional score on a possible points system, or additional consideration with respect to admission to Canada. For that reason, I think the amendment is somewhat defective. But as the minister came a long way toward meeting the desires of the committee, I do not feel disposed to vote against his amendment.

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

Some hon. Members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion No. 49 (Mr. Cullen) agreed to.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Motions Nos. 50 and 52 are grouped for the purpose of debate, but they will be voted on separately.

Mr. Jake Epp (Provencher) moved:

Motion No. 50.

That Bill C-24, respecting immigration to Canada, be amended in clause 115 by striking out lines 39 to 44 at page 68 and substituting the following therefor:

"(3) Every order in council, regulation or form made under this act shall be laid before parliament within fifteen days after the order in council, regulation or form, as the case may be, is made or, if parliament is not then in session, within fifteen days after the commencement of the next ensuing session thereof and every order in council, regulation, or form shall be subject to affirmative resolution of parliament and shall not come into force until 30 days after it has been published in the Canada Gazette."

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood) moved:

Motion No. 52.

That Bill C-24, respecting immigration to Canada, be amended in clause 115 by adding immediately after line 50 at page 68 the following new subclause:

"(5) Any regulation passed under provisions of paragraphs 1(*a*), (*b*) and (*c*) of this section shall not come into force unless approved by the House of Commons after a motion for consideration is signed by 20 members which shall be considered within 15 days after the motion is filed when the House of Commons is in session or within 15 days after the opening of parliament, if it is not in session."

Mr. Jake Epp (Provencher): Mr. Speaker, I will speak briefly on motion No. 50. This topic has been swirling around immigration debates for as long as I have had the opportunity to read the record of our debates. As the hon. member for Hamilton West (Mr. Alexander) so perfectly describes it, the topic is legislation by regulation. As a member of the committee, I can appreciate that the minister and his officials must have a fair amount of regulatory power. They must have that so they can react to changing conditions. Conditions can change very quickly. There are fewer receiving countries in the world taking in fewer immigrants, and it is incumbent on the minister and his officials to respond. I think we all understand that, but we do not accept the fact that regulations can come very close to changing the spirit of legislation. I believe that the supremacy and primacy of parliament should prevail. It is for that reason that this amendment has been moved.

We were able to squeeze—how shall I put it—half an amendment out of the minister. The minister went part of the way in meeting the objections we raised at second reading. The minister said he went a long way. I suppose it depends upon where you start. However, I think we must keep in mind the experiences of the last few years. There was a time when people could change their status while in Canada. They might have come in as students or visitors and changed their status to that of landed immigrants. When that change was made there was a great effect on the flow and the nature of the flow. There was nothing parliament could do about it. The only time we had a chance to do anything was when the main estimates or the supplementary estimates were before the committee. At best, that is a frail substitute for what we really want. We do not want regulations to change dramatically the immigration policy of this country as to flow or qualitative flow. Changes like that should be presented to parliament, because parliament is supreme. It is for that reason this amendment is before us. The minister has gone part of the way in meeting our objection, but obviously not far enough. Clause 115(3), at page 68 of the bill, reads as follows:

No regulation made under paragraph (1)(a), (b) or (c) shall come into force until 30 days after it has been published in the Canada *Gazette*, and the text of such regulation shall be laid before parliament as soon as practicable.

As I understand that wording, regulations cannot be passed in the dead of night. We will not wake up in the morning to find that our immigration policy has changed dramatically. That subclause means that regulations will be published in the Canada *Gazette* and will not come into effect for 30 days after that. I know that the hon. member for Greenwood (Mr. Brewin) has had more experience with the Canada *Gazette* than I have or might ever have. He feels the Canada *Gazette* is not well enough organized and wonders how many Canadians read it anyhow. However, those interested in immigration will be reading the *Gazette* and they will at least have some prior notice. This prior notice will allow them to raise objections or to indicate what effects they think the regulations might have on immigration policy.

● (1550)

The other position the minister has taken is that he will lay the text of such regulations before parliament as soon as possible. I am not worried about the time-frame; that is acceptable. We are in a co-operative spirit. However, simply laying the text of the regulations before parliament does not give parliament any chance for debate. While parliament will be notified, parliament will not be able to see whether the

regulations in fact change the spirit and intent of the legislation passed in the House.

It is for that purpose I have moved the amendment which will do the following: every order in council, and I know we have had some discussion in committee as to who can given information vis-à-vis orders in council respecting immigration, regulation or forms that are needed for the administration of the Immigration Act, will be laid before parliament within 15 days if parliament is in session. If it is not in session, I have given conditions for that. What is more important is that the regulation will then need the affirmative resolution of parliament: that is the important part.

What I am deeply concerned about is that as parliamentarians we have the right to debate these regulations and, if we choose, to vote on them. Whether we want to admit it or not, the regulations have a tremendous effect on immigration. It is for that reason it is imperative that parliament has the right to debate the regulation and voice its opinion on it. I do not believe this is restrictive as far as the minister is concerned, because it takes in the spirit of amendment to which he has agreed. For that reason, I commend that amendment to all members of the House.

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, I wish to say a few words on motion No. 52. It is aimed at the same purpose to which the hon. member for Provencher (Mr. Epp) has directed his motion No. 50: it is aimed at ensuring that there be some measure of parliamentary control over the more important and substantial regulations. Where motion No. 52 differs from motion No. 50 is that we apply it, and I do not think this is in No. 50, to the regulations passed under the provisions of clause 115(1)(a) (b) and (c). I would like to tell the House what those regulations provide for. They provide what might be termed as the guts of the whole of the immigration system. I quote:

> The governor in council may make regulations (a) providing for the establishment and application of selection standards based on such factors as family relationships, education, language, skill, occupational experience and other personal attributes and attainments, together with demographic considerations and labour market conditions in Canada, for the purpose of determining whether or not an immigrant will be able to become successfully established in Canada—

That is the basic purpose of an immigration act, to set standards of selection. We all agree we cannot allow a completely open door so that everyone who wants to come to Canada as an immigrant may do so. We need to have a selection process. Therefore, we set up the Department of Immigration and passed the act. These regulations dealing with selection standards for the various items included in the selection standards are the very essence of any immigration policy. The hon. member for Provencher is correct when he says these regulations are absolutely essential to the whole act. We believe that at least some of them should be under the direct control of parliament.

Subclause (b) prescribes the classes of persons whose applications for landing may be sponsored. The House knows that sponsored applications are the applications of close relatives. It is said in clause 13 that the reunion of families through a process of sponsorship is one of the key purposes of the act. However, we leave to regulation the prescribing of what classes of people may be sponsored. We are abdicating in this particular clause. Subclause (c) exempts members of the family class from the requirements and the regulations, prescribing special regulations. I am not sure whether that use of the dispensing power is even legal. My recollection is that James II lost his throne, and King Charles I his head, because they used widespread exempting powers. However, that is a technical point.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): It was not technical for Charles I!

Mr. Brewin: No. These three clauses are highly important. The act is full of references to regulations. There are at least 18 clauses of matters to be dealt with by regulation in this section alone. Indeed, the whole bill is full of "as prescribed by regulation". As far as I know, the whole question of what refugees ought to be admitted is to be prescribed by regulation. The terms and conditions which people may have imposed on them when they come to this country can be prescribed by regulation. One can go through the whole bill picking out the phrase "as prescribed by regulation". I have not attempted, in my motion No. 52, to deal with that. I have taken out the ones that are the key provisions of any immigration scheme. I pretty well know what the minister is going to say. He will say that we have to be flexible in these matters, but that parliament cannot meet all the time. That is perfectly true.

Mr. Epp: You mean, we do meet all the time.

Mr. Brewin: We nearly do. There is a perfectly legitimate excuse for many matters of detail being decided by regulation. However, there is no reason why these key issues should not be dealt with by parliament itself. The method I have suggested is somewhat similar to the method selected by the hon. member for Provencher in his motion No. 50. His is subject to affirmative vote. I have a provision for a motion for consideration signed by 20 members which shall be considered within 15 days after the motion is filed. I want it clear that after this motion is brought in by a certain number of members of parliament to initiate discussion, it will come before parliament. That would be a useful way of doing it.

This might eliminate some frivolous motions to consider regulations. More important, it would give any 20 members the right to bring it directly to parliament. It would provide a time-frame within which it would be dealt. That is necessary, because we are all familiar with motions piling up and not being dealt with adequately or at all. I have sympathy for the President of the Privy Council trying to get all the business handled. However, unless there is a clear, strong provision, we cannot get it in.

The minister says we have to be flexible about this. I do not know why we have to be so flexible about the key provisions in the act. There are places for flexibility, but there are also places for clarity by parliament itself, and there is every reason

why parliament should take a greater interest in this subject. Under the present system, a lot of what has been done by regulation has, in effect, been done in secret.

● (1600)

As we have heard, the minister has proposed an amendment. The hon. member for Provencher said it was half an answer. I would put the fraction lower; I would say it is one-tenth of an answer. What does it amount to? It says the regulations will be found in the *Canada Gazette*. I do not know how many hon. members have ever looked at the *Canada Gazette*. It lists all the innumerable regulations which are made under the various statutes of Canada—huge volumes of them. No one who does not have the patience of Job can possibly expect to find a particular regulation in that mass of words.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): It is not exactly a best-seller.

Mr. Brewin: I doubt that it is. And I imagine fewer copies of it are read than are printed. Yet here we are, saying to prospective immigrants, "Read the *Canada Gazette*. Get the information from these fearful tomes". I gather it does not even have a proper index, so people would have an awful time finding a particular regulation.

The other aspect, and a more important one, is the undertaking that the text of such regulations will be laid before parliament as soon as possible. But even this is not a process which gives notice to very many people. As I understand it, the minister can simply table the relevant document, and that ends the matter because there is no way of questioning here what is contained in the regulations. For this reason, I find the minister's proposal altogether inadequate. The issue here is whether we in parliament are to exercise some measure of control in accordance with the principle of parliamentary supremacy, or whether we shall continue to countenance the issue of a series of semi-secret documents—no doubt got together and put into shape by very distinguished bureaucrats in the department. In my view, that is not good enough. After all, we are here for the purpose of dealing with matters like this.

If I have not been very successful in persuading the minister to accept the amendment I have proposed, may I say I would not feel at all badly if motion 50 were passed, rather than motion 52. I think there is very little difference between them, though naturally, from pride of ownership, I prefer my own version.

Hon. Bud Cullen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Here, again, we have two approaches before us, the one taken by those who have responsibility for administering a particular bill in a particular situation, and the other by those who have no responsibility and who see no practical difficulty in circumstances which the party or the government of the day must face when dealing with 600,000 people who apply to come into this country every year.

At the committee stage we discussed this proposal at some length. A motion was made by the hon. member for Provencher (Mr. Epp) requiring an affirmative resolution of parliament. That motion was defeated in the committee. However, in the interest of meeting some of the suggestions which were made, we did bring forth 115(3). The hon. member for Greenwood (Mr. Brewin) denigrates that particular effort, the point of which was to get necessary information to the public who are concerned about immigration. After all, laying regulations before parliament is making them available in a public forum. They are available to everyone, and it is up to the research staff of the party concerned to check on a daily basis to see what papers have been filed so that if desired they might be given the widest publicity.

The motion put forward by the hon. member for Provencher goes further, requiring that every order in council and every form should also be subject to parliamentary approval. In other words, he apparently wishes to prevent the exercise of virtually all the powers assigned in the act to the governor in council or the minister until parliament has given its approval, no matter how trivial a regulation, order in council, form or amendment might be. This motion would have the effect of bringing the operations of the department to a virtual standstill.

Many of the regulations are relatively unimportant or technical, though they are still essential for the efficient and effective operation of the immigration program. The delays which could result from the requirement to attain parliamentary approval followed by publicity for 30 days would permit persons to circumvent new regulations by coming to Canada before a regulation came into effect, thus defeating the very purpose of the regulation. The provision for 30-days delay already built into 115(3) poses sufficient danger of such circumventions. Most regulations are made to overcome or to prevent serious problems. Delay in their implementation can easily augment those problems.

I recognize what hon. members are endeavouring to do. I suggest that if we are able to change our rules in such a way that it is not necessary to spend an interminable amount of time before we are able to get anything done, that may be the time to give effect to these motions. But given the rules under which we presently operate I suggest, with respect, that the hon. members proposal would be to the detriment of the immigration program and to the detriment of the people we are trying to help, namely, those who apply to come to our great country.

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

Some hon. Members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

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

Some hon. Members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): In my opinion the nays have it. Pursuant to Standing Order 75(11), the recorded division on the motion stands deferred. We will now move to motion 52.

Some hon. Members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion? All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

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

Some hon. Members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): In my opinion the nays have it. Pursuant to Standing Order 75(11), the recorded motion on the division stands deferred.

Mr. Ian Watson (Laprairie) moved:

Motion No. 51.

That Bill C-24, respecting immigration to Canada, be amended in clause 115 by striking out lines 45 to 50 at page 68.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I move this motion to draw the attention of the House and of the people of Canada to what I consider to be another example of the government reneging on its commitments with respect to urban priorities. It is several years now since the government indicated that among its priorities for the long term there would be a move, through whichever vehicle it had at its disposal, to encourage less growth of the larger metropolitan areas of Canada and greater growth of many of our smaller cities. The objective is obvious. There are too many people concentrated in too few urban areas, and the quality of life in some of those urban areas is diminishing rather than improving.

● (1610)

At the trilevel conference in which the federal government participated, through the Department of Urban Affairs, in 1973 the federal government took a tack which recommended elimination of regional disparities, which elimination would be nullified if Canada continued to accept a pattern of urban growth that concentrated people and activities within a few small areas of the country. At that time the position of the government appeared to be that if we continued to accept that the present trend toward highly concentrated and rapid urban growth is undesirable, we must as a government seek an alternative pattern of urbanization through the recognition that Canadian towns and cities are not in competition with each other but are closely linked in a nationwide system of cities.

At that time, the position of the government appeared to be premised on the conviction that the degree of concentration then being experienced—and certainly it has not diminished today—was unacceptable and that a better alternative to the existing pattern was not only feasible but desirable. The conference agreed that there was a role for all levels of government to play in trying to achieve this long-term decentralization of population. Among the levers mentioned at the conference as being available to the federal government were those of monetary and fiscal policy, immigration and migration, transportation, regional development, land use, housing, social welfare, resource management, industrial promotion, and one or two others.

As I have said, Mr. Speaker, this was the position in 1973. In 1975 we had a new urban affairs minister who was still on the same wavelength basically. In referring to the earlier trilevel conference, he said that all three levels of government had agreed on that occasion that the trend should be shifted in favour of a more regionally balanced pattern of growth. The conference also agreed to examine ways and means of doing this and had indicated a readiness to co-ordinate selected relevant policies and programs. The urban affairs minister at that time, the present Minister of National Defence (Mr. Danson), said he was going to involve all provinces, and through them the municipalities, in the consultation process, and he was confident that through this dialogue we could evolve an urban strategy for Canada, a strategy to which all governments would lend their support and within which we could co-ordinate our various policies and programs. The minister then went on to say:

I will also take every opportunity to discuss these issues publicly with Canadian non-governmental organizations concerned with the future of our cities. Out of this process, I believe that a consensus on a national demographic policy and a Canadian urban strategy will emerge.

When this bill came along, Mr. Speaker, I thought that something was emerging which made a bit of sense. I thought we were going to use one of the levers which was referred to in 1973 to help discourage the tremendous population growth in Toronto particularly, as well as on the west coast. I was unhappy when the committee decided to remove the particular clause from the bill which would have required a new immigrant or person applying for immigrant status who required a few extra points to live in a designated area of Canada away from the larger metropolitan centres for a period of six months. Hopefully, that person, after remaining for that length of time, would then have planted sufficient roots to stay.

In committee, members felt that this would not be a very effective route, that somehow it did not accord with the proper attitude to be taken toward human rights. I would take issue with this latter argument, though I think from the practical point of view some of the committee arguments may have been valid. It seems to me that the argument of interference with human rights is based on a view of immigration which I do not accept. I contend that the granting of immigrant status is a privilege accorded by this country and is not, as some would assert, the right of any person coming to this country. Our immigration policy remains the most liberal in the world. The assertion that requiring people to live in areas outside concentrations of population so as to achieve a better demographic balance is somehow an interference with a person's human rights and a reflection upon Canada's reputation in this regard

I find quite unacceptable. It is a line of argument that I just do not buy.

I would not, perhaps, have taken this initiative to make my point concerning what I feel has been the reneging of the government on its urban priorities had it not been for my strong concern about some of the other backtrackings that have occurred. I will touch upon these briefly, and I should like to give a little background about why I am particularly critical of the government's lack of direction and inability to pursue a course that will benefit over the longer term some 85 per cent of our population which now live in the urban areas of Canada.

● (1620)

I should like to refer back to the period after World War II when Canada had an opportunity not only to ensure adequate housing for its population but adequate planning for that housing. The original personnel who made up the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation in the early fifties had a very clear concept for the future of Canada, that it would be well planned. Unfortunately, those far-sighted individuals were not given an opportunity by the government of that day to use the government's lending power to that end. The government was practically the only body lending money for housing at that time.

Had that lending level been used to force better planning for our suburbs, we would have had a totally different situation today. We would have avoided massive speculation with the results we are all aware of. We would have had communities planned around transportation facilities not totally dependent on highways. We would have had basic planning involving things such as sewers and water. The result would have been far less expensive for our taxpayers in the long run, and a much healthier municipal tax situation across the country than we have now. Mind you, that is water under the bridge. The federal government did not do what it should have done.

In 1968, when our present Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) was running for the leadership of his party, there was hope that he was someone who could see what the country's priorities were in the form of better living conditions for the areas where most of our people live. The hope for getting more out of this government was encouraged. At the beginning there was a slow period, but by 1972-73 there was a hope that finally the government was seeing the error of its earlier ways and was going to move in a direction to link transportation planning with redevelopment planning. A prime example of that is the Railway Relocation Act. It is a vehicle which allows the federal government to contribute on a 50-50 basis with the provinces, or even higher.

I am referring to regional transportation plans and the regional development plans which must precede transportation plans desired by particular urban or suburban areas. This type of direction is more necessary now because of the energy crisis, and it seemed to be on the point of being pushed by the federal government and a consensus had almost been reached with the provinces. The provinces have matured substantially in their treatment of regional and city planning. The need is not as great as it was in the late fifties and early sixties for a federal policy guidance input. But along came a new areas of necessity resulting from the energy situation, and the federal government realized there was a new opening for their presence because the provinces were not showing an adequate appreciation of the long-term consequences of what energy shortages would do to our urban and suburban societies. It was not only there for the grabbing; it was there for grasping by the federal government. No one else was doing it, and by not doing it we are putting our people into a more and more precarious situation from an energy consumption point of view and from the point of view of our long-term energy balance with the rest of the world.

From 1972 to 1974 the situation was one of hope. We were finally going to move to a central policy planning push which was needed and useful. The transportation development agency was in existence, and we were going to develop an industry, with government encouragement, to standardize transportation equipment in this country. The industry would have had a fantastic export potential. But on that, too, we have moved way from any concrete action: we are talking; we are not doing anything.

Under the National Housing Act, we have had laws which encouraged land assembly from as early as 1953. Some lands were assembled in Toronto at that time. One can imagine the consequence for house prices around Toronto had the federal government pushed its program for land assembly. After the provinces were embarrassed, Ontario finally moved to assemble some land. Several years ago the federal government moved toward a new cities program which also has disappeared into the woodwork somewhere along the line. There was southeast city in Ottawa. The Pickering airport land was conceived of being for airport use and for the potential use of a new city. These efforts were to be examples for the rest of the country.

The new city concept and land banking could have had an enormous effect upon the inflation situation in Canada. House prices in Ottawa are a direct result of the lack of proper city planning for the expansion of Ottawa suburbs. Had our new cities program been in effect, or had we pushed a land assembly program around Ottawa with that possible lever at our disposal, land and house prices could have been anywhere from 25 per cent to 35 per cent lower than the last few years. Thus, public servants would have been faced with lower costs for housing which might have alleviated some of their demands for higher wages.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Order.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: The hon. member is making statements not related to this bill.

Mr. Watson: From the beginning I have attempted to underscore the federal government's backing away from a number of urban priorities, including the one referred to in this motion. These priorities would have encouraged immigrants

into the slower growth areas of this country and would have had a salutary demographic effect on the country.

• (1630)

Finally, I raise the question of one other urban priority. So far the government has been unwilling to use its lending power to push for proper land use in areas of this country which, in the long term, could benefit from such a policy. I am referring particularly to what is happening in the Niagara peninsula, the rich farmlands around Montreal—in fact, to rich farmlands around our major cities, farmlands not protected by provincial action. We should use the lending powers available to us under the National Housing Act. That is to say, we should abstain from lending or not to guarantee loans with respect to those areas of the country where, in our judgment, proper land use procedures are not followed.

I feel that we have not adequately considered what should be Canada's urban priorities. I suggest that the people of this country have a right to expect more far-sighted action from the government in certain areas than they have witnessed in the last few years. They expect the government to take action in matters which affect their lives, where they live and on questions such as commuting between work and home. That brings me to urban transit. One need not spell out the details of what is not happening. We all know what is not happening and what was promised. This is a sad story which I will not belabour. After the hon. member for Ottawa West (Mr. Francis) has spoken on my motion, I intend to rise on a point of order to request leave to withdraw it.

Mr. Fairweather: That sounds like a dirty trick.

Mr. Watson: I shall do this because my support of the recent Science Council of Canada recommendations outweighs my concern with the government's backtracking on decentralization of population, and I wish to stress that the Science Council of Canada has recommended limiting our future population growth to allow in 50,000 immigrant per year. That being the case, I do not want to open the doors wider than they are now open. If we grant immigrant status on certain conditions to people who would otherwise not be allowed in to this country, that is, if we grant them immigrant status only on the condition that they shall land in certain areas, we shall allow a greater number of people in per year. The Science Council of Canada has examined the question of the long-term availability of energy against the background of our northern climate and the impact on our standard of living of a larger population. In view of its findings, I suggest that if we are to maintain the present high quality of life in Canada and our present living standards, we shall have to think seriously about slowing down the growth of our population. The government thinks our population should grow at between 140,000 and 150,000 per year from immigration. I say our growth rate should be lower. I agree with the Science Council of Canada. I am agreeable to the hon. member for Ottawa West speaking, after which I shall rise on a point of order.

Immigration

Mr. Jake Epp (Provencher): Mr. Speaker, I had not intended speaking on this motion, but having heard the hon. member condemn the government for its lack of immigration policy and blame urban congestion on immigrants, I felt compelled to speak. I agree with one thing the hon. member said. The government's attempt to rationalize population growth has been, to use his words, I think, a sad story. We tried to make the minister aware of this point, but he has not accepted our amendments concerning demographic policy. The point the hon. member for Laprairie (Mr. Watson) made in that regard is correct.

The special joint committee tried to bring forward a recommendation for placing a large number of immigrants in areas of the country with job vacancies. Unfortunately, the original draft of the bill did not incorporate that recommendation, possibly because the committee's intent was not clear to the minister and his officials. In any event, that suggested section was considered unworkable. During the committee consideration, the hon. member for Davenport (Mr. Caccia) was able to bring in an amendment for removing area criteria. Consequently, the news media reported that the hon. member for Davenport had won his war against area designation. With all respect, the press did not understand the situation and had not analysed what had happened. It left the impression that there was to be no area designation, which was not the case. If you take a look at the situation as amended, this is what will happen. We found it impractical to police the movement of immigrants to a specific point, and that they would have to stay there for six months. Longitudinal studies indicate that there is evidence to support what the minister said. These studies indicate that if a person goes to an area other than one of the larger metropolitan areas, the chances of his staying there are fairly good. That is fair enough—but the question of the policing becomes a difficulty.

I agree with the hon. member when he indicates that immigration is a privilege, rather than a right. When you get into the whole question of human rights, whose human rights are being violated? What is going to be done now is a workable compromise. For example, an immigrant who indicates that he is going to northern Canada will not have his landing completed in Toronto, which is the first point of contact in Canada. His landing will be completed at the nearest Canada Immigration centre or Canada Manpower centre. The fact that they will be obligated to complete landing at the destination of the immigrant will facilitate, to some degree, the movement of the people into that area.

Simply having an area designation requiring a person to stay for six months in a given spot, and virtually a given employment situation, can create exploitation of which we are not in favour. It has been indicated in newspapers that the area designation is now gone; but if I understand the regulations correctly, points will be awarded or removed depending on the area to which a person goes. It can be controlled somewhat in the regulations and the area designations as to the number of points. Up to the present time, not enough points were given for area designations. During months when unemployment was

very low in the prairies and employment opportunities existed, people were receiving four out of five points by saying that they were going to the prairies.

● (1640)

If the immigrant wanted to settle in a place like Toronto or another place in the province of Ontario which was getting more than 50 per cent of the immigrant flow and where employment was higher, he would get three out of five points. So the regulation was meaningless in the sense of encouraging people to go to other areas. But I believe the compromise that has been made is much more practical than the area designation suggested by the hon. member. However, I want the record to show clearly that what was reported after the amendment of the hon. member for Davenport was carried in committee, that there would be no area designation, is not in fact the case and that points will still be awarded for area designation.

What should be pointed out, again, after the speech of the hon. member for Laprairie, is that the government still does not have a demographic policy and that immigration is but one problem of the larger problems of the urbanization of Canada. A much greater condition is that of Canadians moving—inward migration to our urban centres where job opportunities exist. I must say to this government that they will have to get on with a demographic policy and regional expansion policies which will encourage, through incentives, people to move into other areas rather than force them through regulation to settle in special areas.

Mr. Lloyd Francis (Ottawa West): Mr. Speaker, my intervention will not be a lengthy one at this point. I merely wish to say that I support the arguments that have been advanced by the hon. member for Laprairie (Mr. Watson) and most of what the hon. member for Provencher (Mr. Epp) had to say. Part of the clause which this amendment will delete says the following:

> For the purpose of this act and the regulations, whenever a person is granted landing and terms and conditions are imposed, no such term or condition may specify the area in which that person shall reside.

I listened with interest to the hon. member for Provencher who said that points would still be granted and in effect there would be some area designation by the back door, in spite of what appears to be the clear wording of the bill before us. I share the fears of those who point out that our immigration has been heavily concentrated in the cities. This has added to our housing problems and to the social services that are required. An attempt to direct immigration to the slower growth areas in Canada seems to me to be a reasonable thing to do. I am aware of the problems concerning possible exploitation.

I have listened to the arguments of those who say that this might be a violation of human rights. However, I am not persuaded that it is a violation of human rights to say to those who choose to come to Canada that they are requested to spend a certain period of time in one of the slower growth areas in the country. This appears to me to be a reasonable request. I know the mover of this amendment, the hon. member for Laprairie, has indicated he might withdraw it, but I simply wish to say that I, for one, believe we must face the problems of urbanization to a much greater degree than we have so far.

The hon. member for Laprairie referred to our housing policy and to the urban transportation commitment of the party to which I belong. We have a substantial obligation in that area. I would like to see the development of an urban policy along with measures which would allow the free movement of people in Canada wherever they choose to reside. But in principle I go along with those who say that it would not be a violation of human rights to request those who come to Canada to spend a certain period of time in one of the underdeveloped areas so that they would not all go, in overwhelming numbers, to the urban centres where the problems of urban life are magnified as a result.

Mr. Gilbert: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the hon. member would permit a question. I want to ask him which areas he would designate as the slower growth areas in Canada where immigrants could be sent, because all the slower growth areas are areas of very high unemployment, and if we were to send these people to the slow growth areas there would be a tremendous problem with regard to their employment. I would like the hon. member to address his remarks to that question.

Mr. Francis: I am not in a position to give a detailed description, but I listened to the Minister of State for Fitness and Amateur Sport (Mrs. Campagnolo) who tells me that there are job opportunities in her area in British Columbia and they would welcome a number of immigrants to that area. I am aware that there are employment opportunities in the frontier areas of Canada.

Mrs. Campagnolo: For skilled workers.

Mr. Francis: For skilled workers and others.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Francis: My point is that the concentration of immigration in the large cities compounds and magnifies the problem. It is still a very basic point and the hon. member, I am sure, would have to concede it.

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): I understood the hon. member for Laprairie (Mr. Watson) to say that at a certain stage he might withdraw his motion, so obviously it is not necessary for me to make a long speech. I am sure many of us might be in agreement with a great deal of what he said about urban planning, but I cannot support his theory that we should direct certain people resident in Canada as to where they are to go, this despite what the hon. member for Laprairie and the hon. member for Ottawa West (Mr. Francis) said that there is no right involved. That is not quite correct.

I am sorry, I do not have the actual citation here, but the United Nations convention on this subject clearly refers to freedom of movement. If we invite people to this country, we

should not invite them as second-class citizens and tell them they cannot go where they see fit. I see no objection to inducements being offered to make certain areas attractive for them to go to, such as employment opportunities, good housing, or whatever is necessary to persuade people to avoid overcrowded urban areas and go to some other areas where things are booming and where they are needed. I have no objection to that at all. I think we should do all we can to assist that. But there is a right not to be pushed around.

I have often heard the hon. member's argument in courts and in this place, that is, the argument that the opportunity to immigrate is a privilege and is by no means a right. That is only partially true. Of course, there is no general right to immigrate. Every sovereign nation has the right to say who should come to their shores from outside. But we legislate to give statutory rights to certain people and we have given certain statutory rights in the act we are now discussing and in previous acts which confirm that people qualify under those certain limited rights, and then we say to them that as permanent residents they will be treated like everyone else in Canada.

I hope we will not abandon that principle. I suspect there are grave practical difficulties in enforcing or dealing with this provision. As the hon. member no doubt knows, these terms and conditions are supposed to last for six months only. There may be some powers for extending the requirement to go to those places where they were designated to go for a short time. I think the hon. member for Provencher is quite right in saying that the regulations give certain extra points to people who are ready to fit into certain economic conditions which are satisfactory. I see no great objection to doing that, but I object to directing people to where they should live. There would be too many exceptions.

● (1650)

Let us suppose that someone comes to a place like Thompson, Manitoba, and then the plant closes down. Is that person supposed to stay there for six months if the plant closes down and there is no employment there? Let us suppose that person has a relative in Toronto. Perhaps I should not mention Toronto; but suppose that relative is very ill and might be dying. We are dealing with human beings, and I think it would be wise to extend to them the same freedoms and privileges we claim for ourselves. Indeed, it would be right to live up to the principles enunciated by the United Nations.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[*English*]

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Order, please. It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 40, to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles)—Veterans Affairs—Number of widows not receiving pensions, and low level of disability pension—government action; the hon. member for Central Nova (Mr. MacKay)—Royal Canadian Mounted Police—Ministerial responsibility for operation of security services—knowledge of minister of allegedly illegal activities; the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre (Mr. McKenzie)—The Canadian economy—Measures to stop exodus of capital to United States—Reason real estate developers will not invest in Canada.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

IMMIGRATION ACT, 1976

AMENDMENTS TO IMPLEMENT CHANGES IN IMMIGRATION POLICY

The House resumed consideration of Bill C-24, respecting immigration to Canada, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): I would like to point out that if the hon. member for Laprairie (Mr. Watson) wishes to withdraw his motion, he needs the unanimous consent of the House. Does the hon. member have unanimous consent to withdraw his motion?

Mr. Watson: I request the unanimous consent of the House to withdraw my motion.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

An hon. Member: On division.

Motion No. 51 (Mr. Watson) withdrawn.

Hon. Bud Cullen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration) moved:

Motion No. 53.

That Bill C-24, respecting immigration to Canada, be amended in clause 121 by striking out lines 4 to 12 at page 71 and substituting the following therefor:

"for the purpose of

(*a*) paying the costs of establishing that they and their families may be granted admission;

(*b*) paying the costs of obtaining transportation to Canada and transportation from the port of arrival to the place of destination in Canada for them and their families; and

(*c*) paying the reasonable living expenses of such persons and their families and such other expenses as are prescribed in order to assist those persons in establishing themselves successfully in Canada."

Motion No. 53 (Mr. Cullen) agreed to.

Mr. R. Gordon L. Fairweather (Fundy-Royal) moved:

Motion No. 54.

That Bill C-24, respecting immigration to Canada, be amended in clause 125 by striking out line 17 at page 73 and substituting the following therefor:

"with this act or the former act at the option of the person concerned with this proceeding."

He said: Mr. Speaker, I really want to test the minister on this one exactly as I did on an earlier motion, and I would be glad if the minister would reassure the House. Then I would ask, in the same way as the hon. member for Laprairie (Mr. Watson), for the permission of the House to have the motion withdrawn. It seems to me that my motion is essentially one of fairness. There are certain tests under the existing act. There are certain requirements, and I suggest that it would be fairer to the immigrant if he could use either the existing ground rules or the new ground rules, depending on his wishes. Somebody in the middle of the process suddenly confronted by this formidable statute might have imposed on him different criteria. I would like to think that this is not true, and if my apprehension is not well founded and the minister can reassure me that there will not be new tests or criteria, I would be glad to ask that my motion be dropped.

Hon. Bud Cullen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, it is my feeling that the motion is, in fact, redundant because by judicial interpretation the clause as it now stands always would be read to ensure that the legislation which is to the person's advantage would be the legislation applied in his case. In most cases the new act will apply. The judicial interpretation is that in most cases the new act will be to the person's advantage, but where it is not— primarily unsuccessful claimants to convention refugee status—the board would, quite legally, act under the former legislation.

To give the person a choice would do the opposite to what the hon. member wishes, since it would permit the person to choose, in ignorance, the option which may very well not be to his advantage.

Mr. Fairweather: I would like permission to withdraw my motion.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Does the hon. member have unanimous consent to withdraw his motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion No. 54 (Mr. Fairweather) withdrawn.

Hon. Bud Cullen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration) moved:

Motion No. 55.

That Bill C-24, respecting immigration to Canada, be amended in the Schedule by striking out subparagraph (b)(ii) in item 6 at page 77 and substituting the following therefor:

"(ii) in prescribed circumstances, is a visitor in Canada or the holder of a permit in Canada within the meaning of the *Immigration Act, 1976*."

He said: Mr. Speaker, this is simply a consequential amendment. It comes about as a result of too zealous an attempt to change the language. It was inhibiting and limiting, and I think this amendment corrects the flaw.

Motion No. 55 (Mr. Cullen) agreed to.

[Mr. Fairweather.]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): The House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred divisions on Bill C-24. Call in the members.

Mr. Goodale: Mr. Speaker, there have been discussions among representatives of the parties. As the House will recall, we have one other item of business with which we would like to deal before the conclusion of the discussion with respect to the immigration bill, and that is the one hour which was mentioned earlier respecting the special order of the House relating to the metric conversion legislation.

I believe there is a disposition in the House at the moment—since we have now concluded all the motions at the report stage of Bill C-24—to defer the votes on those motions until the first order of business tonight at eight o'clock, and to devote the hour which remains before six o'clock to a discussion of the metric conversion legislation. I wonder if Your Honour could confirm that there is that disposition. Then we could use this hour to discuss the metric conversion legislation, proceed with the votes on Bill C-24 this evening, and then move immediately after those votes to the third reading of Bill C-24.

As I make that suggestion, I sincerely apologize to Your Honour and to the officers at the table. The discussions which led to this development took place just now and we did not have an opportunity to alert you before this moment.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I want to concur in what the parliamentary secretary has said. The special order which was made on Friday envisaged that we might complete the report stage of Bill C-24 and then proceed directly to third reading. However, for the purposes of this hour it is agreeable to us to move to consideration of Bill C-23 and complete it. In the order of Friday, the House indicated that this hour would be set aside for the completion of Bill C-23, so we concur in the suggestion made by the parliamentary secretary.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, the suggestion being made is in conformity with the order passed the other day under Standing Order 75A, and it also represents what we have been discussing in the last little while. Just so that we can be clear, I will make one suggestion. If it does not take the full hour to deal with Bill C-23, I suggest we call it six o'clock when we finish Bill C-23, so it is understood that tonight at eight o'clock the bells will be rung to call in the members for the votes on Bill C-24.

Mr. Goodale: Mr. Speaker, just to be technically correct, I think the motion under Standing Order 75A required that this hour be designated by a minister of the Crown, and I invite the President of the Privy Council to make that designation.

● (1700)

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Speaker, I designate whatever is required of this hour to deal with Bill C-23. It is understood that the Minister of State will make a number of amendments to the bill, when consent is given, to go into committee of the

whole for the purpose of amending clauses 2, 6 and 10. It will be possible to come out of committee of the whole and give the bill third reading within that hour. Otherwise, I will be very disappointed, having made the amendments.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

* * *

STATUTE LAW (METRIC CONVERSION) AMENDMENT ACT, 1976

AMENDMENTS TO WHEAT BOARD ACT TO FACILITATE CONVERSION TO METRIC SYSTEM

The House resumed, from Thursday, June 16, consideration of the motion of Mr. Marchand (for the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce) that Bill C-23, to facilitate conversion to the metric system of measurement, be read the third time and do pass.

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Speaker, I believe we require the consent of the House to give authority to return to committee of the whole for consideration of clauses 2, 6 and 10.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): We were never there on this bill.

Mr. MacEachen: Return to, or go into committee of the whole. Whatever words the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) wishes to select, I will concur. May we have consent on that?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Is it agreed that I do now leave the chair to go into committee of the whole on Bill C-23?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

The House went into committee on Bill C-23—Mr. Ethier in the chair.

On clause 2

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Speaker, I hesitate to take the floor in preference to the minister. However, I move:

That Bill C-23, to facilitate conversion to the metric system of measurement, be amended in clause 2

(a) by striking out lines 7 to 13 inclusive on page 1 and substituting the following:

"2. (1) The following provisions of the *Canadian Wheat Board Act*, namely,"

and (b) by striking out line 23 on page 1 and substituting the following:

"(2) This section shall come into force on"

I believe hon. members have had copies of this proposed amendment.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Chairman, I am just a simple city boy. Will somebody tell me what this amendment does?

Mr. Marchand: Mr. Chairman, these three amendments just deal with restoring the acre back into the various pieces of legislation.

Metric System

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Marchand: This one deals with the Wheat Board Act. As hon. members know, we have had many representations from that side and this side of the House relating to the removal of the "hectare" from the four pieces of legislation. We are just restoring the "acre".

Mr. Hnatyshyn: Mr. Chairman, I agree with the explanation given by the minister. However, he left out a very important element of this change. According to the correspondence we have all been receiving from western farmers, they have made a number of representations on this matter and will be very much in favour of this capitulation by the government.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. MacEachen moved:

That Bill C-23, to facilitate conversion to the metric system of measurement, be amended in clause 6

(*a*) by striking out lines 17 to 28 inclusive on page 4 and substituting the following:

"6. (1) The following provisions of the *Prairie Grain Advance Payments Act*, namely,"

(*b*) by striking out line 31 on page 4 and substituting the following:

"(*b*) subsections 4(2) and 7(1), (2) and (4), and"

(*c*) by striking out lines 36 to 44 inclusive on page 4 and lines 1 to 12 on page 5 and substituting the following:

"(2) Paragraph 7.1(4)(*b*) of the said Act is"; and

(*d*) by striking out line 26 on page 5 and substituting the following:

"(3) This section shall come into force on a"

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Does the President of the Privy Council know what he has just said? What does it mean?

Mr. Alexander: Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the minister a question. Does this really mean that "hectare" is dead? Is that what this motion indicates? Seeing that the President of the Privy Council did not answer the question, I thought maybe the minister responsible for small business could answer. Is that what the second amendment means?

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): How do you spell "hectare"?

Mr. Alexander: It does not matter, as long as he is dead.

Mr. Marchand: I do not know what kind of language they use in describing this situation, whether it is dead or not. Certainly, the "hectare" is being removed from the Canadian Wheat Board Act. In this amendment it is removed from the Prairie Grain Advance Payments Act. It restores the "acre" wherever it was used on previous occasions.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Marchand: As far as being dead is concerned, I would like to refer to some words by Premier Lougheed when talking about moves in their legislature not to proceed with converting the usage of "acre" to "hectare". He said that perhaps at some

future date when the education process regarding metric conversion is more complete we can move to the "hectare". But that is not what we are suggesting here.

● (1710)

Mr. Paproski: Another century.

Mr. Marchand: The "hectare" is being removed, and the "acre" is being put back, largely because of pressure by the farmers.

Motion (Mr. MacEachen) agreed to.

Mr. MacEachen moved:

That Bill C-23, to facilitate conversion to the metric system of measurement, be amended in subclause 10(1) by striking out lines 30-32 inclusive on page eight and substituting the following:

"stituting for the word "bushel", wherever it appears therein, the word "tonne".

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Explain.

Motion agreed to.

Bill reported and concurred in.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): When shall the bill be read the third time? Now?

Some hon. Members: By leave, now.

Mr. MacEachen moved that the bill be read the third time and do pass.

Mr. Bill Kempling (Halton-Wentworth): I thought the minister was about to rise, Mr. Speaker, and I was waiting for him to say a few words. I shall be brief, because I understand there has been an all-party agreement to proceed with the third reading of this bill without delay and to accept certain amendments put forward to remove "hectares" as a land measure from the bill.

This whole matter could have been dealt with many months ago. My hon. friend from Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain (Mr. Hamilton) in his opening speech on Bill C-23 offered speedy passage of the measure if the government would abandon its insistence on the use of "hectares" for land measurement. Today, eight months later, we are adopting the same proposal as was made so long ago by my hon. friend. I might mention, also, that an amendment to this effect was put forward in the standing committee, where government members voted against it. There is no doubt that the metric commission has misled the minister, misled the standing committee and misled the House of Commons in connection with this matter. Despite the overwhelming objection of western farmers to the change from "acres" to "hectares", the commission brought witnesses before the inquiry who gave evidence to the contrary. They told us that farmers wholeheartedly supported metric conversion. Yet at the very time the standing committee was hearing evidence with regard to the details of Bill C-23, there was a meeting going on in Ottawa of a large farm federation at a large hotel not far from Parliament Hill. The subject of metrication was brought up at that meeting by farm representatives and provoked such violent discussion and division of opinion that the chairman postponed consideration of the matter so that the meeting could proceed with other business. While this meeting was going on, the farm federation sent a representative here—we are told he was a witness selected by the metric commission—and this witness misled the House.

We have now reached agreement to pass Bill C-23. There is no desire on this side to prolong the debate one moment longer than is necessary, but I feel obliged to mention two points. First, it is evident to everyone that the government's willingness to negotiate with our party with respect to the amendment on the use of the "acres" is a clear victory for those Conservative members from western Canada who listened to their constituents and made their objections known in this chamber. It is also evidence that the hon. member for Crowfoot (Mr. Horner) has been gelded and put out to pasture. In spite of his boast that he would influence the decision, it is obvious he had no influence whatever. In fact, after he had crossed the floor, the government brought this bill forward on three separate occasions and attempted to force it through the House. It should be noted that the hon. member for Crowfoot neither spoke in the debate on this issue nor participated in the committee proceedings. It should also be noted that he did not take part in any of the votes on this bill.

The final point I wish to make, before we move on to other business, has to do with the metric commission itself. We believe the commission should be revamped and shaken up. Someone should really build a fire under it. The commission should now be prepared to make known the balance of the metric conversion program. A complete bill should be brought forward so that parliament might have a chance to comment on the last phases of the metric conversion program. Such a bill should contain a schedule of the statutes which require amendment. In fact, it should include the amendments, together with a time schedule so that we might know when they were to come into effect. I have contended since 1973 that the metric commission is not fulfilling its mandate as set forth in the order in council. In my view, it has failed miserably. The commission owes it to the House and to the people to recommend legislation covering the balance of the conversion program. It should revise its approach to the program and have its annual report ready on time, not eight months late as on the last occasion.

If the commission fails to fulfil its mandate, I believe its members should be discharged as being incompetent. As members of the Conservative party, we shall continue to monitor very closely the work of the commission along with the whole metric conversion program. We urge the commission and the minister to see to it that we receive full value for the money we are spending on conversion and that the program goes forward in a businesslike manner.

Motion agreed to and bill read the third time and passed.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

SUMMER RECESS

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Speaker, I would ask consent to revert to motions for the purpose of passing the adjournment motion, if there is consent that we can do so without debate.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): We are prepared to do so, on the understanding that no debate takes place.

Mr. MacEachen: I should like, then, to read the motion:

That, when the House adjourns following the disposal of the third reading and passage stage of Bill C-24, respecting immigration to Canada, it shall stand adjourned until August 4, 1977 and, when it adjourns on August 5, 1977, it shall stand adjourned until October 17, 1977, provided that at any time prior to that date if it appears to the satisfaction of Mr. Speaker, after consultation with the government, that the public interest requires that the House should meet at an earlier time during the adjournment, Mr. Speaker may give notice that he is so satisfied, and thereupon the House shall meet at the time stated in such notice, and shall transact its business as if it had been duly adjourned to that time; and

That, in the event of Mr. Speaker's being unable to act owing to illness or other cause, the Deputy Speaker or the Deputy Chairman of Committees shall act in his stead for the purpose of reconvening the House.

● (1720)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Six o'clock.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Is it agreed that we call it six o'clock?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): It being six o'clock I do now leave the chair until eight o'clock p.m.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The House met at 8 p.m.

IMMIGRATION ACT, 1976

AMENDMENTS TO IMPLEMENT CHANGES IN IMMIGRATION POLICY

The House resumed consideration of Bill C-24, respecting immigration to Canada, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Having completed the report stage, the House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred divisions on Bill C-24. Call in the members.

● (2020)

Mr. Speaker: The first question is upon motion No. 13.

The House divided on motion No. 13 (Mr. Cullen) which was agreed to on the following division:

(Division No. 98)

YEAS

Messrs.

Anderson	Flynn	MacFarlane
Andras	Foster	MacGuigan
(Port Arthur)	Francis	Marceau
Appolloni (Mrs.)	Gauthier	Marchand
Bégin (Miss)	(Ottawa-Vanier)	McIsaac
Blais	Gillespie	McRae
Blaker	Goodale	Milne
Boulanger	Goyer	Nicholson (Miss)
Breau	Gray	O'Connell
Buchanan	Guay	Parent
Cafik	(St. Boniface)	Pearsall
Campagnolo (Mrs.)	Guay	Penner
Campbell (Miss)	(Lévis)	Portelance
(South Western Nova)	Harquail	Poulin
Campbell	Herbert	Prud'homme
(LaSalle-Émard-Côte	Hopkins	Railton
Saint-Paul)	Isabelle	Reid
Caron	Jamieson	Rompkey
Chrétien	Joyal	Roy
Clermont	Kaplan	(Laval)
Collenette	Lachance	Sauvé (Mrs.)
Condon	Lalonde	Sharp
Corbin	Langlois	Smith
Cullen	Laniel	(Saint-Jean)
Cyr	Lapointe	Stanbury
Danson	Lavoie	Stewart
Demers	LeBlanc	(Cochrane)
Douglas	(Westmorland-Kent)	Stollery
(Bruce-Grey)	Lefebvre	Tessier
Drury	Loiselle	Trudeau
Duclos	(Saint-Henri)	Trudel
Dupont	MacDonald	Turner
Dupras	(Cardigan)	Watson
Duquet	Macdonald	Young—91.
Faulkner	(Rosedale)	
Fleming	MacEachen	

NAYS

Messrs.

Alexander	Gillies	MacKay
Alkenbrack	Hamilton	McCain
Allard	(Swift Current-	McKenzie
Baker	Maple Creek)	McKinley
(Grenville-Carleton)	Hargrave	Muir
Baldwin	Hnatyshyn	Munro
Beatty	Holmes	(Esquimalt-Saanich)
Benjamin	Howie	Nowlan
Brewin	Jarvis	Orlikow
Coates	Kempling	Paproski
Darling	Knowles	Peters
Elzinga	(Winnipeg	Pigott (Mrs.)
Epp	North Centre)	Schumacher
Fairweather	Lambert	Scott
Forrestall	(Edmonton West)	Stanfield
Friesen	La Salle	Stevens
Gilbert	Lawrence	Whittaker—44.

● (2030)

Mr. Speaker: I therefore declare motion No. 13 carried.

Motion No. 13 (Mr. Cullen) agreed to.

Mr. Speaker: The question is on motion No. 14.

The House divided on motion No. 14 (Mr. Brewin) which was negatived on the following division:

(*Division No. 99*)

YEAS

Messrs.

Allard
Benjamin
Brewin
Gilbert
Knowles
(Winnipeg
North Centre)
Orlikow
Peters—7.

NAYS

Messrs.

Alexander
Alkenbrack
Anderson
Andras
(Port Arthur)
Appolloni (Mrs.)
Baker
(Grenville-Carleton)
Baldwin
Beatty
Béchard
Bégin (Miss)
Blais
Blaker
Boulanger
Breau
Buchanan
Campagnolo (Mrs.)
Campbell (Miss)
(South Western Nova)
Campbell
(LaSalle-Émard-Côte
Saint-Paul)
Caron
Chrétien
Clermont
Coates
Collenette
Condon
Corbin
Cullen
Cyr
Danson
Darling
Demers
Douglas
(Bruce-Grey)
Drury
Duclos
Dupont
Dupras
Duquet
Elzinga
Epp
Faulkner
Fleming
Flynn
Forrestall
Foster
Francis
Friesen
Gauthier
(Ottawa-Vanier)
Gillespie
Gillies
Goodale
Goyer
Gray
Guay
(St. Boniface)
Guay
(Lévis)
Hamilton
(Swift Current-
Maple Creek)
Hargrave
Harquail
Herbert
Hnatyshyn
Holmes
Hopkins
Howie
Isabelle
Jamieson
Jarvis
Joyal
Kaplan
Kempling
Lachance
Lalonde
Lambert
(Edmonton West)
Langlois
Laniel
Lapointe
La Salle
Lavoie
Lawrence
LeBlanc
(Westmorland-Kent)
Lefebvre
Loiselle
(Saint-Henri)
MacDonald
(Cardigan)
Macdonald
(Rosedale)
MacEachen
MacFarlane
MacGuigan
MacKay
Marceau
Marchand
McCain
McIsaac
McKenzie
McKinley
McRae
Milne
Muir
Munro
(Esquimalt-Saanich)
Nicholson (Miss)
Nowlan
O'Connell
Paproski
Parent
Pearsall
Penner
Pigott (Mrs.)
Portelance
Poulin
Prud'homme
Railton
Reid
Rompkey
Roy
(Laval)
Sauvé (Mrs.)
Schumacher
Scott
Sharp
Smith
(Saint-Jean)
Stanbury
Stanfield
Stevens
Stewart
(Cochrane)
Stollery
Tessier
Trudeau
Trudel
Turner
Watson
Whittaker
Young—127.

Mr. Speaker: I therefore declare motion No. 14 lost.

Motion No. 14 (Mr. Brewin) negatived.

Mr. Speaker: The question is on motion No. 32.

The House divided on motion No. 32 which was negatived on the following division:

(*Division No. 100*)

YEAS

Messrs.

Allard
Benjamin
Brewin
Duclos
Gilbert
Joyal
Knowles
(Winnipeg
North Centre)
Lachance
Orlikow
Peters—10.

[Mr. Speaker.]

NAYS

Messrs.

Alexander
Alkenbrack
Anderson
Andras
(Port Arthur)
Appolloni (Mrs.)
Baker
(Grenville-Carleton)
Baldwin
Beatty
Béchard
Bégin (Miss)
Blais
Blaker
Boulanger
Breau
Buchanan
Campagnolo (Mrs.)
Campbell (Miss)
(South Western Nova)
Campbell
(LaSalle-Émard-Côte
Saint-Paul)
Caron
Chrétien
Clermont
Coates
Collenette
Condon
Corbin
Cullen
Cyr
Danson
Darling
Demers
Douglas
(Bruce-Grey)
Drury
Dupont
Dupras
Duquet
Elzinga
Epp
Fairweather
Faulkner
Fleming
Flynn
Forrestall
Foster
Francis
Friesen
Gauthier
(Ottawa-Vanier)
Gillespie
Gillies
Goodale
Goyer
Gray
Guay
(St. Boniface)
Guay
(Lévis)
Hamilton
(Swift Current-
Maple Creek)
Hargrave
Harquail
Herbert
Hnatyshyn
Holmes
Hopkins
Howie
Isabelle
Jamieson
Jarvis
Kaplan
Kempling
Lalonde
Lambert
(Edmonton West)
Langlois
Laniel
Lapointe
La Salle
Lavoie
Lawrence
LeBlanc
(Westmorland-Kent)
Lefebvre
Loiselle
(Saint-Henri)
MacDonald
(Cardigan)
Macdonald
(Rosedale)
MacEachen
MacFarlane
MacGuigan
MacKay
Marceau
Marchand
McCain
McIsaac
McKenzie
McKinley
McRae
Milne
Muir
Munro
(Esquimalt-Saanich)
Nicholson (Miss)
Nowlan
O'Connell
Paproski
Parent
Pearsall
Penner
Pigott (Mrs.)
Portelance
Poulin
Prud'homme
Railton
Reid
Rompkey
Roy
(Laval)
Sauvé (Mrs.)
Schumacher
Scott
Sharp
Smith
(Saint-Jean)
Stanbury
Stanfield
Stevens
Stewart
(Cochrane)
Stollery
Tessier
Trudeau
Trudel
Turner
Watson
Whittaker
Young—125.

Mr. Speaker: I therefore declare motion No. 32 lost.

Motion No. 32 (Mr. De Bané) negatived.

● (2040)

Mr. Speaker: The question is on Motion No. 50 in the name of the hon. member for Provencher (Mr. Epp).

The House divided on motion No. 50 which was negatived on the following division:

(*Division No. 101*)

YEAS

Messrs.

Alexander
Alkenbrack
Allard
Baker
(Grenville-Carleton)
Baldwin
Beatty
Benjamin
Brewin
Coates
Darling
Elzinga
Epp
Fairweather
Forrestall
Friesen
Gilbert
Gillies
Hamilton
(Swift Current-
Maple Creek)
Hargrave
Hnatyshyn
Holmes

Messrs.

Howie
Jarvis
Kempling
Knowles
(Winnipeg
North Centre)
Lambert
(Edmonton West)
La Salle
Lawrence
MacKay
McCain
McKenzie
McKinley
Muir
Munro
(Esquimalt-Saanich)
Nowlan
Orlikow
Paproski
Peters
Pigott (Mrs.)
Schumacher
Scott
Stanfield
Stevens
Whittaker—44.

NAYS

Messrs.

Anderson
Andras
(Port Arthur)
Appolloni (Mrs.)
Béchard
Bégin (Miss)
Blais
Blaker
Boulanger
Breau
Buchanan
Campagnolo (Mrs.)
Campbell (Miss)
(South Western Nova)
Campbell
(LaSalle-Émard-Côte
Saint-Paul)
Caron
Chrétien
Clermont
Collenette
Condon
Corbin
Cullen
Cyr
Danson
Demers
Douglas
(Bruce-Grey)
Drury
Duclos
Dupont
Dupras
Duquet
Faulkner
Fleming
Flynn
Foster
Francis
Gauthier
(Ottawa-Vanier)
Gillespie
Goodale
Goyer
Gray
Guay
(St. Boniface)
Guay
(Lévis)
Harquail
Herbert
Hopkins
Isabelle
Jamieson
Joyal
Kaplan
Lachance
Lalonde
Langlois
Laniel
Lapointe
Lavoie
LeBlanc
(Westmorland-Kent)
Lefebvre
Loiselle
(Saint-Henri)
MacDonald
(Cardigan)
Macdonald
(Rosedale)
MacEachen
MacFarlane
MacGuigan
Marceau
Marchand
McIsaac
McRae
Milne
Nicholson (Miss)
O'Connell
Parent
Pearsall
Penner
Portelance
Poulin
Prud'homme
Railton
Reid
Rompkey
Roy
(Laval)
Sauvé (Mrs.)
Sharp
Smith
(Saint-Jean)
Stanbury
Stewart
(Cochrane)
Stollery
Tessier
Trudeau
Trudel
Turner
Watson
Young—91.

Mr. Speaker: I declare the motion lost.

Motion No. 50 (Mr. Epp) negatived.

Mr. Speaker: The question is on motion No. 52 in the name of the hon. member for Greenwood (Mr. Brewin).

The House divided on the motion No. 52 which was negatived on the following division.

(*Division No. 102*)

YEAS

Messrs.

Allard
Benjamin
Brewin
Duclos
Gilbert
Joyal
Knowles
(Winnipeg
North Centre)
Lachance
Orlikow
Peters—10.

NAYS

Messrs.

Alexander
Alkenbrack
Anderson
Andras
(Port Arthur)
Appolloni (Mrs.)
Baker
(Grenville-Carleton)
Baldwin
Beatty
Béchard
Bégin (Miss)
Blais
Blaker
Boulanger
Breau
Buchanan
Campagnolo (Mrs.)
Campbell (Miss)
(South Western Nova)
Campbell
(LaSalle-Émard-Côte
Saint-Paul)
Caron
Chrétien
Clermont
Coates
Collenette
Condon
Corbin
Cullen
Cyr
Danson
Darling
Demers
Douglas
(Bruce-Grey)
Drury
Dupont
Dupras
Duquet
Elzinga
Epp
Faulkner
Fleming
Flynn
Forrestall
Foster
Francis
Friesen
Gauthier
(Ottawa-Vanier)
Gillespie
Gillies
Goodale
Goyer
Gray
Guay
(St. Boniface)
Guay
(Lévis)
Hamilton
(Swift Current-
Maple Creek)
Hargrave
Harquail
Herbert
Hnatyshyn
Holmes
Hopkins
Howie
Isabelle
Jamieson
Jarvis
Kaplan
Kempling
Lalonde
Lambert
(Edmonton West)
Langlois
Laniel
Lapointe
La Salle
Lavoie
Lawrence
LeBlanc
(Westmorland-Kent)
Lefebvre
Loiselle
(Saint-Henri)
MacDonald
(Cardigan)
Macdonald
(Rosedale)
MacEachen
MacFarlane
MacGuigan
MacKay
Marceau
Marchand
McCain
McIsaac
McKenzie
McKinley
McRae
Milne
Muir
Munro
(Esquimalt-Saanich)
Nicholson (Miss)
Nowlan
O'Connell
Paproski
Parent
Pearsall
Penner
Pigott (Mrs.)
Portelance
Poulin
Prud'homme
Railton
Reid
Rompkey
Roy
(Laval)
Sauvé (Mrs.)
Schumacher
Scott
Sharp
Smith
(Saint-Jean)
Stanbury
Stanfield
Stevens
Stewart
(Cochrane)
Stollery
Tessier
Trudeau
Trudel
Turner
Watson
Whittaker
Young—124.

Mr. Speaker: I declare the motion lost.

Motion No. 52 (Mr. Brewin) negatived.

• (2050)

Hon. Bud Cullen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration) moved that Bill C-24, an act respecting immigration to Canada, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration, be concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Speaker: When shall the bill be read the third time? By leave, now?

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): By order, now.

Mr. Speaker: By order of the House.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Cullen moved that the bill be read the third time and passed.

He said: Mr. Speaker, when I moved second reading of Bill C-24 I gave a brief historical account of the development of the legislation we now have before us. I pointed out that it was a bill in whose preparation thousands of Canadians had participated. They did so in part through the instrument of the Special Joint Committee on Immigration Policy which held hearings throughout Canada from May to November, 1975. Some Canadians submitted briefs through their members; others sent them directly to myself or to the department.

Since then the bill has had the benefit of a most thorough review by the Standing Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration. That committee invited to appear before it many of the organizations which had appeared during 1975 so that it could determine the degree to which the earlier expressed views had been interpreted in terms of legislation.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I regret having to interrupt the minister but I do so for the sole purpose of asking hon. members who are not interested in listening to the speech of the minister please to leave the House quickly so that other hon. members who are interested can hear what is being said.

Mr. Cullen: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In my attendance at that committee's sessions I was impressed with the depth of knowledge and the interest of individual members in a law which will have such an impact on the conduct of Canada's immigration program in the future. I was impressed too with the essentially non-partisan approach which the members adopted during their clause by clause review, in their efforts to formulate legislation which I believe is a model in this field. Members approached the subject with the same open-mindedness to immigration which I suggest the government has had since it originated the review of immigration policy in 1973.

To underline the constructive attitude which members of the committee adopted toward the bill, one should note the sources of the amendments. A number were proposed by both opposition and Liberal members of the committee and were accepted by the government. Others were accepted in part by the government and were either modified by the proposer or by a government spokesman. Still others were moved on behalf of the government. Taken as a whole, I believe that these changes have resulted in an even better piece of legislation.

When I spoke on March 10 I described what I considered to be the major features of the bill. I would remind the House of what they are and how they have been improved by the amendments which were made in committee.

The first feature of the bill to which I referred last March was its establishment, in Clause 3, of the objectives which will govern future immigration policy. The committee endorsed those objectives but amended the preamble to the clause to declare "that the rules and regulations made under this act" would recognize those objectives. That, of course, is entirely acceptable and reinforces the government's intent when it drafted this clause.

The second point which I made at second reading was that the bill represents a new approach to the prohibited classes particularly by its removal of the archaic provisions of the present act concerning criminal and medical classes. I am particularly pleased that the unqualified ban against epileptics has been removed. The bill which has issued from the committee confirms this approach. Improvements have been made. For example, when dealing with persons seeking entry to Canada who have committed offences outside this country, it is now clearer that those offences must have a relationship to Canadian law.

I believe hon. members will find that the committee has improved Clause 19(1)(d) which is aimed at persons engaged in organized criminal activity. It describes more precisely than the original subsection the very sort of person and activity from whom we are attempting to protect the Canadian public.

The third reference I made related to the volume of the immigration movement. I stated that the bill removed the determination of immigration flow from the current practice of administrative decision. It provides for forward planning of the immigration program. In doing so it involves the provinces in the process. The amended bill fortifies the government's decision of adopting a new and open approach. It requires the minister responsible for immigration to table in this House not later than November 1 of each year a report which will indicate the immigration target for the following calendar year. That report will also indicate in which way demographic factors were taken into account when the annual target was determined.

On my fourth point, I dealt with the regulation making powers of the government and the minister. I indicated that the almost unlimited authority given in the current act was being replaced by a much more precise delineation of those powers.

While the bill was in committee I arranged for an amendment to be made to combine Clauses 115 and 116 which provided for governor in council and ministerial regulations respectively. While both sets of regulations are published in the *Canada Gazette* I considered that it would be less confusing to the public if only a single set of regulations were reported.

With respect to regulations, I was pleased to support an amendment in committee which would require certain of the regulations to be published in the *Canada Gazette* and the text laid before parliament 30 days prior to the coming into force of such regulations.

The fifth topic on which I spoke was refugees. I think it is true to say that it was a subject that concerned the members of the standing committee and the witnesses who appeared before it more than any other. There was a common feeling, in which the government fully shared, that Canada's refugee policy should not only live up to the obligations of the United Nations Convention to which we adhere, but that the bill should also reflect the humanitarian selection policy we have been following for more than 30 years.

In the achievement of these ends several changes were made to the bill in committee stage. An amendment to Clause 4 made it clear that a convention refugee who is in visitor status cannot be deported for minor offences. To underline what had been the government's original intent, Clause 6 was amended to emphasize that special selection criteria would be applied to refugees. I hope that this will finally clear up a misconception held by many groups that refugees will be selected under the same criteria as independent immigrants. That was never our proposal in the first place, and I am pleased to have our position clarified in this way.

The government proposed an amendment in committee which puts into law the present practice of permitting a refugee claimant in Canada to have a counsel while he or she is being examined.

I am now more confident than ever that the refugee sections of the bill are among the most generous in the world. They far exceed our international obligations in terms of the acceptance and protection of refugees.

My sixth point related to the protection of Canada from threats which did not exist in 1952 when the current act was passed. Terrorism and hijacking are contemporary crimes, perpetrated by individuals who give no advance warning of their intended deeds. The committee recognized the need for legislation to deal with these potential crimes.

● (2100)

My final point was on the safeguarding of civil liberties. I believe Bill C-24 unquestionably achieves this goal. Even potential or actual terrorists, or members of organized crime, have a right to a hearing, although in a small minority of cases they may not be made aware of all the allegations against them in order to protect sensitive information or even the life of the person who gave it. Elsewhere every subject of an immigration inquiry will know precisely the allegations against him. In addition, he will have the right to counsel and, if he chooses, the public may attend the hearing. The officer presiding over the case, known as an adjudicator, does not participate in the development of the case and renders his decision exclusively on the information adduced at the inquiry. This is an improvement over the present situation where a special inquiry officer not only prepares and presents the department's case but also renders the decision.

The same rights of appeal to the independent Immigration Appeal Board will be carried into the new legislation, but it will now be possible for an appellant to seek the board's compassionate consideration without contesting the legality of the removal order.

Parliament has been involved in the preparation of this legislation for some two and one half years. That was preceded by a year and a half of activity by the department in the preparation of the green paper. This has been a long process, but the quality of the bill now before us justifies the extended preparation that has gone into it.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Jake Epp (Provencher): Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to be very long tonight. It is the hope of our party that this bill will go through third reading this evening and that our work will be completed.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Epp: I should like to echo the words of the hon. minister regarding committee stage. It was a very fine working committee, and in non-partisan manner it attempted to improve the legislation. As I said during report stage, we have reported back and improved this bill. On behalf of my party, I should like to say that we will support this legislation on third reading if a vote is called.

All of us who have been involved realize that a new immigration act is needed. I am pleased to see that the Immigration Act contains some objectives regarding Canada's new immigration policy. The minister and I do not agree totally as to the scope of those objectives. Some of us wanted to see them go a little further, especially my favourite whipping horse, namely, the demographic policy. The minister has accepted a partial step in that direction, which will place before parliament the target for immigration flow. It does not take a look at internal migration. While this is not within the exclusive purview of the Department of Manpower and Immigration, I urge the minister, and those who sit on the interdepartmental council, that a very clear-cut demographic policy be placed before us in the very near future.

Immigration cannot be rationalized without having a demographic policy and knowing exactly what are the objectives. We feel the amendment of the hon. member for Greenwood (Mr. Brewin) should have been included. Immigration should not only reflect Canada's bilingual nature, but it should reflect Canada's multicultural nature. Unfortunately that was not accepted by the government. That concept was in the original draft of the bill and it was presented to Liberal caucus. It was at that point that it was very hotly debated and finally rejected. It is absolutely unacceptable for the Minister of State for Multiculturalism (Mr. Guay) to get up in his place and vote against—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I regret to interrupt the hon. member, but he should be aware of the fact that a decision has been rendered by the House on this motion. I do not think the hon. member is in line to criticize a vote by one of his colleagues.

Mr. Epp: Mr. Speaker, I thank you for that direction.

Mr. Paproski: In any event, he voted against it.

Mr. Epp: This party wanted to see included in the objectives the multicultural aspect of Canada. Unfortunately that will not be the case.

Mr. Paproski: Right, but we will let the people in western Canada know.

Mr. Epp: The removal of prohibition against those for medical reasons from the 1952 bill is an improvement. The removal of the prohibition against epileptics whose condition is medically controlled is another improvement. The minister should be reminded of the commitment made by his officials at committee stage regarding persons present in Canada on the minister's permission. These persons were not given landed immigrant status. They will be contacted by the department and granted landed immigrant status after the bill is proclaimed. These persons will be granted a landed immigrant status and a calculation will be made as to the residency requirement in conjunction with the Department of the Secre-

tary of State. Hopefully that will lead to citizenship for these people.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Epp: All of us can take pride in the fact that for the first time in Canada's immigration legislation we have a clear-cut definition of refugees and also a claim for refugee status. All members of the committee wanted to see this incorporated into the act. It is pleasing to see, after many representations from various interest groups across the country, that a refugee policy has been incorporated into the bill. Members of the United Nations Commission on refugees feel that it is a forerunner of refugee legislation.

From time to time too much stress has been placed on the so-called civil liberties of persons who have been on the fringes of a criminal element. It has concerned me that these people should be afforded every civil liberty. On the other hand there were members of the committee who seemed to stress the civil liberties of these persons over the protection of Canadians. This government has lost the handle on immigration. Canada's immigration laws have not been administered strongly enough. People have come into Canada and used Canada as a base to continue their criminal activities. I am referring to a very small number of people. That is not part of immigration and it should not be accepted by Canadians.

The minister's powers in this new legislation should prevent the criminal element from coming into Canada. He has the power to deport, and that is what is expected of him. It has nothing to do with the landing of bona fide immigrants who want to come to this country and start a new life, thus giving us the benefit of their experience and their ability. It has nothing to do with persons who try to exploit this country and beat the law. That is not what we want to see in the act. Criticism has been strongly levelled at the minister. He should use the act in such a manner that criminals will not use Canada as a base for their activities. It is for this reason we have endorsed clauses which may be wide-reaching and discretionary, new clauses regarding organized crime, terrorists and hijacking. This is an ongoing phenomenon in our modern world, and we need a law whereby the minister and his officials can act quickly and forcibly to protect Canadian society.

● (2110)

There is one other matter that I want to bring to the attention of the House tonight, and that is the matter of immigrant selection. Hon. members opposite know that I have favoured an immigration selection system based on the point system whereby we would have a sponsored class, a refugee class, and an independent class. The minister and his officials also know that we have recommended the expansion of the sponsored class and the removal of the nominated class. One might say that that means that one is opposed to such objectives as timely reunification. That is not the case. I believe that the reunification of next of kin, of those within the nuclear family, is well taken care of in the sponsored class, especially if we expand it to the sponsorship of parents of any age.

I am concerned that with the point system as it is now retained what will happen is that the percentage of the total flow of the so-called nominated class will increase to the point where independent immigrants will have a very difficult time in coming into Canada. There is a distinct advantage for a person getting points to have some family relationship. What I would have preferred is that all those apply as independent immigrants. They would then come into the country, it is true, and adjust to Canadian society with the assistance of their families. I feel very strongly that we will see the day when the sponsor of the refugee class will take such a high proportion of our annual flow that the independent immigrant who is willing to go to areas outside our cities—and studies show this is the group that has frequently gone to the outlying areas—will have much greater difficulty coming to this country, and I do not believe our immigration policy should be structured in that way.

In conclusion I would like to say that we have a better bill than before, a better immigration policy, and members of this House are pleased to see the end of the exercise. It is for that reason we will be supporting it on final reading.

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, I tried to make clear in the debate on second reading, and indeed in discussions in the committee, that I am quite prepared to admit that there are some features of the present legislation which are satisfactory, and improvements on what we had before, and I am also prepared to admit that the committee produced some useful amendments. Nevertheless, we think we have a bad bill and we should vote against it.

There are three areas in which the bill is unsatisfactory. First, the bill contains provisions which seriously jeopardize the right to proper hearings and fundamental freedoms. The main sections which are unsatisfactory are found in Clauses 19 and 27 dealing with reports against persons in Canada providing for their removal or deportation. I will not go over the whole argument in respect of Clause 19—members of the committee have heard me speak on it more than once and they must probably be getting a little tired of it—but the difficulty is that Clause 19 gives the right to refuse admission on the basis of speculative opinions and suspicions of immigration officers. This is in direct contradiction of what was previously in the Immigration Act. It was only when a person was convicted of certain kinds of criminal acts, or admitted to the commission of such acts, that he or she might be deported.

It has long been a basic principle of justice as it is known in Canada that a person should not be penalized for things he might do at some future time but has not done. What he is likely to do is purely a matter of speculation, and it is wrong that a person should be condemned, with the severe consequence of deportation, on the basis of committing one or more indictable offences, when some of these offences are relatively trivial. Nor should persons be liable to deportation because an immigration officer believes that there are reasonable grounds to assume that such a person will engage in subversion by force

of any government. Any democratic government would have some sympathy for them, but some Canadian immigrants come from countries in which brutal dictatorships deny fundamental human rights, deny any possibility of a peaceful change, and indeed engage in widespread torture. The previous act dealt with this matter by referring to democratic governments, and I am prepared to see our immigration law seeking to protect democratic governments, but I see no reason why we should seek to protect regimes such as the one in Uganda at present, or those in some parts of South America and other parts of the world.

Another subclause makes liable to deportation a person who is a member of or is likely to participate in local activities and organizations likely to engage in such acts of violence. In the world as we know it today there are many organizations in different parts of the world engaged in many different ways of doing things. In other parts of the world there are people who are held down by violence and terror, and if they desire to change these regimes in order to assist their country, that is no good reason for Canada to refuse them admission. But it is quite possible that members of these organizations in Canada know nothing about the so-called violent activities of other members of an organization in another section of the world—they are perfectly innocent of any offence, and to penalize a person who is not knowingly guilty of any offence is wrong. It is what people do in Canada that should be of importance.

Clause 27 provides that where a person other than a Canadian citizen or permanent resident obtains entry by reason of any fraud or improper means of representation or any material fact, he or she can be deported. The American clause that covers this refers to wilful misrepresentation of any material facts. Our courts have interpreted an act similar to Clause 27(h) as applying even where the misrepresentation of material facts is without any intent to deceive. It is indeed a harsh penalty to refuse admission in such a case.

Every police officer, every immigration officer, is given the power to arrest without a warrant. The need to secure a warrant is a reasonable protection. It can usually be obtained on an affidavit or other sworn document. The deputy minister or senior immigration officer may issue such a warrant on reasonable grounds. Therefore there should be no difficulty for an immigration officer seeking to make an arrest in securing a warrant, and this would give adequate protection by having two different people, a senior member of the department or an immigration officer, look into the question of whether there is a proper basis for detention. It is extremely dangerous to give this power allowing wide groups of people, some trained and some not trained, to arrest on their own initiative at any time of the day or night. It removes a most important bulwark to hasty and ill-considered arrests.

The act still contains some provisions to permit fingerprinting, although it does not apply them with uniformity. People who come from the United States or the United Kingdom do not require visas and therefore are not liable to be fingerprinted. I am not personally very violently against fingerprinting, but it has been associated with criminal activities, and it is wrong for it to be required for certain classes of immigrants and not required for other immigrants. One thing that adds to the vice of deporting people on the grounds of suspicion is that the right of appeal to the Immigration Appeal Board is severely limited. In order to be sure of proper hearings all cases of deportation should be subject to appeal.

● (2120)

The second major objection we have was mentioned at second reading. That is that some of the most important provisions with respect to immigrants are delegated to the governor in council, and any parliamentary control, even of some of the key factors, is done away with.

Clause 115 deals with the making of regulations. There are 18 different classes of matters. Some of these are matters of detail, and it is perfectly reasonable to make rules and regulations without reference to parliament, but there are three subclauses in Clause 115(a) which provide for the establishment and application of selection criteria based on such factors as family relationships, education, and skill.

I do not need to read the whole group of things which are to be taken into account. At the very core of the Immigration Act are the standards by which we admit people, yet that is not delegated to parliament, and parliament has no real input whatever into the process.

Clause 115(b) deals with sponsored applicants. We say very piously in Clause 3 that one of the main purposes of the bill is to aid in the reunion of families. Then, instead of insisting that the rules in this respect be set out by acts of parliament so that they can be seen by all, we say that the rules with respect to this shall be delegated to the governor in council. Of course we do not really mean the governor in council. We know that the governor in council does not have time to deal with all these immigration matters. We mean the people who advise the Minister of Manpower and Immigration.

By changing the regulations the government on a number of occasions has totally changed the law and caused the number of immigrants to vary very widely either up or down. Some of this may be necessary, but the important laws should be made by parliament. I tried in two amendments to introduce provisions which would enable parliament to intervene. The first was to define "family" for the purposes of sponsorship by setting out precise relationships.

The second amendment I proposed was that any regulations passed under Clause 115(a), (b) and (c) could be brought before parliament by a petition of 20 members, to be followed by debate and recorded vote within a certain limited time. This would make it necessary that all regulations under (a), (b) or (c) would be reviewed in parliament where 20 members are sufficiently concerned to take action by petition to secure parliamentary approval. The difference between the minister and my party on this lies in our evaluation of the role and supremacy of parliament. There are, of course, many other clauses of the bill which are to be dealt with by regulation.

As far as the principle of acceptance of refugees is concerned the minister said that we have a wonderful scheme for

refugees, but no member of the committee knows what it is because it is in regulations which have not been published. We really do not know whether his words of praise for the regulations or proposals are justified or not justified. Terms and conditions which may be imposed on immigrants when they come to Canada are to be dealt with by regulation, and they are yet to be prescribed. I could go through the bill and find time and time again the reference in clauses "as prescribed by the regulations".

One of the difficulties of having everything done by regulations is the lack of public knowledge or, in fact, the secrecy with which some of these regulations are dealt. The minister did, as he has told us, indeed cause an amendment to Clause 115 to be proposed which provided that regulations passed under subclauses (a), (b) or (c) would not come into force unless published in the *Canada Gazette*. However, the *Canada Gazette* is packed with volumes of material, and it is almost impossible to find anything in it. I defy a layman or a new immigrant to be able to make head or tail of what is in the *Canada Gazette*. It would be extremely difficult to find the relevant provisions. The average immigrant would be completely at a loss, even if he did find the appropriate regulation. They are often highly complicated. The amendments I proposed were turned down, so we did not have and will not have a direct parliamentary say in these crucial matters.

There are one or two other matters I would like to call to the attention of the House. One has to do with security matters. These are very elaborate provisions allowing the minister or the Solicitor General (Mr. Fox) to give certificates, and an advisory board to make recommendations, and then for the governor in council to order deportation after considering the reports of the special advisory board.

The weakness of all this is that what should be a matter of judicial power is given to political officers. I think that is quite wrong. It is wrong to say that procedures could not be devised which would enable a review of these cases by judicial officers. During the last war the defence of Canada regulations were passed giving to the then minister of justice, Mr. Louis St. Laurent, the power to detain and intern persons who, in his opinion, might be dangerous to the state. A fairly large number of persons was so detained. Eventually, however, parliament approved of a change whereby county and superior court judges could have hearings in such cases, and provision was made in cases where information was confidential not to publicize the sources of that information. This system worked perfectly well, and many persons were released. No difficulties seemed to result. I proposed such an amendment in straightforward terms to this section of the present act. This again was turned down.

The minister has developed a habit of saying that if a change is made, it would be a threat to the whole administration of the Immigration Act. What we have been primarily concerned about has been fairness and justice so that human beings facing the prospects of deportation can have fair hearings and an opportunity to meet the cases against them.

[Mr. Brewin.]

One other clause has been mentioned by the hon. member for Provencher (Mr. Epp). I find that clause very strange indeed. Clause 3 sets out the purposes of Canadian immigration policy and includes, as one of the main purposes, enriching and strengthening the cultural and social fabric of Canada, taking into account the federal and bilingual character of Canada. I proposed an amendment which would have added the multicultural nature of Canada. I was, of course, referring to the thousands of people—nay, perhaps millions—who come to Canada from countries other than Britain and France.

I am told that there are as many as perhaps three million from different ethnic backgrounds in Canada. They are particularly concerned about the management of immigration. Many of them have not been in this country very long, and they still have friends and relatives in the countries from which they came. There is a general statement of purpose in Clause 3, and I think it justifies consultation with these groups. As a matter of fact, some of the very best recommendations the committee received were from some of the so-called ethnic, multicultural groups. They have a right to be interested. They are not second class citizens. They are Canadians. We are all Canadians together, and no differences of culture should provide even a verbal exclusion of these people.

• (2130)

I am sure there are many other things that can be said about the bill. I am trying to bring out the salient features. I would like to finish by saying two things. First, we must always remember when discussing immigration that we are dealing with persons, human beings. It is all very well to be practical, to look into the economics and consider our own security. However, we must also in our own interests look at the human side of these problems.

These, therefore, are my three main objections. First is Clause 19 which condemns people on speculation and suspicion. Second is the refusal to recognize that the regulations are often not the right way to deal with key parts of the statute. The third is the recognition of the multicultural nature of Canada. I therefore move, seconded by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles):

> That the motion be amended by striking out all the words after the word "That", and by substituting therefor the following words:
>
> "Bill C-24, An Act respecting immigration to Canada, be not now read a third time, but that it be referred back to the Standing Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration for the purpose of reconsidering Clauses 3, 19 and 115 thereof.".

Mr. Roger Young (Niagara Falls): Mr. Speaker, my remarks at this stage of the debate will be very brief indeed. In view of the fact that Bill C-24 has been in preparation for two years or more, that there have been extensive hearings across the country, and even more extensive hearings in committee, and that we have had extensive and complete debate at second reading and report stage, pursuant to Standing Order 6(5)(*a*) I move, seconded by the hon. member for Grand Falls-White Bay-Labrador (Mr. Rompkey):

That this House continue sitting beyond the ordinary time of daily adjournment this day for the purpose of continuing the consideration of the third reading stage of Bill C-24, An Act respecting immigration to Canada.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Hon. members are aware that Standing Order 6(5)(*a*) permits a member to move such a motion to sit beyond the normal hours of sitting for the purpose of considering a specified item of business. Such a motion should be moved in the hour preceding the hour of adjournment. The Standing Order is very clear. It provides for the Speaker to put the question to the House. If fewer than ten members rise to indicate their opposition to the motion, the motion is declared as being adopted. I invite hon. members who are opposed to this motion to rise at this time.

And fewer than ten members having risen:

Mr. Deputy Speaker: There not being ten members indicating their opposition to the motion, I declare the motion carried.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Benno Friesen (Surrey-White Rock): Mr. Speaker, I begin by saying it would be a great disservice to the country if the motion proposed by the hon. member for Greenwood (Mr. Brewin) were passed. It is time that we passed this measure to give Canadians the immigration bill for which they have waited much too long.

On second reading debate I could not find it within my convictions to support this bill. I felt that the measures in it were far too open ended. They gave the minister too much power to change the immigration policy of the government simply by altering regulations with little reference to parliament, only by order in council.

That kind of power has distorted the demographics of Canada for the past 15 years. We do not need to extend that power now. For that reason, and for the reason of the loose definition of the family, I felt it was a very poor bill and could not vote in favour of it.

Having worked in committee and having seen some of the amendments that have been passed, I am pleased to see what has happened and the openness on the part of the minister to accept amendments. Therefore I am in favour of what is happening, even though the bill is still imperfect in many ways.

If we are going to talk about immigration, we need to concern ourselves with two very important principles. First, in looking at an immigration policy for Canada we must look to further the interests and welfare of Canada. That is our responsibility. I am very concerned about the humanitarian objectives that we as Canadians need to espouse and cultivate in our country.

It seems to me that those who are interested in coming to Canada are interested in Canada for one reason. Our country is different from theirs. They not only come here because Canada is attractive to them but because the place in which they are is unattractive to them. They want to leave the circumstances in which they find themselves.

• (2140)

If we are to preserve an attractive country we must preserve the characteristics which made it attractive and which we enjoy today. In order to do this we must maintain a sensitive control of immigration flow. For this reason I would be happier if the regulations were contained in the bill. Nevertheless, I am pleased to see that one of the amendments, an amendment to Clause 3, calls for the rules and regulations made by the immigration department to be in conformity with the objectives of the bill. That is an acceptable compromise and therefore I am happy to support the bill.

Mr. Benjamin: Happy?

Mr. Friesen: Yes, I am happy.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Friesen: Members of the NDP would like to slow down passage of the bill and make it more difficult for the epileptics who need it to come into the country. They show such concern about the criminal element getting justice that they are willing to jeopardize justice for people who cannot help themselves. The flow of immigration must be controlled in order to preserve the employment climate, and at a time when we have between 800,000 and one million unemployed we cannot justify unlimited immigration.

One of our objectives must be the encouragement of entrepreneurial growth through the admission of immigrants with appropriate background and qualification.

An hon. Member: And money!

Mr. Friesen: Yes, provided it is honest money, not the kind which in the past has allegedly come from Hong Kong. So the first principle is that of preserving the well-being of Canada. The second is that immigration rules must be fair. There are those who feel this means we must cater to the most needy and that by doing this we would be fulfilling humanitarian goals. I suggest that the people who are most needy are those who do not even know Canada exists; if we were to take care of the most needy people of all, we ought to bring them here. Then we would face the difficulty of accepting immigrants who were incapable of standing the culture shock. If we cannot work on the principle of bringing in the most needy, we must work on the basis of fairness and we must be prepared to do our very best to give all the information which is needed by those who desire it. They have the right, for instance, to know how they are to be judged. Up to now, a large part of the statute and of the regulations was veiled in obscurity.

Consider the criteria which apply to health qualifications. All too often people do not know why they have failed. That is why I was disappointed in the amendment which the minister brought in at the report stage to limit an amendment which had already been agreed upon unanimously in committee. We agreed that if an applicant had a health problem he should

have the right to the opinion of a competent health specialist in addition to that of the examining doctor. But the minister told us at the report stage that he had changed his mind, that the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Lalonde) had whispered in his ear that this was not a workable program. Mr. Speaker, the minister of health had better be called the minister of stealth because he is sneaking in his own ideas, as if the minister directly responsible could not run his department properly. He is claiming he knows better. He is aspiring to godhead. He knows better, so he is overriding the wisdom of the committee, including the opinion of the staff of the department who agreed that this was a workable amendment and a good policy.

An hon. Member: Perhaps a ghost writer did it.

Mr. Friesen: Yes, perhaps a ghost writer did that for him—and it will come back to haunt him. The minister of health was looking after his own welfare and that of his bureaucrats when he revised that policy. Representations were brought to us by the National Association of the Mentally Retarded. They said it was easy enough for an immigration officer to betray his bias when examining an immigrant, and that it was not fair that the fate of an application should rest upon the opinion of one medical officer; there should be the right of recourse to the opinion of a specialist. But the minister of health knows better than those who specialize in various areas. He has never dealt with these cases. He has never been in contact with a family whose child might be retarded, or considered as being retarded. Because he is a Rhodes scholar he has never entered into the world of such a family or felt for its needs.

I think it is a shame that the minister has seen fit to bring in an amendment which waters down the protection afforded to applicants in such cases. The principle is the right to know. Under present circumstances when a case rests upon the opinion of one medical officer there is no way in which an applicant can feel sure his application is being rejected fairly. Under the amendment which unfortunately the House has just passed, the application simply goes to a second medical officer, a process which does nothing for the applicant and gives him no extra protection. All it means is a shuffling of folders and application forms in some immigration office overseas.

If we are to be fair, we must eliminate bias and prejudice. It is all too easy in the world in which we live for an immigration officer in any country abroad to get tired of looking at applications, tired of making decisions. In this connection, I think of the line which reads: "And wretches hang that jurymen may dine". I can offer the House a perfect illustration.

Some time ago a constituent of mine came to see me, with his wife. They are from India. They wanted to enter Canada but they had a teen-aged son who suffered from a serious heart condition. The medical officer examining them said the rest of the family could enter as immigrants but the son could not pass the medical test because of his heart condition. In view of the exigencies of the family's situation in India, the family decided to come to Canada and leave the child in the care of an uncle. The uncle formally adopted him so that the rest of the family could come here.

• (2150)

Once here, naturally they were lonesome for their son. They earned enough money to supply him with an air ticket so that he could visit them. While he was here they took him to a heart specialist. The heart specialist said he had a very severe problem but that the operation was not very severe and the boy could be taken care of very quickly. This they proceeded to do; the young boy underwent an operation and was cured 100 per cent. The family wants to bring him to Canada but he is now a member of a different family. If the minister had adopted the amendment we put forward in committee that would not have happened. The medical officer would have been required to pass the application on to the responsible medical specialist who would have said that he could take care of it. A general practitioner would not have looked at the matter.

The minister of health who is supposed to be looking after the welfare of people I say has done a disservice to some Canadians as well as discriminated against some who want to come to Canada to join their families. He has displayed his bias, and I say shame on him.

I do not want to prolong the debate. I just want to bring to the attention of hon. members what we have done to some families who want to come to Canada. They have been done harm. We have talked about prejudice. People come to my office every month who seem to think that prejudice exists in the immigration system. People from England say that it would be easier to reunite their families if they were from some country other than England. They believe there is prejudice. It is time that we made our immigration policy as open as possible in the sense of information, so that both by statute and by published regulations people know how their applications to come to Canada will be judged.

That is all I have to say, Mr. Speaker. I trust we will end this debate soon and give the Canadian people the Immigration Act that they deserve.

Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North): Mr. Speaker, I have no intention of keeping the House very long, although I think we could have done without the motion which was moved a few moments ago.

I have been surprised at some of the comments which the minister made. It is true that both at second reading stage and in committee there was a great deal of discussion and exchange of opinions among members. Representations were made by a very wide variety of organizations. However, I cannot agree with the minister when he suggests that the committee approached questions with an open mind. He inferred, if he did not actually say so, that the committee reached a consensus. Anyone who has read the minutes of the meetings will realize that there were many submissions made by organizations which were not accepted by the government. A similar fate befell many of the most important suggestions

and draft amendments made by members from all parties, including members on the government side.

We oppose this bill for the reason which some of us outlined at the report stage in some detail, as did my colleague the hon. member for Greenwood (Mr. Brewin) tonight. We believe that the bill gives much too much power and authority to the department and its officials. This does not mean that we think the policy in past years has been bad. It does not mean that we think we have permitted too many people to come to Canada or that we believe that the wrong kind of people have come to Canada. We just do not believe that any individuals or departments should be given the power virtually over life and death that is given in this bill to those who work for the government.

We do not believe, as we have made clear at all stages of debate that regulations drafted by public servants and adopted by cabinet, regulations which are not discussed or debated in parliament, are the way to formulate immigration policy.

I do not believe that this bill is as good as its proponents have suggested. Nor do I believe it is as bad as its opponents say. I have had representations made to me by constituents, as I am sure have many members from city constituencies, particularly constituencies in cities where there has been large scale immigration, to the effect that there has not been enough debate. I do not believe that is true, but they believe it is because there has been relatively little media reporting of the debates which have taken place in the House and in committee on this bill.

They believe that this bill will cut off immigration and that it will stop their friends and relatives from coming to Canada in the future. I do not believe that, but that is the way they feel. Nor do I believe, as I have said, that the bill is as good as the minister and members on the government side claim.

We are living in a changing world. Our open immigration policy is bound to change in the next few years. I doubt that there is a single member—certainly there is not a party in parliament—who does not believe that such a change is inevitable and who would not support such a change. After all, no other country in the world has taken in the number of immigrants Canada has, at least in percentage terms. This country has always been a country of immigrants.

Since the end of World War II more than three million people have come to Canada. Prior to World War II, and for four or five years after the war, almost all of the immigrants who came to Canada were either from Great Britain or countries in northern Europe. This began to change in the 1950's when we saw large scale immigration to Canada of people from countries such as Italy, and later Spain and Portugal. In more recent years we have seen a very large inflow of immigrants from countries which in earlier times never provided immigrants to this country, namely, countries in the West Indies, India, Pakistan, Hong Kong and Africa.

We Canadians have had to learn, and are still learning to live in close proximity with people whose language, colour and religion are different from those to which we have been accustomed. On the whole, that adjustment has been easy and smooth and Canadians have accepted the changes which have taken place. But there have been other changes. Immigrants who came to Canada before World War I to a large extent, at least in western Canada, became farmers. They came to open up land which had not been worked prior to their arrival. Their children and grandchildren can be found in almost every part of western Canada.

● (2200)

Today's immigrants will work in our cities, mostly Montreal, Toronto and Vancouver. Some people express surprise about that. There has been talk to devise policies encouraging people to come to Canada, provided they will not move to our large cities. That will not be possible because when they opt for large cities they are following the example of people resident in Canada. They want to go to the large cities because that is where the action is and that is where the jobs are.

The number of immigrants coming to Canada will decline. According to Statistics Canada, we have about 900,000 unemployed. In fact we are aware that there are substantially more than one million unemployed. Faced with that kind of situation and the pressure for housing and other facilities in the city, people living in Canada, including the children and granchildren of immigrants, are saying to members of parliament that Canada should slow down the number of immigrants it permits to come into this country. I do not believe anyone would disagree with that policy, but a reduction will not take place as a result of this bill.

Reduction can occur if the government changes regulations, as it has done in the past when it desired a reduction in the number of immigrants. A reduction can be achieved by changing the staffing of immigration officers in the countries from which people want to emigrate. If we want to reduce the number of immigrants, we have to cut the staff by 25 per cent or 50 per cent, thus enabling them to process a lesser number of immigrants wanting to come to Canada. We do not object to a reduction, but we object to the reduction which will take place under a closed policy, even if the minister will be making an annual statement. By devices within his department this statement will be kept a secret from the people of Canada.

As has been stated previously, we will vote against this bill because we do not believe that the immigration policies of this country should be decided as they will be, to a large extent, by the minister, the deputy minister, and officers of their department both inside and outside Canada. We believe prospective immigrants should be more aware of the reason why they were turned down. They should also be aware of the fact that they have the right to appeal. The appeal procedure should be easier than that found in the provisions of the bill as drafted.

This bill is deficient in view of the fact that it does not recognize the multicultural character of this country. For these various reasons, it is my intention to vote against this bill.

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

Immigration

Mr. Arnold Peters (Timiskaming): Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether I should thank the hon. member for Niagara Falls (Mr. Young) for giving me these 40 minutes in which to speak on immigration or not. If the hon. member for Winnipeg North (Mr. Orlikow) had been willing to cut his remarks somewhat, we would have been finished by now. But I do not intend to take the full 40 minutes.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Peters: My reason for not requiring the 40 minutes is that the hon. member for Greenwood (Mr. Brewin) has made a very noble presentation of his party's views. By far he is the most competent of any member in this House to speak on immigration. He has been associated with it for years and years. He is not biased in relation to language, creed, colour, or whatever else may be involved. His position has been that of a purist. Probably some members will regret, no matter how good the legislation is, some of the changes which would be very difficult for the public service.

Everyone should realize the speed and the compromise made by hon. members on all sides of this House in relation to Bill C-24, which had over 50 amendments at report stage. It was disposed of in a matter of six or eight hours of debate, and third reading was included in that time. The House leader, even if a backbencher does not work with him, should realize that he owes us, and that I will collect. We could have used the period of time between now and October when we will be returning, rather than talking about adjourning at this time.

The remarks which have been made during this debate, and the work done by the hon. member for Greenwood in committee will be long remembered because of his knowledge, sincerity, and objectivity in this field. It is unfortunate that some of the amendments were not given consideration, particularly those regarding cultures other than our two major ones in this country. There will be many regrets because of that.

I regret the government House leader was not present tonight to see the action that was taken. He is certainly liberal enough to admit that the deliberations have proceeded beyond our wildest hopes. The action taken by one of his backbenchers will be regretted by all of us because of the bad taste which has been left in our mouths.

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

Some hon. Members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): The question is now on the amendment. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the amendment?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): All those in favour will please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

[The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner).]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. Members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Call in the members.

● (2210)

The House divided on the amendment (Mr. Brewin) which was negatived on the following division:

(Division No. 103)

YEAS

Messrs.

Benjamin
Brewin
Gilbert
Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre)
Orlikow
Peters—6.

NAYS

Messrs.

Alexander
Alkenbrack
Allard
Anderson
Andras (Port Arthur)
Appolloni (Mrs.)
Baker (Grenville-Carleton)
Baldwin
Beatty
Béchard
Blaker
Boulanger
Breau
Buchanan
Campagnolo (Mrs.)
Campbell (Miss) (South Western Nova)
Campbell (LaSalle-Émard-Côte Saint-Paul)
Caron
Clermont
Coates
Collenette
Condon
Corbin
Cullen
Cyr
Danson
Darling
Demers
Douglas (Bruce-Grey)
Drury
Dupont
Dupras
Duquet
Elzinga
Epp
Fairweather
Fleming
Forrestall
Foster
Francis
Fraser
Friesen
Gauthier (Ottawa-Vanier)
Gendron
Gillespie
Goodale
Goyer
Gray
Guay
Guay (St. Boniface)
Guay (Lévis)
Hamilton (Swift Current-Maple Creek)
Hargrave
Harquail
Herbert
Hnatyshyn
Holmes
Hopkins
Isabelle
Jarvis
Kaplan
Kempling
Lachance
Lalonde
Lambert (Edmonton West)
Langlois
Laniel
Lapointe
Lavoie
Lawrence
LeBlanc (Westmorland-Kent)
Lefebvre
Loiselle (Saint-Henri)
MacDonald (Cardigan)
Macdonald (Rosedale)
MacEachen
MacFarlane
MacGuigan
MacKay
Marceau
Marchand
McCain
McIsaac
McKenzie
McKinley
McRae
Milne
Muir
Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich)
Nicholson (Miss)
Nowlan
O'Connell
Ouellet
Paproski
Parent
Penner
Pigott (Mrs.)
Portelance
Prud'homme
Railton
Reid
Rompkey
Roy (Laval)
Rynard
Sauvé (Mrs.)
Scott
Sharp
Smith (Saint-Jean)
Stanbury
Stanfield
Stevens
Stewart (Cochrane)
Stollery
Tessier
Trudeau
Trudel
Turner
Watson
Young—118.

• (2220)

• (2230)

Mr. Speaker: I therefore declare the amendment lost.

Amendment (Mr. Brewin) negatived.

Mr. Speaker: The question is upon the main motion. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Louis Duclos (Montmorency): Mr. Speaker, the House has finally come tonight to the conclusion of a long and interesting debate which has at last opposed people with very different views on the relations between the state and the citizen. I have deeply appreciated working in committee where cooperation as well as fair exchanges of views prevailed throughout the 70 hours of debate.

It is a fact, Mr. Speaker, that the work accomplished has brought a substantial improvement to the quality of this legislation introduced in the House of Commons by the government. Mr. Speaker, the minister pointed out during the debate at the report stage that the law had been improved. He insisted a lot on the number of amendments he had accepted. I think he mentioned that close to one hundred amendments were approved by the House and the committee and then sanctioned by the House but I would respectfully remind him that the number of amendments approved and passed are not necessarily an indication of a substantial improvement of this bill.

I was surprised last night to hear another minister on television, a minister representing another level of government, using exactly the same argument to try to explain that a famous legislation, a legislation in which a good many members of this House are quite interested, had been greatly improved because of some hundred amendments that had been accepted. I think what is important is the nature, the effect, the substance of these amendments, which give the real measure to determine whether a legislation has been improved or not.

Mr. Speaker, the issue of national security has been present throughout the whole debate. I will not elaborate too much on this, but I think that the difficult problem encountered and still present in any democratic system is to try to find a balance between the safeguard of our institutions and of democracy and the steps a government or the executive must take to protect the democratic system.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that Bill C-24 unfortunately contains in several of its provisions some factors which could give rise to rather serious abuses. I do not challenge nor question the good faith and the ideal which inspire this government. Being well acquainted with the cabinet members and the people who run the government, I do not think there is any problem for the time being. However, I think that to govern is essentially to anticipate and we must see that any bill passed by Parliament is drafted in such way that not only this government, but also the government of tomorrow or the day after tomorrow—since we are living under a democratic system and governments are replaced—but also future governments could not be in a position to take advantage of it, especially as far as national security is concerned, and open the door to abuses which could infringe the individual freedom of the Canadian people, the permanent residents and visitors.

Mr. Speaker, I would like more especially to quote a few examples. Amendments have been submitted, for example, to clause 39 which more specifically deal with visitors and security certificates. Under the proposed amendment, the security certificate should be issued at the discretion of a judge of the Federal Court, but since that amendment has been negatived, we are back to a situation where, essentially, the security certificates may be issued by the Minister of Manpower and Immigration and the Solicitor General, without any form of control whatsoever. The same goes with clause 40, where the Advisory Board provided for has advisory powers only, which means that whatever its verdict the excutive can always ignore it.

I would now like to say a few words about political refugees, which has been my main issue with Bill C-24 through all its stages. I would suggest once more to the minister, in a most friendly way, that on this matter I have the deep conviction that I have been defending not only a just cause but the right one. Because I cannot accept the point that widening the definition of "refugee" would have created problems as far as the refugee program administration is concerned. I feel that the special programs developed by the government in respect of certain countries such as Uganda or Chile could create as many problems strictly speaking, inasmuch as a great number of residents, citizens and nationals living in those countries could in theory seek political asylum in Canada. The key to this whole matter in my view lies in a distinction that has been ignored, the difference between admissibility and selection. Clearly, under the act a greater number of individuals could have been admissible as refugees, but on the other hand the possibility always remained with the government under the act itself, as is now the case, to select those who seemed to meet certain criteria. To conclude on the matter of political refugees, I am otherwise happy that the minister accepted to submit refugees to clause 6(2), so that special criteria would apply to those special immigrants. Mr. Speaker, important improvements have also been made in the committee, and I would like to speak about the matter of exit permits which, it seems to me, constituted an extremely dangerous initiative and opened the door to many potential abuses from which the Canadian democracy would inevitably have suffered in a few years.

Mr. Speaker, we could speak for hours about such a complex bill, but I would like to close by quoting the French poet Paul Valéry since, as I said in the beginning, this bill essentially concerns the relationship between the state and the citizens. Valéry said: If the state is strong, we are crushed, if it is weak, we perish. Therefore, in such a bill as this one, the objective

that we should have aimed for, and I believe that we have missed it, should have been, on one hand, to establish a balance to enable the state to gain sufficient strength so that our democracy may endure and develop, and on the other hand, to protect the freedoms of the citizens of this country, and not only of the Canadian citizens, but also of all the people in the world who wish to come to Canada, either as immigrants or as visitors. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, it is the duty of members of this House to see to it that the legislative authority, the courts have some input in major decisions, and I believe that in Bill C-24, the legislative authority has been in a certain way short-circuited through a series of regulations. I am pleased that an amendment was made to clause 115, so that at least, before regulations are proclaimed in the *Official Gazette,* Parliament can be made aware of them.

[*English*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): The question is on the motion (Mr. Cullen) that the bill be now read the third time and do pass. All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

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

Some hon. Members: Nay.

And five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Call in the members.

The House divided on the motion (Mr. Cullen) which was agreed to on the following division:

(*Division No. 104*)

YEAS

Messrs.

Alexander	Demers	Hnatyshyn
Alkenbrack	Douglas (Bruce-Grey)	Holmes
Allard	Drury	Hopkins
Anderson	Dupont	Isabelle
Andras (Port Arthur)	Dupras	Jarvis
Appolloni (Mrs.)	Duquet	Kaplan
Baker (Grenville-Carleton)	Elzinga	Kempling
Beatty	Epp	Lachance
Béchard	Fairweather	Lalonde
Blaker	Fleming	Lambert (Edmonton West)
Boulanger	Forrestall	Langlois
Breau	Francis	Lapointe
Buchanan	Friesen	Lavoie
Campagnolo (Mrs.)	Gauthier (Ottawa-Vanier)	Lawrence
Campbell (Miss) (South Western Nova)	Gendron	LeBlanc (Westmorland-Kent)
Campbell (LaSalle-Émard-Côte Saint-Paul)	Gillespie	Lefebvre
Caron	Goodale	Lessard
Clermont	Goyer	Loiselle (Saint-Henri)
Coates	Gray	MacDonald (Cardigan)
Collenette	Guay (St. Boniface)	Macdonald (Rosedale)
Condon	Guay (Lévis)	MacEachen
Corbin	Hamilton (Swift Current-Maple Creek)	MacFarlane
Cullen	Hargrave	MacGuigan
Cyr	Harquail	MacKay
Danson	Herbert	Marceau
Darling		Marchand

McCain	Parent	Sharp
McIsaac	Penner	Smith (Saint-Jean)
McKenzie	Pigott (Mrs.)	Stanfield
McKinley	Portelance	Stevens
McRae	Poulin	Stewart (Cochrane)
Milne	Prud'homme	Stollery
Muir	Railton	Tessier
Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich)	Reid	Trudeau
Nicholson (Miss)	Rompkey	Trudel
Nowlan	Roy (Laval)	Turner
O'Connell	Rynard	Watson
Ouellet	Sauvé (Mrs.)	Young—115.
Paproski	Scott	

NAYS

Messrs.

Benjamin	Joyal	Orlikow
Brewin	Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre)	Peters—8.
Duclos		
Gilbert		

● (2300)

Mr. Speaker: I therefore declare the motion carried.

Motion agreed to and bill read the third time and passed.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. By virtue of a series of rather fascinating orders, we now appear to have arrived at the time at which we have exhausted the order pursuant to Standing Order 75A. We have also fulfilled the order made earlier this day standing in the name of the President of the Privy Council (Mr. MacEachen). Further, we have given effect to the special order under Standing Order 6(5)(a) made earlier this evening on the hour of adjournment, which therefore makes applicable the order on the adjournment standing in the name of the President of the Privy Council. Therefore, with the fulfilment of the orders and the passage of time, this House stands adjourned, pursuant to that order, until August 4 at 2 p.m.

May I say three other things. First, it appears possible now that when we return to this House on August 4 for the debate that is ordered for August 4 and 5, we will be able to do so in this Chamber without prejudice to the projects that we have under way which are so important for the commencement in the fall.

Second, there was to be an adjournment debate pursuant to Standing Order 40 this evening. Those hon. members who have been scheduled to appear on that adjournment debate this evening have been rescheduled by popular demand for August 4 at ten o'clock or whatever may be the time.

Third, at the risk of having to do this a second time in the same summer—a rather unprecedented combination—I now invite all hon. members to join me in my chambers.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

At 11.10 p.m. the House adjourned until August 4, 1977, pursuant to special order made earlier this day.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Thursday, August 4, 1977

The House met at 2 p.m.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

MANPOWER

SUGGESTED WITHHOLDING OF CANADA WORKS GRANTS FROM QUEBEC WHILE CIVIL SERVANTS HOLD TWO JOBS—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Dan McKenzie (Winnipeg South Centre): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a matter of urgent and pressing necessity under the provisions of Standing Order 43. My motion is prompted by the fact that the public service minister of the province of Quebec has confirmed that 22,000 Quebec public servants hold two permanent public service jobs and collect two salaries during a time of high unemployment. Furthermore, since the federal government has announced that Quebec will get more than $84 million from the Canada Works program for make work projects, I should like to move, seconded by the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Whiteway):

That this House direct the Minister of Manpower and Immigration to proportionately reduce the $84 million Canada Works grant to Quebec and UIC payments to Quebec until 22,000 Quebeckers are taken off the unemployment rolls by eliminating dual jobs in the Quebec civil service, and if this is not done to withhold the Canada Works grant from Quebec.

Mr. Speaker: Order. Such a motion requires the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

* * *

THE CANADIAN ECONOMY

PROPOSED PROLONGATION OF SESSION TO DEAL WITH ECONOMIC SITUATION—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby): Mr. Speaker, I too rise under the provisions of Standing Order 43. In view of public and private forecasts, including most recently the *Wall Street Journal,* indicating continuing high levels of unemployment throughout Canada, in view of the general uncertainty in the Canadian economy and considering the fact that the government has promised a statement on job creation in the first week of August and nothing has been forthcoming, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles):

That this House agrees to sit beyond Friday, August 5, in order to enable the government to bring in legislation to deal with the serious problems of the Canadian economy, and in particular the alarming and worsening problem of unemployment.

Mr. Speaker: Such a motion can be presented for debate only with unanimous consent. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

[*Translation*]

SUGGESTION GOVERNMENT LET QUEBEC CONTROL ITS OWN FUNDS—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. René Matte (Champlain): Mr. Speaker, under the provisions of Standing Order 43, I ask for the unanimous consent of the House to move a motion of pressing necessity.

Considering the economic situation now prevailing in the western world and especially in North America; considering that such a situation affects mostly the American dollar and as a consequence the Canadian dollar; considering the dangerous fluctuation of the Canadian dollar related to the American dollar; and considering that the government headed by the Prime Minister is attempting to hide this situation under the pretext that all these problems are due to the new political situation created by the elections of November 15, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Abitibi (Mr. Laprise):

That the government stop fighting in every possible way the Quebec political emancipation that, instead, it concern itself with solving the problems of our deficient economic system which generates the worse ills, namely including unemployment, through a feasibility study to let the provinces control their credit, thus guaranteeing each one's progress.

Mr. Speaker: Order. Under the provisions of Standing Order 43, such a motion requires the unanimous consent of the House. Is there such consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

* * *

[*English*]

COMBINES

REQUEST FOR INQUIRY INTO ALLEGED URANIUM CARTEL—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Sinclair Stevens (York-Simcoe): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a matter of urgent and pressing necessity under the provisions of Standing Order 43. My motion is prompted by the apparently illegal activities of a uranium cartel which operated

between 1972 and 1975. In view of the fact that the Canadian government took an active part in fostering this cartel, and bearing in mind that as the uranium cartel functioned cartel prices become world prices, which in turn became the Canadian domestic price, all of which is carefully recorded as it was screened with the cartel secretary in Paris, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Stanfield):

That this House order an inquiry immediately into such cartel, with particular reference as to whether the provisions of the Combines Investigation Act have been violated.

Mr. Speaker: Presentation for debate of such a motion requires unanimous consent. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

* * *

● (1410)

ROYAL CANADIAN MOUNTED POLICE

SUGGESTED INQUIRY TO ASSURE MAINTENANCE OF LAW ENFORCEMENT STANDARDS—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Elmer M. MacKay (Central Nova): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 43, I rise on a matter of urgent and pressing necessity with regard to the contractual and working relationship of the RCMP vis-à-vis provinces to which the force is under contract, specifically Nova Scotia. I move, seconded by the hon. member for Annapolis Valley (Mr. Nowlan):

That the Solicitor General, in view of differences between the RCMP and the Nova Scotia department of the attorney general as set out in correspondence this spring regarding certain matters of criminal procedure and investigations of persons in the Berwick area of Nova Scotia which touched on the police force of that town among other things, enquire to make certain that proper and usual standards of law enforcement of the force are not being restricted.

Mr. Speaker: Presentation of such a motion for debate requires the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

* * *

SMALL BUSINESS

REQUEST FOR INTRODUCTION OF COMPREHENSIVE POLICY—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Cyril Symes (Sault Ste. Marie): Mr. Speaker, I rise under the provisions of Standing Order 43 on a matter of urgent and pressing necessity. In view of the brief presented to the Minister of State (Small Business) by the Canadian Chamber of Commerce, which criticized the government for failing to address itself to the many problems faced by small business, such as access to capital, cash flow, tax policies, government purchasing policies, government regulations and reporting requirements, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Nickel Belt (Mr. Rodriguez):

That this House instructs the Minister of State for Small Business to end the patchwork quilt of government programs by introducing a comprehensive small business policy which will truly meet the needs of small businessmen in Canada.

Mr. Speaker: Presentation of such a motion for debate can be done only with the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

* * *

CRIMINAL CODE

REQUEST FOR STATEMENT ON ACTION TAKEN AGAINST THOSE ADVERTISING ABORTION ON DEMAND—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Dean Whiteway (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, I rise under the provisions of Standing Order 43 on a matter of urgent and pressing necessity. In light of the promise of the Minister of Justice to investigate the May 9 advertisement in the Ottawa *Journal* for legal abortions on demand, and in view of the fact that these abortions take place in Montreal at a cost of $250 on a same day no questions asked basis and are in obvious and direct contravention to the Criminal Code, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre (Mr. McKenzie):

That this House directs the Minister of Justice to make a statement on motions today outlining what actions have been taken in conjunction with the Ontario and Quebec ministers of justice and clearly indicate what charges have been laid.

Mr. Speaker: Pursuant to the provisions of Standing Order 43, presentation of such a motion for debate requires the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[*English*]

COMBINES

ALLEGED URANIUM CARTEL—REASON FOR ORDER IN COUNCIL PROHIBITING POSSESSION OF DOCUMENTS

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Prime Minister in connection with this very considerable uranium cartel of a dubious nature, and probably tainted with illegality, in which the government apparently played some part, as referred to by my hon. friend earlier. Will the Prime Minister explain to this House the reasons the

government had to accommodate the parties by indicating in advance that "an opinion will be rendered by the Minister of Justice which will prevent any action from being taken under Canada law against participants in the agreement, at least as long as the present government is in power", which is a quote from a memorandum from Gulf legal counsel under date April 12, 1972.

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the position of the government is one of not permitting United States law to have extraterritorial jurisdiction in Canada. I suspect the hon. member for Peace River will support the government on that, as long as he is in the opposition.

Mr. Baldwin: Mr. Speaker, obviously the Prime Minister is afraid to answer the question directly.

Mr. Alexander: When he is in trouble, as usual.

Mr. Baldwin: If the government is satisfied that there was no illegality and that there is nothing to hide, despite the fact that it is trying desperately both in the courts in England and in Toronto to prevent any information being given, can the Prime Minister explain why the government promulgated Order in Council 76-644 which effectively bars possession and use of all documents relating to the cartel from 1972 to 1975 inclusive, as an horrendous attempt to hide evidence. I might make myself liable under it by bringing from my office in the Confederation Building to this Chamber a copy of the memo I have just read.

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, I really wonder whether the hon. member listened to the substantive answers which were given by the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources and other ministers in this House some time ago. If he is just being farcical about the subject, then I can understand his question. If he will recall the substantive issue itself this "cartel" was deliberately encouraged by the government in order to protect Canadian industry and industries of other countries which were being inhibited by restrictive practices in the United States. We find it objectionable that United States law should inquire into this practice which we consider legitimate, as if their law should be forced upon Canadians and we in Canada should be forced to submit to that law. This point was made by the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources. It was made by the Minister of Finance in this very House, I believe in the presence of the Attorney General of the United States. If the hon. member objects to the Canadian government taking measures to protect our industry from foreign interference, he should say so and not disguise it in the form of a question that is spurious.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Baldwin: I am not talking about extraterritorial law. I am talking about this House of Commons and an order in council which this government passed prohibiting members of this House, members of the gallery and members of the public from having in their possession any documents relating to this conspiracy. If the government has nothing to hide, why did it pass this order in council and why will it not let the documents in question become public so that we can all make our judgment?

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, the issue is really whether we want to let Canadian residents be subjected to United States law—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Fraser: The issue is whether Canada is prepared to break other countries' laws.

Mr. Trudeau: —when that law tells them they shall make certain documents public. In that sense, we are telling Canadians that they do not have to divulge everything that Uncle Sam says they should. In that sense they are obliged to hide facts from foreign application of a foreign law.

ALLEGED URANIUM CARTEL—EFFECT ON DOMESTIC USERS—POSSIBILITY DOMESTIC CONTRACTS EXAMINED BY CARTEL

Mr. Sinclair Stevens (York-Simcoe): Mr. Speaker, my question is also to the Prime Minister. As it has now been revealed in documents, in minutes and in sworn testimony relating to the uranium cartel group, known as the Club of Five, that Canadian consumers have been injured while international companies may gain billions in windfall gains, and as on several occasions the cabinet approved of these cartel activities and even facilitated them, which appear to have contravened the Canadian Combines Investigation Act, will the Prime Minister indicate if at any time, as head of cabinet, he inquired as to what effect cartel activities would have on domestic users in Canada and, if so, what did he learn?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, this subject was acted on by the government in the normal way.

An hon. Member: It sure was.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Trudeau: I cannot recall, in answer to the precise question, which particular decisions went before the cabinet. I do say that the then Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources and the then Minister of Justice were acting within their authority and acted in the way they did to protect Canadian interests.

Mr. Stevens: As a search of the Club of Five organization's records maintained in Paris, supposedly secret, confirm that Canadian domestic contracts involving Ontario Hydro, for example, were scrutinized and policed by the group, will the Prime Minister indicate if he was informed of this fact, bearing in mind such information was certainly available to his

then Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources and to at least one member of his staff?

Mr. Trudeau: In answer to that particular question, Mr. Speaker, the answer is no, I did not know that particular fact. I fail to see how that would have changed the decision at the time.

● (1420)

ALLEGED URANIUM CARTEL—POSSIBILITY PRIME MINISTER INQUIRED AS TO LEGALITY OF SCHEME

Mr. Sinclair Stevens (York-Simcoe): Bearing in mind Club of Five records indicate that many participants feared their activities would lead to charges under the Combines Investigation Act, and in fact the then director of investigation and research of the Combines Branch, Mr. Henry, was said to have warned that the proposed activity was illegal, would the Prime Minister indicate if he inquired as to the legality of the scheme and, if so, what was he informed?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I cannot recall whether I asked any specific question about the legality of the scheme or otherwise. This was a plan put forward once again to protect Canadian producers, and I presume consumers, against restrictive measures by the U.S. uranium industry.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

An hon. Member: Not the consumers.

Mr. Trudeau: As such it went forward with the government's approval. I would ask the hon. member, if he is concerned with specific aspects of this, to let me inquire into them or else to address his questions to the ministers who were then responsible for these portfolios.

* * *

THE CANADIAN ECONOMY

REASON FOR LACK OF ACTION ON JOB-CREATING MEASURES

Mr. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby): I am tempted to say that only the Conservatives could make the Prime Minister look like a nationalist.

I would like to ask the Minister of Finance a question. Considering that recently the minister said that, unless the private business sector did something soon about creating more jobs, the government would have to move in with special job creation measures, and since he also added that the cabinet would have to reach a decision on this matter by the end of July and that an announcement would be made about such new efforts by the government in the first week of August, since none of these three conditions have materialized, I would like to ask the Minister of Finance why he has changed his mind and why the government has done nothing in the past week about the new job creating measures that the Minister of Finance said were essential?

[Mr. Stevens.]

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): I would remind the hon. gentleman that my colleague, the Minister of Manpower and Immigration, set out late last month a proposed expenditure of a quarter of a billion dollars for additional direct job creation measures in this coming winter. We have been keeping under close surveillance the report on the first and second quarter performance within the Canadian economy, and that close surveillance will be continuing as the year goes on.

Mr. Broadbent: Mr. Speaker, the minister well knows that the announcement he has just referred to by one of his colleagues was a decision that was made prior to his own statement that some additional measures might be required. Is he now saying that the announcement that was made by one of his colleagues will be sufficient to head off what every independent and public group has forescast as increasing unemployment for the coming fall?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): I would remind the hon. gentleman again that the announcement incorporated the expenditure of a quarter of a billion dollars, which of course, is a very substantial expenditure for the coming year.

EFFECT OF UNEMPLOYMENT ON NATIONAL UNITY—REASON FOR FAILURE TO ADOPT CORRECTIVE MEASURES

Mr. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby): I would remind the minister that what he has just said does not at all deny the point that I have made. He admitted just a few weeks ago that all these measures were insufficient; now he is implying that the measures that were in existence then and that remain unchanged are sufficient.

My last question is directed to the Prime Minister. I would like to ask him whether, considering that he himself has said that the private sector has not been creating the kinds of jobs that the budget was supposed to establish, and considering that the President of the Treasury Board is quoted as having said that it is "getting pretty hard on the nerves" to wait for action by the private sector in terms of job creation and that this is contributing to national disunity—

Some hon. Members: Question.

Mr. Fraser: You are in the House, not on television.

Mr. Broadbent: —I would like to ask the Prime Minister, if he agrees with these observations and if he agrees that national disunity results in part from higher levels of unemployment, why the government persists in doing nothing.

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I can answer that question fairly only by putting it in the context of the larger problem of economic development in Canada, which I am sure the leader of the NDP would welcome. In that sense it fits into the discussion we had with management and labour on Friday of last week and with some other labour groups this week to try to impress upon them that the Canadian economy must be made to perform better and

that that depends not only on government action—I mean all governments, federal, provincial and municipal—but that it also relies very heavily on the private sector, of which the groups we met last week were very representative.

In this sense I support the views of the Minister of Finance and the quotes from the President of the Treasury Board that there is a great onus on government to do what it can to correct the high unemployment situation, but much of our corrective measures will depend on the co-operation we can have from all sectors of the Canadian economy to make sure that we have an economy which is competitive with our principal competitors, principally the United States.

Mr. Broadbent: What is the government going to do?

* * *

[*Translation*]

HOUSING

PROVINCES CONSENTING TO HOME INSULATION PROGRAM

Mr. Adrien Lambert (Bellechasse): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the right hon. Prime Minister? Considering that a few weeks ago the government announced that a special insulation program designed to urge those who own a house built before 1921 to save energy, can the Prime Minister tell the House whether all provinces agreed to follow this program and, if not, which provinces have agreed so far?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to take notice of the question but the hon. member will realize that I did not communicate myself with the provinces but the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources did so before announcing his program, and he is also the one who will be able to report on the reception given to this program by the various provinces.

Mr. Lambert (Bellechasse): Mr. Speaker, my supplementary is directed to the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources.

Could the minister tell the House whether the provinces were consulted before the announcement of the program? If so, did they all agree? If not, which provinces did not and did they say why?

[*English*]

Hon. Alastair Gillespie (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Yes, Mr. Speaker, there was considerable consultation between the federal government and the provinces. This matter was raised at the federal-provincial energy ministers' meeting on May 11 of this year. Subsequent to that and subsequent to discussions between myself and my cabinet colleagues and a cabinet decision, I then discussed the principles of the home insulation program with each of the energy ministers, or their premiers, of all the provinces across the country before announcing the government's decision. On each occasion I got a very favourable response from each energy minister or premier to whom I was talking. Indeed, in the case of Quebec there was a discussion between myself and the energy minister, and the minister made it quite clear to me that he accepted and agreed with the principles which the federal government proposed to impose in the home insulation program.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Lambert (Bellechasse): Mr. Speaker, considering the importance of this question and the somewhat controversial radio news like I heard this morning, did the province of Quebec categorically refuse or does it agree on principle, and if it does agree on principle can the minister tell us that we can hope it will do so in practice?

[*English*]

Mr. Gillespie: Mr. Speaker, that is a question we are trying to clarify right now with the Quebec government. There has been an exchange of telexes and letters between myself and the energy minister, and I hope to be able to define and clarify the areas of concern of the government of Quebec very shortly.

* * *

● (1430)

COMBINES

ALLEGED URANIUM CARTEL—RIGHT OF GOVERNMENT TO PARTICIPATE IN ILLEGAL ACTION

Mr. Joe Clark (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister. In light of matters which were raised today by my colleagues from Peace River and York-Simcoe relating to a matter which could well have involved the participation of ministers and officials of the government of Canada in an action which at the time, and in view of the then director of combines and investigation of this government, was illegal, will the Prime Minister tell the House whether it is the position of the government that there are circumstances in which ministers of the Crown or the government itself have the right to take actions which break the law of Canada?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, no, that is not a right to which we, on this side, subscribe.

Mr. Fraser: Then, why did you do it?

Mr. Trudeau: Of course, I cannot quarrel with what Mr. Henry, the then director of combines and investigation said, but I know that the order in council we passed was under a law passed by this parliament setting up Atomic Energy of Canada Limited, and that we had a legal opinion from the Department of Justice of Canada to the effect that we were not infringing on the combines act.

Mr. Hees: When did you become a supporter of cartels?

Oral Questions

ALLEGED URANIUM CARTEL—REQUEST FOR INQUIRY INTO ACTIVITIES OF CABINET MINISTERS OR GOVERNMENT REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. Joe Clark (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, it is clear that there is a difference between subscription and practice on the government side. Since it now appears on the basis of available evidence that there was what amounts to a uranium sales conspiracy which included ministers of the Crown and the Canadian government, a conspiracy to sell uranium in a way which violated Canadian domestic laws, not foreign laws, which may well have transgressed international codes and perhaps artificially inflated the domestic prices of power and uranium in Canada, I wonder if the Prime Minister, instead of covering up this matter by order in council or any other means, would undertake to have a complete review and a full report made to the House of Commons with regard to any actions by any cabinet minister or representatives of the government of Canada which might have been or were in clear conflict with the law of Canada.

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I cannot believe that the question was properly asked in light of my previous answer, in which I indicated clearly that we received information from the Department of Justice to the effect that we were not in contravention of the competition act, that we were not in conflict with the restrictive trade practices legislation of Canada and that we were perfectly within our rights to pass that order in council which, I repeat, was made pursuant to an act of this parliament setting up atomic energy controls.

ALLEGED URANIUM CARTEL—SUGGESTED REPEAL OF ORDER IN COUNCIL PROHIBITING POSSESSION OF DOCUMENTS

Mr. Joe Clark (Leader of the Opposition): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. The Prime Minister had at least two legal opinions which were in conflict. The then director of the combines investigation branch told the Prime Minister and his colleagues that what they were doing was in conflict with the law of Canada. For some reason, perhaps relating to the fear of litigation on this matter or of the matter becoming public, they have promulgated a most extraordinary order in council which in effect makes it illegal for me as Leader of the Opposition, any member of this House, any member of the gallery, or any member of the public of Canada to carry, discuss or have in his possession any of a wide range of documents which are public in other countries and would normally be public here. I ask the Prime Minister, if he is not prepared to carry out an investigation of this matter will he at least repeal the regulation in this most offensive order in council, this latest attempt by the government of Canada to keep information from the people of Canada? Will he at least give us the undertaking that he will today, by order in council, repeal this document and then institute immediately an inquiry under the Combines Investigation Act into all aspects of the uranium cartel's operation?

[Mr. Hees.]

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the premise of the question is false, at least in part, in that the Leader of the Opposition said we had conflicting legal opinions. I must remind him that the Crown in Canada is advised by the legal officers of the Crown and that we had legal advice from the Department of Justice—

An hon. Member: To cover up.

Mr. Trudeau: —which is empowered by parliament to advise the Crown and does so by tradition. We had advice that we were acting legally. Any allegations about cover up or of the desire to controvert the law are spurious accusations.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Nonsense!

Mr. Fraser: Was the order in council spurious? Why do you need something like that in a free country?

Mr. Paproski: They only do things like that in Russia.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, this is dealing with the matter of whether the government acted legally or not. We acted within the law, as we were advised the law read. That is point number one.

Obviously, the object of the order in council is not to prevent the Leader of the Opposition or the hon. member for Peace River—

An hon. Member: What?

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Read it.

An hon. Member: Listen.

Mr. Trudeau: —to carry around documents in their pockets. The object of the legislation, to repeat my earlier answers, is to prevent foreign law from obliging Canadian residents or Canadian citizens, including the Leader of the Opposition, to submit to that foreign law.

Mr. Stevens: That is not what it says.

Mr. Trudeau: If there is any way in which that objective can be reached by improving the order in council, by not infringing on the rights of the opposition to carry documents in their pockets when they walk from their offices to the House of Commons, I undertake to look at the order in council, to see if it can be improved.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, the opposition laughs, but this is what the Leader of the Opposition wants me to do.

Mr. Fraser: It is enough to make us cry.

Mr. Trudeau: You can cry, of course, and you will be following your natural habit.

Mr. Fraser: I cry for my country.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, I have been asked by the Leader of the Opposition to examine a statutory instrument, to see if it can be improved. I have answered that I would, Mr. Speaker. What else does the opposition want?

Mr. Fraser: The truth.

Mr. Clark: Mr. Speaker, I wonder, after that performance, if I may ask if the Prime Minister has read this order in council which makes it illegal for any person to release any note, document or material or disclose or communicate the contents thereof to any person, government, Crown corporation, agent or other organization, unless required to do so under a law of Canada, or unless he does so with the consent of the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources, the man in charge of the department which was then involved in an activity which may well have been illegal. Surely, the Prime Minister does not need any more evidence than that I have read into the record to prove to him that we have here a restriction upon free speech, upon free inquiry, upon the ability of the House of Commons to do its job and upon the ability of the courts of the land to do their job, and that this most illiberal attempt to limit debate and hide information should be withdrawn and stopped immediately.

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition read part of an order in council and the words I heard were "release any note or document." I have not read the order in council.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Trudeau: I do not have it before me.

Mr. Epp: But you signed it.

Mr. Trudeau: Obviously—I listened to what the Leader of the Opposition said—it depends on what the note or document relates to. I hope the Leader of the Opposition is not claiming that he can carry and release any document relating to anything without being liable to some kind of restriction by the law.

Mr. Hees: This performance would make the Russians blush.

ALLEGED URANIUM CARTEL—REQUEST FOR REPORT ON ACTIONS OF COMBINES DIRECTOR

Mr. James Gillies (Don Valley): Mr. Speaker, my question to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs also relates to the uranium cartel. In response to my question of June 17, the minister replied, as reported on page 6785 of *Hansard*, that:

> . . . the director has been following the situation closely for evidence of violation of the act.

Has the minister anything further to report on what the director of the combines and investigation has been doing, given that the previous director had said it was very likely that the action taken on the part of the conspirators was illegal under Canadian law?

Hon. A. C. Abbott (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Mr. Speaker, given the questioning which arose a few minutes ago, and in response to the hon. member's last point, may I say that I consulted the deputy director a few minutes ago who advised me the matter is still under consideration.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Paproski: Why don't you blush, Abbott? Resign.

● (1440)

ALLEGED URANIUM CARTEL—INQUIRY WHETHER MINISTER REVIEWED EVIDENCE AND WILL LAY CHARGES

Mr. James Gillies (Don Valley): A question to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. Can the minister tell us whether or not he has reviewed personally any of the evidence which has been produced in the U.S. courts, and which has now been produced in Toronto in connection with this conspiracy and allegations that Canadian law has been broken and that some of the participants were the hon. gentleman's colleagues in the present Cabinet?

Hon. A. C. Abbott (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): I have reviewed the press reports and material but I was not a member of the government at the time and I can add nothing to the answers which the Prime Minister has given, answers which I believe adequately deal with the scurrilous remarks made by the opposition.

Some hon. Members: Oh!

Mr. Gillies: It is a very interesting question whether this government believes that any means can be used to justify certain ends. However, it has long been a proposition among the people of this country that even governments must obey the law.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Gillies: I did not ask the minister whether he had read any press reports. I asked him whether he had read any of the depositions taken in this case, evidence which to most people indicates there was a conspiracy and that Canadian law was broken. More specifically, will the minister lay charges under Section 8 of the act and require that the Director of the Combines Investigation Branch take this matter under consideration so that it may be properly investigated?

Mr. Abbott: As the hon. member is aware, my powers under Section 8 of the Combines Investigation Act are as he outlines. But at the time I answered a question earlier in the summer I did so quite accurately—that in the light of the proceedings taking place in the United States the Director of the Combines Branch was studying the question and would be reporting to me. Until that study has been completed and until he has reported I do not intend to take any further action.

Oral Questions

PUBLIC SERVICE

PAYMENT OF BILINGUAL BONUS

Mr. Lloyd Francis (Ottawa West): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the President of the Treasury Board. In view of articles appearing in today's Ottawa press, can the hon. gentleman tell us when an announcement will be made concerning payment of bilingual bonuses to public servants?

Hon. Robert K. Andras (President of the Treasury Board): Consultations are under way with the official languages committee of the National Joint Council and we are hopeful a consensus will be reached on certain proposals placed before that body covering this whole area, one of which also includes significant and related provisions for changes in the implementation of the Official Languages Act in the Public Service. I hope such a consensus may be available within a month. Until then we are not in a position to make any formal announcement.

* * *

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

ALLEGATION UNITED STATES USED CANADIAN INSTITUTIONS FOR EXPERIMENTS IN SENSORY DEPRIVATION

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Secretary of State for External Affairs—I am sorry I did not give him notice. Is the government aware of the use by the United States CIA, a U.S. government agency, of Canadians and the Canadian Institute at McGill to experiment in brainwashing or sensory deprivation? Is the minister aware that persons who are subjected to this treatment lose the senses of sound, sight, smell and in some cases touch and time also, and that the experience has serious effects upon their personalities?

An hon. Member: Like the Liberals!

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Secretary of State for External Affairs): The only evidence I have about changes in people's personality relates to this House and is usually the result of actions taken by the other side. But as to the question, which is a serious one, may I say I have not had an opportunity to find out anything beyond the account I have read in the newspaper. But I will undertake to inquire further.

Mr. Brewin: May I ask the minister whether, if these accounts, which certainly appear to be authentic, prove to be authentic, he will consider making a protest to the United States government with regard to what appears to have been an intrusion into the affairs of Canadians?

Mr. Jamieson: I will consider that possibility.

[Mr. Abbott.]

COMBINES

ALLEGED URANIUM CARTEL—SUGGESTION MINISTER MADE MISLEADING STATEMENT CONCERNING EFFECT ON DOMESTIC PRICE

Mr. Ron Huntington (Capilano): Mr. Speaker, I, too, have a question for the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs relating to the subject of the cartel. On June 17, the minister told the House that this cartel "was designed to exclude price fixing in the Canadian market". The quotation is from *Hansard*. It is now evident from a quarterly report of the Paris-based cartel secretariat dated July 4, 1974, that seven tonnes of uranium were sold to Ontario Hydro at the fixed cartel price—Ontario Hydro records will confirm this sale. Further documentation shows clearly that Ontario Hydro, hence, the Ontario consumer, was forced to pay the cartel price on a continuing basis. Will the minister tell us why he chose to mislead the House in his statement of June 17?

Hon. A. C. Abbott (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): When I answered that question I stated correctly that the design of the cartel was as I described it. I was not attempting to deceive the House in any way. The information which the hon. member has provided to the House and which has been discussed today is new to me, so my answer at that time was accurate given the information I had.

ALLEGED URANIUM CARTEL—REQUEST FOR INQUIRY

Mr. Ron Huntington (Capilano): In view of the fact the former director of investigation and research advised the government in 1972 that what they subsequently did would be illegal, does the minister not feel he has a duty to move the matter from being one of investigation to one of inquiry into this illegal arrangement and behaviour, particularly in the light of the tremendous amount of work the finance committee of this House has just completed with regard to the proposed revisions to the Combines Investigation Act?

Hon. A. C. Abbott (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): I think it only proper that I should refer the hon. member to the answers given by the Prime Minister today.

Some hon. Members: Oh!

Mr. Abbott: Members who are catcalling have not, I suggest, been as interested in the Competition Act as is the hon. member who asked the question. I am trying to explain in as factual a way as possible that the question he raised about a possible illegality as described by one officer can be contrasted with the opinion of another. Therefore I referred the hon. member to the statement of the right hon. gentleman today in which he gave his version, one which I submit is the correct appraisal of the situation upon which the government acted.

ENERGY

ALLEGED URANIUM CARTEL—REQUEST FOR TABLING OF LETTER TO GULF TO PARTICIPATE IN SCHEME

Mr. John C. Crosbie (St. John's West): My question is to the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources. In a letter dated November 8, 1976 and addressed to Mr. Janisch the president of Gulf Minerals, the minister admitted, and I quote, that "Gulf participated in the arrangement only at the specific written request of the government of Canada." Will the minister table this "specific written request" in the House and will he tell us whether that document was one of several which Gulf was allowed to draft on departmental stationery for signature by officials of the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources or by the minister?

Hon. Alastair Gillespie (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): I shall be prepared to take a look at the correspondence to which the hon. member is referring, but I think it is clear from answers ministers have given in the House that the government did invite Gulf Minerals of Canada to participate in the producers' arrangements.

ALLEGED URANIUM CARTEL—RETURN OF DOCUMENTS FROM PARTICIPATING COMPANIES

Mr. John C. Crosbie (St. John's West): On June 17, the minister told the House there was "no secrecy with respect to the producers' group arrangement at all". Since all the documents in our possession concerning this cartel were marked secret or "specially confidential" after an order in council was passed on September 21, 1976, as was mentioned here today, and since the minister wrote Gulf Minerals on November 8, 1976 demanding the return of all documents relating to the cartel, is he still telling us there was no secrecy? Was the minister successful in getting all the documents back from Gulf so that his coverup could continue and did he write to other cartel members asking them to send back documents so that the coverup could continue?

● (1450)

Hon. Alastair Gillespie (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, apparently the hon. member does not distinguish between Gulf Minerals of Canada Limited, the Canadian corporation, and Gulf Minerals of the U.S.

Mr. Fraser: What difference does it make?

Mr. Gillespie: What is the difference, the hon. member says. I say there is a great difference. That is part of the whole issue here, the extraterritorial application of United States law to Canada; the ability of a U.S. parent to compel its Canadian subsidiary to provide confidential Government of Canada documents. That is the issue here.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Crosbie: The minister is very touchy about this question, Mr. Speaker, but there is possibly criminal liability involved. My question was whether he wrote others, apart from Gulf Minerals of Canada Limited, requesting the return of documents, such as Rio Tinto-Zinc and the others involved, did they return the documents, and has Gulf returned all the documents? That is my question to the minister.

Mr. Gillespie: Mr. Speaker, I will check the record. I know that all the participants in Canada were contacted. They were asked for certain undertakings with respect to the documents. I believe that a large number of those documents have been returned. Others may have been subject to some kind of in-trust arrangement so that those documents could not be relayed to foreign corporations, foreign governments or to agencies of foreign governments, or to foreign courts.

* * *

[*Translation*]

BILINGUALISM

REQUEST FOR IMMEDIATE PAYMENT OF BONUS—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Serge Joyal (Maisonneuve-Rosemont): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the President of the Treasury Board. Since he just said, in reply to a question from the hon. member for Ottawa West, that the Civil Service Act will have to be amended before granting the bilingualism bonus and since the House cannot look into that matter before the end of 1977, could the President of the Treasury Board tell the House whether or not he would consider granting immediately a minimum amount to all those who fill designated bilingual positions and adjust thoses amounts once administrative details have been established?

[*English*]

Hon. Robert K. Andras (President of the Treasury Board): Mr. Speaker, I think there is some misunderstanding here.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Paproski: Where are you, Francis?

Mr. Andras: At no time has there been an indication that amendments will be required to the Public Service Staff Relations Act or to the Public Service Employment Act specifically relating to the payment of compensation for bilingualism. That is not the case; therefore, the premise of the question is unfortunately incorrectly based.

* * *

COMBINES

ALLEGED URANIUM CARTEL—REQUEST FOR TABLING OF LEGAL OPINION GIVEN TO GOVERNMENT

Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Calgary North): Mr. Speaker, I should like to put a follow up question to the Prime Minister. In light of the fact that the Prime Minister has said that the government has received a legal opinion from the Crown

officers of the Department of Justice, and in light of the fact that that legal opinion certainly seems to contradict either the assistant director or the director of the combines investigation branch, was that opinion given to the cabinet in writing, and if it was in writing, since I am sure the Prime Minister would want to maintain his credibility in respect to this very serious matter, would he be prepared to table that opinion?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I will inquire as to the form in which the opinion was given. I have just been told by the Minister of Justice that it was in the form of correspondence, presumably between his department and the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources. The hon. member knows that it is the constant practice of the House not to table legal opinions given by the Department of Justice—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Trudeau: —and so far as that practice is an established one, I do not propose to break it.

Mr. Woolliams: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. The hon. member to whom the Prime Minister refers, being myself, is not aware of such practice. That is only a procedure which is a complete cover-up; we do not know whether those are the facts or not. I am asking the Prime Minister, the head of the government, in light of the fact—

Some hon. Members: Louder.

Mr. Woolliams: Yes, I will be loud. It is time that the Canadian people got loud about something as bad as this.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Woolliams: In light of the fact that this is such a serious matter, I wonder whether the Prime Minister, even if he does believe the procedure to be as he set it out, would waive that procedure and consent to table the document in the House of Commons, so that even his credibility can look good today?

Mr. Trudeau: I think that if the hon. member reflects on the question, Mr. Speaker, he will understand why this practice has been established.

Mr. Fraser: We understand it.

Mr. Trudeau: Perhaps the hon. member from Vancouver does not understand it.

Mr. Fraser: You are making it very clear.

Mr. Trudeau: I think the hon. member from Vancouver is a lawyer.

Mr. Fraser: That is right, I am.

Mr. Trudeau: He knows what redress exists within Canada for people who think that an order in council or an action taken by the government is illegal.

[Mr. Woolliams.]

Mr. Fraser: I can also read an opinion, and that is what you are afraid to give me.

Mr. Trudeau: The courts are there, Mr. Speaker, to settle this matter. If the opposition—

Mr. Fraser: You can relieve yourself of your self-imposed restrictions.

Mr. Trudeau: The hon. member does not have to agree with me, but I have stated that we have an opinion from the Department of Justice.

Mr. Fraser: Then let us see it.

Mr. Trudeau: It is not the practice to table such an opinion.

Mr. Woolliams: Don't give us that.

Mr. Fraser: You cannot expect me to take that seriously.

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, let me try a different tack; I might be more successful.

Mr. Fraser: Try the truth.

Mr. Trudeau: The government has made it a policy—

Mr. Paproski: Now, here come the histrionics.

Mr. Trudeau: If any person in this country, including a member of the opposition, thinks that we have acted illegally, redress is available in the courts.

Miss MacDonald: What is wrong with this court?

Mr. Trudeau: We have adopted and applied a policy which was meant to defend the Canadian producer and the Canadian consumer.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Trudeau: Anything that the government does can be attacked by the opposition as being illegal. In some cases we ask the law officers of the Crown to advise us whether such an interpretation of the law is correct or not. It is the government's privilege to ask for the advice of its lawyers. It is the job of the Minister of Justice to advise the government whether it is acting legally or not. The opposition does not have to agree with the government. It does not have to believe the Department of Justice. It is up to them—

Mr. Hees: A new John Barrymore has been born. You have missed your calling, Pierre.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Peace River on a question of privilege.

PRIVILEGE

MR. BALDWIN—MEMBERS' RIGHTS RESPECTING ORDERS IN COUNCIL

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): Mr. Speaker, I gave the Chair notice, as the rules require, regarding a question of privilege relating to the matter we have been discussing. It is a very important matter because it affects the rights and privileges of every member of this House in discharging his or her duty with respect to the obtaining of information to be used in connection with proceedings in this House or its committees.

● (1500)

At the moment there is no doubt that we are inhibited and prevented from discharging our responsibilities because of the order in council which has been referred to. As the Prime Minister seems to be unaware of the contents of the order in council, which are very brief, I should like to read it so the Prime Minister can consider the heinous nature of the document he has laid his hand to. It is dated September 23, 1976, which was four days after a former official of Eldorado appeared in court in Toronto and released a great deal of information after being questioned in respect of this particular issue. The order in council referred to uranium information security regulations, and reads as follows:

> No person who has in his possession or under his control any note, document or other written or printed material in any way related to conversations, discussions or meetings that took place between January 1, 1972 and December 31, 1975, involving that person or any other person or any government, Crown corporation, agency or other organization in respect of the production, import, export, transportation, refining, possession, ownership, use or sale of uranium or its derivatives or compounds, shall
>
> (a) release any such note, document or material, or disclose or communicate the contents thereof to any person, government, Crown corporation, agency or other organization unless
>
> (i) he is required to do so by or under a law of Canada, or
>
> (ii) he does so with the consent of the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources; or
>
> (b) fail to guard against or take reasonable care to prevent the unauthorized release of any such note, document or material or the disclosure or communication of the contents thereof.

For hundreds of years this House, following the practice of the United Kingdom House of Commons at Westminster, has had the right, under the bill of rights, to see that there is no interference with freedom of speech and debate or proceedings in parliament which ought not to be impeached or questioned in any court or place out of parliament. I ask members to contrast that order in council with what should be the uninhibited right of members of this House to discharge their obligations to the people of Canada by bringing into this House documents and material which tend to indicate or touch on the probable liability of the government, members of the government or officials of the government, in connection with any conspiracy, crime or impropriety. Under the terms of the order in council it may well be that we are free to discuss it in the House. But how do we get it here? Under that order in council, as it stands, I am prohibited from finding and obtaining that information in a documentary form and bringing it to this House. I can use it once I get here—but how can I get it here legally? I am prohibited from showing it to members of the public or the media. Under those conditions, how is it possible for me or other members of this House to properly discharge our obligations? There should be no doubt about what took place here, despite what has been said. An extract from what we managed to obtain indicates that on April 28, 1972, a memo was passed from one Gulf official to legal counsel which reads as follows:

> Mr. Zagnoli—a Gulf official—remains of the definite opinion that failure on Gulf's part to submit to coercive pressure being applied by the Canadian government respecting Gulf's participation would almost certainly result in severe adverse economic consequences for Gulf, including a material deterioration of Gulf's relations with the Canadian government.
>
> Effectively Gulf is being compelled to participate by the Canadian government.

There is a second memo, dated April 10, 1972, from Mr. R. K. Allen, a Gulf official, which reads as follows:

> Mr. Austin advised that a formal declaration would be sought from the cabinet—with the Minister of Justice present—that the arrangement is in the interest of Canada. He further stated that an opinion would be obtained from the Minister of Justice as to the legality of the arrangement in so far as the two Crown companies are concerned.

Because of this particular regulation there is a complete prohibition on the part of any member of the public from taking proceedings in any court in Canada. The hon. member for York-Simcoe (Mr. Stevens) made an attempt in consultation with his solicitors who said that in their opinion under no circumstances would it be possible for any proceedings to be launched with regard to a potential infraction of the restrictive trade practices legislation. As a lawyer and counsel of some experience, after looking at a lot of the material, in my judgment there is a prima facie case of breach of that statute. That being the case, the only court left is the highest court in this land—this parliament.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Baldwin: I understand the government is sensitive about this issue. Not so many months ago the now Minister of State for Urban Affairs (Mr. Ouellet) was very put out because of a decision by the supreme court of the province of Quebec dealing with the issue of the restrictive trade practices legislation. I understand why he said what he did. I may not agree with him, but it is his right to say what he did. The government is very sensitive and very solicitous about the competition act and the restrictive trade practices legislation. Attempts were made in Washington and in Toronto, and an attempt is now being made in London—at which the Canadian government is represented—to try to obtain some of the facts in connection with this issue. This government has said "no" and has enacted this order in council.

For that reason there is an obligation on this House to make certain that we pass a motion giving us the right to deal not only with this matter in the House but to obtain the documents for the purpose of so doing. For that purpose, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton (Mr. Baker):

> That this House declare that the order in council SOR 76-644 is not binding on members of the House with regard to proceedings in the House or any committee thereof and that for the purpose of such proceedings, despite the

provisions of such order in council, all documents or copies may be obtained, produced and used in connection with any inquiry into questions of privilege or into the legality and propriety of the actions of the government, ministers and others in the establishment of a uranium cartel.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the government would welcome a debate on this subject. It would welcome it today, if hon. members are more interested in that than in the pipeline question. It would welcome that when the House reconvenes: it would welcome that debate at any time.

Miss MacDonald: On Monday.

Mr. Trudeau: The government's purpose in adopting this order in council under Canadian law, after having received advice that the law was correctly interpreted by the government, was to prevent Canadian uranium producers from going under at the same time as the uranium producers in several other countries would have gone under, when the United States government and its economy adopted measures restricting the entry of uranium into their country.

● (1510)

It must be kept in mind that 70 per cent of the world markets for uranium were in the United States. When in the late sixties and early seventies the Americans adopted this policy, it meant for Canadian producers, miners in Elliot Lake and other parts of Canada, that they would have to close down; they could no longer be kept in the production of uranium. A few years later pressure was upon Canada and every other country to supply uranium. We should keep in mind the consequences of inaction by the government at that time had it not decided to act before other countries and the producer group decided to act in order to protect the uranium industry.

This is our policy. It is in order to carry out this policy that we made the announcement and took this action. I repeat, Mr. Speaker—and Your Honour will have to decide whether the time to debate it is now or at some other time—that we want the policy to be understood by Canadians. We are not, like the opposition, putting up a front in order to serve the interests of Westinghouse in the United States.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Trudeau: The precise and exact effect of the motion put by the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin) would be to do exactly what Westinghouse wants to be done in order to get out from under this Canadian policy. If that is the purpose the opposition wants to serve, that is their right. We will debate this policy when you, Mr. Speaker, so decide. But on this question of privilege, we say there is none. We looked earlier, in answer to the leader of the opposition (Mr. Clark), to see if there was some way in which the order in council could be improved to have any better effect in terms of the right of the opposition to know. We want them to know what is our policy. We want them to debate it, because we know that the Canadian people will support us on this.

[Mr. Baldwin.]

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Trudeau: The question put to you, Mr. Speaker, is the following: In order to debate this policy, do the opposition have to get secret facts of this group of producers, the effect of which will be to serve Westinghouse, U.S.A.? That is the question put to you, Mr. Speaker.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Trudeau: They say that just because you are a member of the opposition, you are entitled so stand up here and claim the right to freedom of speech and freedom of knowledge and, because of that claim, able to go into documents which are privileged under the law.

An hon. Member: Right.

Mr. Trudeau: We say that is not the interpretation of freedom of speech. If they want to attack the law, they can attack the law. If they want to attack the policy, they can attack the policy. They do not have to serve Westinghouse in order to attain that end.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Joe Clark (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, it is not necessary for me to walk around the House in order to make my point.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Clark: My contribution will be brief in response to the histrionic attempt by the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) to avoid the question of privilege raised by my colleague the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin). If I might deal for a moment with the extraneous matters which the Prime Minister raised, we would, of course, welcome a debate on all aspects of this question.

Mr. Trudeau: Now, today.

Mr. Clark: I know that the Prime Minister has been anxious to avoid debate on the pipeline decision for a long time.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Clark: We have business on the agenda of this House of Commons right now, business that should have been debated well before this time. The parliament of Canada should have been allowed to become involved in this question long before it did. We would be prepared to have the matter debated in the fall, or next week, on the provision that the debate would be a full and extensive one that would let us know all aspects of all the transactions and all the illegalities that may be involved in this question.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Clark: The second extraneous matter that the Prime Minister raised had to do with his contention that the actions of his government were designed to support the Canadian uranium industry and were the only means at their disposal. The question we ask is: Why was it necessary for the Government of Canada to take action which the director of the combines investigation branch told them would be a breach of the law of Canada?

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Clark: Why did they accomplish that by illegal means when they had available to them such legal means as the mining control act, the establishment of a marketing board along the model of several boards now in place, or an international commodity agreement? There were legal ways to do this. They chose an illegal way to do it.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Clark: This was the point on which my colleague from Peace River raised this question of privilege and asked for a reference to the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections. Finally, we have this odious order in council clearly designed to inhibit public debate on this question. It is designed to cover up actions which might well have been illegally entered into by members of the government, representatives of the government or members of the public acting on directions of the Government of Canada.

We believe—and it is for you, sir, to decide—that on its face this order in council very signally limits the capacity of the parliament of Canada to do its job of finding out what kind of activities, legal or otherwise, the Government of Canada is involved in.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Clark: The Prime Minister, if I heard him correctly, said that there are some limitations to freedom of speech. That was the clear implication. He agrees.

Mr. Trudeau: Justice Holmes said that.

Mr. Clark: This reminds one profoundly of the rationale that led them to try to reinstitute Information Canada so they could find some other means to control access to information.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Clark: We know too well the views and practices of this Prime Minister and this government with regard to restricting the speech of parliament, the press and others. That is precisely why we are so worried about the order in council on which reputable legal counsel in this country, upon reading the order in council, felt precluded from giving a legal opinion to a member of parliament as to actions that might be taken in this House or the courts of this land.

My colleague from Peace River asked for a reference to the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections so that we can see whether the privileges of the House of Commons have been limited by this odious order in council, and so we can ensure that the parliament of Canada has the opportunity to ask questions and get information which the public of Canada has a right to have in the public domain.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Sinclair Stevens (York-Simcoe): Mr. Speaker, I wish to add a few words to this discussion at my colleague's request. Basically, I believe it is necessary that this regulation be lifted in order that there can be a full examination of the facts of this situation. We have made available to ourselves various documents that are referred to in the regulation which my colleague has already mentioned, and in fact two legal firms have refused to give me a legal opinion on what is the consequence of the documentation and the effect of what has transpired under this arrangement, in that they feel that even to review the documentation would be in violation of the regulation to which my colleague the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin), has referred.

● (1520)

It is important that this regulation be withdrawn in order that the documentation can be properly analysed by those who may wish to look at it, bearing in mind that it tells some very incriminating things concerning many Canadians about cartel actions. We have had a reference here, for example, by the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) to the fact that he received an opinion from the Department of Justice that the regulation was apparently in order. The important matter is that throughout the various documents that we have there are repeated references to various opinions being sought or to be obtained from the Department of Justice concerning these transactions. It is important that we have the letter tabled so that we can identify exactly what letter the Prime Minister is referring to when he states that the Department of Justice officials said that the proposal was all right.

In that connection, I would point out that in the minutes of the meeting of the Canadian uranium producers held in Ottawa on April 10, 1972, marked "Confidential," on every page—

An hon. Member: The lights are going out.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Hees: More histrionics, Pierre.

An hon. Member: You won't get rid of us that way.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Stevens: In this document, under the heading "Discussion of legal aspects of producers' arrangement", Mr. Austin opened up the discussion by pointing out that the Combines Investigation Act is very vague, etc. But then he was asked by Gulf a question concerning the opinion that was to be obtained from the Minister of Justice as to the legality of the arrange-

ment under the Combines Investigation Act. Mr. Austin said they had received the negative opinion from the then director of the combines investigation branch.

The reason I referred to this kind of statement in this document is that the information in these documents cannot be freely dealt with at present as a result of the regulation to which my colleague, the hon. member for Peace River, has referred. In short, I hope that Your Honour will see fit to meet the request of the hon. member for Peace River.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Alastair Gillespie (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to take a lot of time, but I think it is important to put some important facts on the record dealing with this question. The opposition seems to have left the impression in the minds of those of us here that they would have been quite prepared to see the U.S. take action to close off 70 per cent of the world market.

An hon. Member: That has nothing to do with it.

An hon. Member: We want to see things done legally.

Mr. Gillespie: They would seem to imply that the Canadian government should have taken no action to protect Canadian interests. They would have been quite prepared to see Australia, France, and South Africa take action.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. In the contributions made originally by the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin), the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Clark) and the right hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau), I extended considerable leniency in allowing hon. members to get off the procedural point and into the substance of the matter. I would not want to encourage that to continue. The fact is that we have a procedural question based on privilege as to whether or not a certain order in council, in its terms, in fact restricts the ability of a member of parliament to operate. Whether or not the action of the government in setting up a certain organization was illegal is not the matter before us, and whether it was advisable from any point of view is not the matter that is before us. What is before us is whether or not this order in council so inhibits the ability of members of the House to function that it offends their privileges. That is the only matter before us now.

Mr. Gillespie: Mr. Speaker—

An hon. Member: Just stick to what Mr. Speaker said, Alastair.

Mr. Gillespie: —I think it is important to set the particular context of my remarks that follow on this particular point. There is one other important point which the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) mentioned and which I think the House should recognize: that is, that during this period of time, the late 1960s and the early 1970s, when the price of uranium—

Some hon. Members: Order.

[Mr. Stevens.]

An hon. Member: Stick to the point.

Mr. Gillespie: It is very relevant to the question of the confidentiality of these documents, and I would ask your indulgence, Mr. Speaker, so that I might make the point.

An hon. Member: The first one you would have made.

Mr. Gillespie: There was considerable competition to sell reactors at that time, as members may know, and Westinghouse was using uranium as a come-on. They were entering into long-term contracts at fixed prices.

Some hon. Members: Order.

An hon. Member: Stick to the point.

Mr. Gillespie: It is very relevant.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. With respect, I would have to know how the merits of the case are relevant to the procedural question before letting the minister go on.

Mr. Gillespie: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Perhaps you will give me one or two moments to indicate why I believe it is relevant. Westinghouse entered into a large number of long-term contracts on fixed prices.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

An hon. Member: We know that.

Mr. Gillespie: I don't think you or some of your associates know.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

An hon. Member: We all know it.

Mr. Gillespie: I have the floor, Mr. Speaker. The important point was the world price of uranium soared after the oil price increase, and so Westinghouse repudiated its long-term contracts.

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Gillespie: The result of that is that their customers are now suing Westinghouse in the United States, and Westinghouse is faced with suits of well over $1 billion. Westinghouse, as part of its defence, is seeking to use Canadian government confidential documents—documents which were entered into by the Canadian government and members of the producing group, the producers' club on an international basis—an intergovernmental arrangement of which the Canadian government was a part. The Westinghouse Corporation, as part of their defence, is trying to obtain these confidential documents. They are trying to use the United States law, the extra-territorial reach of the U.S. law, to gain access to these documents, and that is why it was necessary to draft the particular order in council which was passed last September in broad terms to prevent the movement of these relevant documents to U.S. jurisdiction.

Mr. Clark: What are you hiding from parliament?

Mr. Gillespie: That is why that particular order in council had to be drafted that way. If it had been done in any other way there would have been a loophole and a number of those documents could have gone back and not served the Canadian national interest.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Peace River has raised a point by way of a question of privilege of which he gave notice to the Chair, and it is, of course, a very serious matter. I think the Chair should have some time to consider the question, although it is obviously a very timely matter. I must confess that my initial impression is that the terms of the motion are such that the order in council should not be binding on members of the House in the discharge of their duties or upon committees of the House or the House itself in carrying out its work.

● (1530)

It seems to me that this motion reflects the basic nature of the question; that is, that while there may be a potential danger in the application of the order in council to the work of members of parliament, in order to give the motion priority over all other items of business before us there would have to have been in fact an actual restriction and prohibition or interference with the ability of hon. members to carry out their work.

What seems to have been discussed here this afternoon is the proposition that the order in council potentially restricts the right of hon. members to have access to documents, the right of parliamentary committees to have access to information or the right of the House or its members to have access to information or documents in order to discharge their duties. Potentially, of course, the question is hypothetical. If in fact we were dealing with a situation where members or committees or the House had been refused access to documents or information on the basis of this order in council, to me that would be a different matter. However, that is an initial impression of the Chair, one upon which I would like to reflect. I would like to examine the precedents and examine again the arguments which have been put forward.

For the moment I will reserve until just after questions tomorrow to see whether the regular business for that day ought to be set aside to debate this question as a matter of privilege and with all the attendant priority questions of privilege have.

Report of Dean Lysyk

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

TRANSPORT

TABLING OF CORRESPONDENCE WITH CANADIAN AIRLINE PILOTS ASSOCIATION

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I should like to table, under Standing Order 41(2), copies in both official languages of correspondence between myself and the president of the Canadian Airline Pilots Association concerning a statement enclosed by him in connection with the interim report of the commission on bilingual air traffic services.

TABLING OF DISCUSSION PAPER ON ACCIDENTS

Hon. Otto. E. Lang (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I should like to table, under Standing Order 41(2), in both official languages, a discussion paper concerning the Canadian transportation accident investigation commission.

Mr. Speaker: Before continuing further with routine proceedings and calling further tabling of documents, I know that all hon. members would want to join with me briefly in recognizing the return to the House of the hon. member for Timmins (Mr. Roy) after a lengthy illness.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

* * *

[*Translation*]

ENVIRONMENT

TABLING OF INTERIM REPORT ON ALASKA PIPELINE

Hon. Roméo LeBlanc (Minister of Fisheries and the Environment): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 41(2), I would like to table in both official languages a copy of the interim report of the Environmental Assessment Panel on the Alaska Highway Pipeline project.

* * *

[*English*]

ENERGY

TABLING OF REPORT OF DEAN LYSYK

Hon. Warren Allmand (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): Mr. Speaker, under the provisions of Standing Order 41(2) I should like to table in both official languages, copies of the report of the Alaska highway pipeline inquiry under the chairmanship of Dean Kenneth Lysyk. Incidentally, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Lysyk is sitting in your gallery for the pipeline debate this afternoon. He is joined in your gallery by Mr. Pearson, the Commissioner for the Yukon Territory. In addition, members from the legislative councils of

the Yukon Territory and of the Northwest Territories are here today.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

TABLING OF SYNOPSIS OF MR. JUSTICE BERGER'S REPORT

Hon. Warren Allmand (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): Mr. Speaker, under the provisions of Standing Order 41(2) I should like to table, in both official languages, copies of the synopsis of volume II of the Mackenzie Valley pipeline inquiry under Mr. Justice Tom Berger.

* * *

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

LENGTH OF SPEECHES ON NORTHERN GAS PIPELINE DEBATE

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Speaker, with respect to the item of business to be dealt with later, I suggest that the House agree that the duration of the speeches of each beginning speaker for each party not exceed 40 minutes, and that the remaining speeches be limited to 20 minutes. Further, I suggest that we agree to dispense with private members' hour today and tomorrow, to provide for additional time.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, the official opposition would be agreeable to that if it were made a House order.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, this is the result of our consultations. We agree.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Lambert (Bellechasse): Mr. Speaker, we fully agree with that and if we could always solve problems in such a way, things would go much better in Canada.

* * *

[*English*]

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, the following questions will be answered today: 116, 191, 678, 688, 804, 859, 914, 1,142, 1,323, 1,372, 1,407, 1,474, 1,564, 1,687, 1,706, 1,805, 1,912, 1,916, 2,147, 2,187, 2,223, 2,253, 2,254, 2,278, 2,279, 2,283, 2,285, 2,300, 2,303, 2,317, 2,319, 2,336, 2,386, 2,387, 2,390, 2,420, 2,421, 2,430, 2,440, 2,443, 2,458, 2,459, 2,463, 2,543, 2,544, 2,624 to 2,635 incl., 2,639, 2,640, 2,649, 2,720, 2,721, 2,722, 2,742, 2,743, 2,765, 2,768, 2,777, 2,796, 2,797, 2,799, 2,802, 2,803, 2,811, 2,816, 2,817, 2,818, 2,823, 2,829, 2,830, 2,836, 2,846, 2,852, 2,859, 2,866, 2,877, 2,879, 2,882, 2,883, 2,888, 2,892, 2,902, 2,906, 2,913, 2,920 and 2,928.

[*Text*]

UIC—DESTRUCTION OF FINANCE RECORDS

Question No. 116—**Mr. Cossitt:**

1. Were any records at the head office of the Unemployment Insurance Commission, 222 Nepean Street, Ottawa, including records of the Finance Division, destroyed, designated for destruction, moved from the location in which they were, or in any way tampered with, since the date the Honourable Member for Leeds first placed questions on the *Order Paper* concerning the UIC during the First Session of the 30th Parliament and, if so, in each case (a) what is the nature of such records (b) what was the date and the reason of the occurrence (c) what is the name of the highest ranking officer ordering such action (d) what actual disposition or move took place?

2. Were any records which would be required to answer questions presently on the *Order Paper* from the Honourable Member for Leeds involved and, if so, which questions?

Hon. Bud Cullen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): 1. Records of the Unemployment Insurance Commission, like those of other agencies and departments, are regularly thinned on a continuing basis according to file category and age. This action is carried out routinely in accordance with the General Records and Disposal Schedules of the government of Canada and no authorization for it is required. During the time frame in question no records of the Finance Division were destroyed. (a) The nature of the records involved fall under the categories of (i) accounts payable (ii) financial services and (iii) records of a routine housekeeping nature. (b) and (c) See 1 above. (d) (i) Accounts payable records have been designated for storage in Archives (ii) financial services records have been designated for destruction (iii) records of a routine housekeeping nature have been destroyed.

2. No.

UIC—DOCUMENT ENTITLED "ACCOUNTING—CONTROL SYSTEMS TAXI CONTROL. PROCEDURES—HEAD OFFICE"

Question No. 191—**Mr. Cossitt:**

1. Is there an Unemployment Insurance Commission document entitled: "Accounting—Control Systems Taxi Control. Procedures—Head Office" bearing the designation "Section 45 and subject 3" and, if so, does it state under the heading "Ordering of Coupons" as follows: "Coupons are ordered from Blue Line Taxi Company by phone and our account number is given"?

2. Are all orders by the Unemployment Insurance Commission in Ottawa exclusively placed with Blue Line Taxi and, if so (a) for what reason (b) on what date was such a decision made and by whom (c) what are the reasons that other taxi companies are not used?

3. What is the total amount of public funds spent for taxis utilized by all persons connected with or employed by the Head Office of the Unemployment Insurance Commission, 222 Nepean Street, Ottawa (a) during the past four years for which figures are available (b) this year to the end of the closest month to which the answer to this question is given?

Hon. Bud Cullen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): 1. (a) Yes. (b) Yes.

2. Under a billing system—Yes (a) convenience; easy source of information for retrieval purposes; control; audit trail; elimination of petty cash usage. (b) Further to a circular issued by Treasury Board outlining the new services being offered by Blue Line Taxi Company, the commission decided to avail itself of the new charge account system on December 5, 1972. (c) No similar billing system.

3. (a) 1972—Not available, 1973—$29,290, 1974—$31,624, 1975—$33,626, (b) Year-to-date October, 1976—$31,245.

LES TERRASSES DE LA CHAUDIÈRE BUILDING, HULL, QUEBEC

Question No. 678—**Mr. McKinley:**

1. Which government departments are to be located in the new Les Terrasses de la Chaudière Building in Hull, Quebec?

2. What is the rent per square foot for office space in the Building?

3. Is the Building covered by a "lease to purchase" contract and, if so (a) what is the cost to the government each year for the lease (b) in what year does the lease expire and the purchase option become available (c) what will be the final purchase price of the Building when the lease does expire?

Hon. Judd Buchanan (Minister of Public Works): 1. There major tenants have been identified and approved by Treasury Board. They are: (1) Indian and Northern Affairs Department; (2) Secretary of State; (3) Canadian Radio Television and Telecommunications Commission.

2. $8.86 per gross rentable square foot annually on basis of 11¼ financing, net lease basis.

3. Yes. (a) $14,578,243 annually, subject to final measurement by DPW when complete and subject to variation as in 2 above. (b) At the expiration of a 35-year term—year 2013. (c) $54,000,000 for the entire complex.

CBC—FARM BROADCASTING INFORMATION

Question No. 688—**Mr. Hnatyshyn:**

Is the government considering (a) giving more autonomy to the regions (b) upgrading the farm broadcasting information service in regard to the programming of CBC?

Hon. John Roberts (Secretary of State): The CBC is autonomous with respect to its programming decisions, however the Corporation has reported as follows: (a) A considerable amount of radio and television programming is already produced by the CBC's regional centres for local, regional and network broadcast. Expansion in this direction will continue as resources allow, within the context of the CBC's responsibilities under the Broadcasting Act. (b) The status of farm broadcasting information service in the programming of the CBC and that of other broadcasters was examined by the House of Commons Standing Committee on Broadcasting, Films and Assistance to the Arts in December, 1976. The brief submitted in that connection by the CBC to that committee contains extensive information on CBC programming dealing with agriculture and the importance attached to it by the CBC. The brief is appended to the minutes of the December 21, 1976 meetings of the committee.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORT—AVAILABILITY OF RECORDS

Question No. 804—**Mr. Cossitt:**

With reference to the answer to Question No. 48 which said that records are not available prior to the fiscal year 1973-74 concerning whether or not the present Minister of Transport used government aircraft to pick up personal friends in Saskatoon and Regina to fly them to Ottawa, what are all reasons that such records are not available and (a) where are such records (b) if such records were destroyed, what is the exact date they were destroyed (c) on whose authority were they destroyed (d) is it customary that records of DOT that are less than three years old become not available or are destroyed after such a short period of time and, if so (i) what are all reasons (ii) specifically, is one of the reasons that the records would be embarrassing to the government?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): (a) Flight report records are destroyed as per the Public Archives approved DOT records disposal schedule. (b) Obsolete flight report records are destroyed on or about the end of April of each year. (c) The flight report disposal schedule was established by the Deputy Minister of Transport and approved by Public Archives as mentioned in (a). (d) Housekeeping or administrative type records are disposed of in accordance with the General Records Disposal Schedule of Canada. Material dealing with the operations of the department are scheduled for disposal in consultation with the user and approved by the Dominion Archivist. Material may have a life span of three months to 50 plus years depending on the administrative value, the legal value, the fiscal value and informational data value. The retention period for flight reports is two years under Public Archives Authority 74/018 dated September 12, 1974. (i) See part (d). (ii) No. The reasons are to dispose of the obsolete and useless records and to identify and preserve the important and valuable records.

DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS—OFFICE SPACE

Question No. 859—**Mr. Herbert:**

1. How many square feet of office space is presently occupied by the Canadian Pension Commission, the Pension Review Board, the War Veterans Allowance Board and the Bureau of Pension Advocates as well as veterans services, treatment services and administration services of the Department of Veterans Affairs?

2. Is any of the space rented and, if so, what are the terms of the lease and its termination date?

Hon. Judd Buchanan (Minister of Public Works): 1. Office space presently occupied by: Canadian Pension Commission—4,835 sq. ft. Pension Review Board—nil. War Veterans Allowance Board—1,280 sq. ft. Bureau of Pension Advocates—26,670 sq. ft. Department of Veterans Affairs—628,144 sq. ft.

2. Yes, as follows:

Location	Square Feet	Annual Rental	Termination Date
Gulf Building Halifax, Nova Scotia	2,170	$ 19,587.50	June 30, 1979
230 Charlotte Street Sydney, Nova Scotia	2,200	$ 14,850.00	March 31, 1980
City Hall Building Saint John, New Brunswick	10,179	$ 64,636.65	February 28, 1978 Option exercised
Hilyard Place Saint John, New Brunswick	11,196	$ 89,468.75	March 31, 1981
Terminal Plaza Moncton, New Brunswick	609	$ 4,306.00	December 31, 1978
Wadena, Saskatchewan	164	$ 900.00	January 31, 1978
Swift Current, Saskatchewan	319	$ 1,934.00	June 30, 1978 Option exercised

Location	Square Feet	Annual Rental	Termination Date
Regina, Saskatchewan	900	$ 4,725.00	July 31, 1977
Stonewall, Manitoba	195	$ 1,020.00	month-to-month
32626 South Frazer Way, Abbotsford, British Columbia	192	$ 1,248.00	March 31, 1979
Pebb Building 2197 Riverside Dr. Ottawa, Ontario	26,726	$128,290.00	October 31, 1979
Billings Bridge Plaza 2271 Riverside Dr. Ottawa, Ontario	24,000	$ 86,400.00	November 30, 1977 Option exercised
Trebla Building 473 Albert Street Ottawa, Ontario	128,659	$577,678.92	October 31, 1979
2 Quebec Street Guelph, Ontario	420	$ 2,835.00	January 31, 1979
Kingston, Ontario	468	$ 2,340.00	November 30, 1977
53 Armstrong New Liskeard, Ontario	507	$ 3,448.00	August 31, 1978
480 University Avenue Toronto, Ontario	38,238	$208,779.48	July 31, 1977
University Hospital Edmonton, Alberta	10,748	$ 14,300.00	indefinite lease

CBC—MR. MARK STAROWICZ

Question No. 914—**Mr. Cossitt:**

1. What is a complete history of employment, contracts, etc., which Mr. Mark Starowicz has held with CBC, at any time, including the names of programmes, the capacity in which he has been associated with them and the amount of remuneration received for various services performed?

2. (a) What is Mr. Starowicz's present status with CBC (b) is it planned to extend his duties or allot further responsibilities to him and, if so, what is a full description of such duties?

Hon. John Roberts (Secretary of State): 1 and 2. (b) It has not been customary to require the CBC to provide such information as the employment histories, salaries and career prospects of individual staff members. (The background of this custom is explained in detail in the reply to question No. 2,530, May 22, 1975).

2. (a) Executive Producer, Radio.

RIDEAU CENTRE AND WOODROFFE DEVELOPMENT PROJECT

Question No. 1,142—**Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton):**

With respect to the plans for relocation and decentralization, what are the government's intentions for the Rideau Centre on Rideau Street and the Woodroffe Development Project in Nepean?

Hon. André Ouellet (Minister of State for Urban Affairs): (a) With respect to the Rideau Centre project, the National Capital Commission and the Department of Public Works are involved with municipal bodies, local merchants and citizens in the development of a land use plan for the federal lands and adjoining properties in the Rideau Centre area. The effect on this plan of relocation and decentralization is currently being assessed. (b) With respect to the Woodroffe Development Project, this is primarily a housing demonstration project and plans for relocation and decentralization will have little or no effect on this project.

[Mr. Buchanan.]

MISS ELIZABETH MACGILLIVRAY

Question No. 1,323—**Mr. Epp:**

1. Was Miss Elizabeth MacGillivray, an employee of Mr. and Mrs. Otto E. Lang, Rockcliffe, Ontario (a) a landed immigrant (b) a visitor (c) granted a work permit, in Canada in 1975 and 1976 and, if so, was there any representation made on her behalf to the Canadian immigration authorities and, if so (i) by whom (ii) on what date (iii) in what form?

2. For the years 1970 to date, were any (a) immigration visas (b) ministerial permits (c) work permits issued to applicants whose intended occupations were in the field of domestic service (nannies, wet nurses, domestics, domestic servants, maids, kitchen help and such) and whose intended destination was the National Capital Region and, if so (i) how many (ii) in each case, were representations made on behalf of the applicants and, if so, what was the name and address of the person making such representation and/or what was the name and address of the resident in the National Capital Region on whose behalf such representation was made (iii) what was the country of last permanent residence of these applicants?

Hon. Bud Cullen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): 1. (a) No. (b) No. (c) Yes. No representation has been made on her behalf to the Canadian Immigration Authorities.

2. (a) 757. (b) None. (c) (i) 1970 to 1973 none. Work permits were not introduced until 1973. 1973 to 1976, 1,826. (ii) The Department of Manpower and Immigration regards as confidential the names and content of all representations made to the minister or the department. (iii) England 219; Scotland 34; Denmark 8; Wales 7; Finland 11; France 38; Austria 3; Czechoslovakia 6; West Germany 31; Irish Republic 9; Italy 5; The Netherlands 9; Norway 3; Poland 18; Portugal 16; Spain 15; Switzerland 31; Sweden 2; Rhodesia 1; Morocco 4; Sri Lanka 19; Hong Kong 13; India 24; Ethiopia 6; Mauritania 2; Nigeria 7; Senegal 6; Japan 5; Pakistan 4; Malaysia 3; Singapore 2; Australia 6; New Zealand 2; Ghana 8; Turkey 1; Formosa 2; Lebanon 5; Indonesia 1; Philippines 3; Thailand 4; Channel Islands 1; Malta 1; Egypt 1; South Africa 1; Cameroon 2; South Vietnam 1; United States 13; Mexico 12; Costa Rica 4; Argentina 1; El Salvador 1; Guatemala 4; St. Pierre and Miquelon 3; Bermuda 3; Jamaica 697; Honduras 1; Trinidad & Tobago 110; Barbados 43; Antigua 15; Dominica 6; Bahamas 2; St. Lucia 51; Grenada 15; St. Vincent 10; Guadeloupe 3; Dominican Republic 5; Haiti 104; Guyana 75; Brazil 7; Columbia 9; Peru 14; Venezuela 3; Chile 3; Peru 9; Mauritius 1; Martinique 1; West Indies 1.

UIC—BENEFITS

Question No. 1,372—**Mr. Herbert:**

1. Is the duration of a claim for regular unemployment insurance benefits decreased by the apportionment of severance and vacation pay as part of the qualifying period?

2. Is it the intention of the government to introduce a change in the regulations so that an individual would not be subject to such a decrease in the claim period and, if so (a) on what date (b) could such a change be made retroactive?

Hon. Bud Cullen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): 1. As a general rule, under the unemployment insurance program, all monies received by a claimant at the time that he is separated from employment, are treated as earnings and have the effect of either delaying the start of a benefit period, or are deducted from benefits otherwise payable. In particular,

both severance pay and vacation pay are considered earnings for unemployment insurance benefit purposes.

2. The government will be making regulatory amendments to effect the disconstinuance of the treatment of severance pay as earnings. It is not intended, however, to make similar changes to the treatment of vacation pay which will continue to be treated as earnings and deducted from benefits. (a) The regulatory amendments to discontinue the treatment of severance pay as earnings will be made as soon as administratively possible, and is expected to be effective in the near future. (b) There is no legislative authority that would allow such an amendment to be made retroactive. The intent, however, is to discontinue the allocation of severance pay on all existing and new claims after the effective date of the regulatory amendment.

DREE—ATLANTIC REGION

Question No. 1,407—**Mr. MacDonald (Egmont):**

1. Is (a) DREE (b) the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce aware that the October, 1976 APEC report *Industrial Incentives Programs in the Atlantic Region* states, with regard to existing programs, that "activity under research and product development has been abysmal", that "it is obvious that the region failed to take advantage of research and industrial design assistance", and that "given the region's emphasis on trade, its lack of participation in programs to encourage market expansion is of concern" and, if so, do the Departments agree with such statements?

2. Do the Departments accept that a sizeable advancement of the Atlantic Region's economy will require major initiatives in product research, development and marketing?

3. What measures do the Departments propose to ensure more adequate participation by the Atlantic Region in the type of programs cited by APEC?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): In so far as the Department of Regional Economic Expansion is concerned: 1. DREE is aware of the report and believes that increased research and product development in the Atlantic region would be desirable.

2. Further advances in the economy of the Atlantic region will call for progress on a number of fronts. Viable initiatives in product research, development and marketing would certainly be helpful.

3. Although DREE does not normally have direct responsibility for the operation of programs of this type, it is prepared to complement and supplement the efforts of the responsible departments with regionally-oriented activities under its General Development Agreements (GDAs) with the various provincial governments. A specific example in this regard is the DREE agreement with Newfoundland providing for the establishment of a Newfoundland Oceans Research and Development Corporation which seek to stimulate the development of marine technology within the province and to foster the establishment of marine ice-related industries based on the technology. DREE's activities under the Regional Development Incentives Act and through industrial development initiatives under the GDAs are also serving to help strengthen the industrial base of the region, thus creating a better climate for new product design and development.

In so far as the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce is concerned: 1. Yes, the department is aware of the statement. The department actively promotes its programs in all provinces, but these programs require an application by individual companies. The use in each province depends on the rate of response of individual companies.

2. Industry, Trade and Commerce continues to actively promote its programs in the Atlantic region recognizing the importance of both innovation and market development in the Atlantic area.

3. The Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce has adapted a number of measures which should ensure more adequate participation by the Atlantic region. Such measures have included a further decentralization of the administration of its programs and the consolidation of a number of the development and incentive programs into the Enterprise Development Program to make them more accessible to smaller and medium-size businesses which play an important role in the Atlantic region.

FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE AVAILABLE TO POULTRY FARMERS IN NEW BRUNSWICK

Question No. 1,474—**Mr. Howie:**

1. Is financial assistance available to poultry farmers in New Brunswick and (a) if so, in what manner (b) if not, is any being planned?

2. Have applications for financial assistance been made by poultry farmers in New Brunswick since January 1, 1975 and, if so, how many and what is their status?

Hon. E. F. Whelan (Minister of Agriculture): Farm Credit Corporation advises: 1. Yes. (a) Loans are available under the Farm Credit Act which is administered by the Farm Credit Corporation. (b) Not applicable.

2. Yes. Twenty enquiries were made to Farm Credit Corporation, of which six resulted in loan applications. All six were approved for a total of $455,000. It is expected that a further one of the enquirers will make an application after April 1, 1977. The remainder were either general enquiries for information, did not wish to proceed at this time, or did not meet the qualifications for a loan under the Farm Credit Act.

DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS OFFICIALS RELOCATING IN PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND

Question No. 1,564—**Mr. Marshall:**

Which officials of the Department of Veterans Affairs have agreed to move to the Province of Prince Edward Island in the impending decentralization of the Department (a) Head Office (i) Deputy Minister (ii) Assistant Deputy Minister (Treatment) (b) Administration (i) Departmental Adviser, Official Languages (ii) Departmental Financial Management Adviser (iii) Department Personnel Management Adviser (iv) Director, Administrative Services (v) Director, Management Advisory Services (vi) Director, Public Relations (c) Treatment Services (i) Director (ii) Deputy Director (iii) Consultant to the ADM(T) (iv) Director, Administration (v) Director, Entitlement and Benefits (vi) Departmental Dental Services Adviser (vii) Director, Financial Services (viii) Acting Chief Financial Services (ix) Personnel Management Adviser (x) Chief, Purchasing and Supply (xi) Director, Facilities, Planning and Construction (xii) Chief, Treatment Statistics (xiii) Organization Development Officer (d) Veterans Land Administration (i) Director General (ii) Director of Finance and Administration

(iii) Director, Property and Securities (iv) Director, Farm Services (e) Veterans Services (i) Director General (ii) Director, Program Operations (iii) Senior Consultant (Temporary SAPP) (iv) Director, Finance and Administration Services (v) Personnel Management Adviser (vi) Chief, WVA/CWA Operations (vii) Program Adviser, Organization Effectiveness (viii) Manager, Payment Services (ix) A/Chief, Veterans Insurance (x) Chief, Veterans Services (xi) Chief, Planning and Analysis (f) Pension Review Board (i) Chairman (ii) Legal Adviser (iii) Executive Secretary and Registrar (iv) the three members of the Board (g) Canadian Pension Commission (i) Chairman (ii) Deputy Chairman (iii) Director of Operations (iv) the twenty-two Commissioners (v) Secretary to the Commission (vi) Chief Medical Adviser (vii) Chief, Ancillary Benefits Branch (viii) Financial Management Adviser (ix) Deputy Chief Medical Adviser (x) Personnel Management Adviser (xi) Commission Counsel (h) War Veterans Allowance Board (i) Chairman (ii) Deputy Chairman (iii) the five Board members (iv) Medical Adviser (v) Executive Director Operations (vi) Chief, Finance and Administration (vii) Chief, Operations Review (viii) Chief, Research and Statistics (ix) Executive Secretary and Registrar (i) Bureau of Pension Advocates (i) Chief Pensions Advocat (ii) Deputy Chief Pensions Advocate (iii) Senior Area Advocate (iv) the three Area Advocates (v) Director Financial and Administrative Services (vi) Chief Reviewer and Registrar?

Hon. Daniel J. MacDonald (Minister of Veterans Affairs): In so far as the officials identified are concerned, this question cannot be answered at this time as there has been no canvass of veterans affairs personnel to identify the staff who will choose to relocate or choose not to relocate. It is expected that this canvass will be made during 1977 as a first step in relocation manpower planning.

In so far as the position titles are concerned, all positions will be relocated except the deputy minister and a small core group, and the positions in the Veterans Land Administration program, which will remain in the National Capital Region.

DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS EMPLOYEES RELOCATING IN PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND

Question No. 1,687—**Mr. Macquarrie:**

1. What is the estimated number of Department of Veterans Affairs employees expected to be stationed in Charlottetown, PEI when a portion of the Department is transferred?

2. How many will be (a) French speaking (b) English speaking (c) transferred from Ottawa and on what proposed date (d) recruited from among citizens of Prince Edward Island?

3. Is the government making any provisions to provide French language instruction in Prince Edward Island for applicants for positions in the Department subsequent to the move and, if so, what are they?

Hon. Daniel J. MacDonald (Minister of Veterans Affairs): 1. While there can be no precise determination of the department's future manpower requirements, it is estimated that there will be approximately 700 Veterans Affairs employees in Charlottetown in 1981 following relocation.

2. This information will not be available until all present employees have indicated their preference with regard to relocation.

3. Consistent with the provisions of the Official Languages policy, French language training will be provided as required for successful applicants. Provision for such training in Prince Edward Island or at other language training facilities in the Atlantic region would depend upon the number of employees requiring training.

[Mr. Marshall.]

MILK SUBSIDIES AND MARKET QUOTAS

Question No. 1,706—**Mr. Caron:**

1. For each constituency, what are the names of milk producers who are subsidized by the government and, in each case, what was their production in (a) 1974-75 (b) 1975-76?

2. What market quota (a) was allocated to each on April 1, 1976 (b) has been allocated to each since October 19, 1976?

Hon. E. F. Whelan (Minister of Agriculture): 1. The Canadian Dairy Commission maintains the information required to answer this part of the question in confidence. The release of this information could infringe upon the right of privacy of the producer as it could form the basis of determining income or establishing a mailing list of all milk producers. However, the total production by province is as follows:

	Million hundredweights of milk	
	1974-75	1975-76
Prince Edward Island	1.37	1.53
Nova Scotia	.84	1.06
New Brunswick	.68	.68
Quebec	47.13	55.61
Ontario	29.83	36.13
Manitoba	4.13	4.37
Saskatchewan	2.29	2.44
Alberta	6.51	7.44
British Columbia	2.74	3.54
Canada	95.52	112.80

2. The allocation of market quotas to producers is the responsibility of the provincial milk marketing boards and the information is not available to the commission.

EQUIPMENT OR BUILDING REPAIRS IN 1974, 1975 AND 1976

Question No. 1,805—**Mr. Mazankowski:**

Was the Treasury Board's policy decision to change accounting practices for the 1975-76 fiscal year, as referred to in the reply of the Secretary of State to Question No. 1,059, carried forward to the 1976-77 fiscal year and (a) if so, what is the reason for the substantial drop in the Purchased Repair and Upkeep estimated for the Department in the 1976-77 Main Estimates from the 1975-76 levels (b) if not, what is the reason for the substantial increase in the Purchased Repair and Upkeep estimated for the Department in the 1976-77 Main Estimates over the 1974-75 level before the accounting policy changed?

Hon. John Roberts (Secretary of State): Treasury Board has issued two policy directives to this department relating to accounting practices during the period in question. The first policy directive was in 1975; this directive authorized DPW to recover its costs for certain tenant services to this department; these included the costs of fitting-up new, leased accommodation needed for the expansion of the translation bureau in the Quebec region. In accordance with the procedures provided by DPW and the definition of the Tenant Services portion of Purchased Repair and Upkeep which were affected under this directive, the Department of the Secretary of State estimated $1.7 million as a cost payable to DPW for Tenant Services. That same directive was not carried over into 1976-77; a new directive was issued in early 1976 which revised the definition of Tenant Services. On the basis of these revised guidelines, DPW was directed once again to absorb the fitting-up cost of new, leased accommodation and the Department of the Secre-

tary of State estimated that $296,000 would be payable to DPW for Tenant Services. (a) It is this revision which accounts for the sizeable decrease from the 1975-76 figures. (b) The reason for the increase in the Tenant Services portion of Purchased Repair and Upkeep in the 1976-77 Main Estimates over the 1974-75 level is that T.B. guidelines, as per the second policy directive, require that the Department include these costs in its departmental estimates whereas in 1974-75 these costs were included in DPW estimates. It is to be noted, however, that the figure is lower than for 1975-76 since Treasury Board revised the original definition of the cost of Tenant Services. In summary, the figures for the three years in question are as follows: 1974-75 (Tenant Services portion of Purchased Repair and Upkeep absorbed by DPW) $3,000. 1975-76 T.B. issued 1st directive $1,700,000. 1976-77 T.B. issued 2nd directive (but definition of Tenant Services redefined) $296,000.

UIC—MR. DANIEL COATES

Question No. 1,912—**Mr. O'Sullivan:**

1. Is Mr. Daniel Coates employed by the government or any of its agencies and, if so (a) in what capacity (b) what is his salary range?

2. For each year (a) 1974 (b) 1975 (c) 1976, how many times was Mr. Coates reimbursed for travel expenses by the government or any of its agencies and, in each case (i) what was the amount (ii) what was the origin, destination and purpose of each related trip (iii) under whose prior authorization was each trip undertaken (iv) under whose authorization was each payment for travel expenses made?

3. For each year (a) 1974 (b) 1975 (c) 1976, how many times were payments by the government or any of its agencies for charges on credit cards taken out by departments or agencies in the name of Mr. Coates and, in each case (i) what was the amount (ii) for what specific purposes were the charges made (iii) under whose prior authorization were these charges incurred (iv) under whose authorization was each payment of these credit card expenses made?

4. Has the government or any of its agencies ever paid for the moving expenses of Daniel Coates and, if so, in each case (a) what was the amount (b) to whom (c) what was the origin and destination of the objects moved?

Hon. Bud Cullen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): In so far as the Unemployment Insurance Commission is concerned—1. Mr. D. Coates is (a) Special Advisor to the Chairman; (b) $31,500 to $41,500.

2. (a) See list below. (b) See list below. (c) Nil.

3. (a) 9. (i) $945.00. (ii) Air transportation costs. See 2(a)(ii). (iii) See 2 (a) (iii). (iv) See 2(a)(iv). (b) 2 (i) $295.00—$284.00. (ii) See 2(b)(ii). Parts 3 and 4. (iii) See 2(b)(iii). Parts 3 and 4. (iv) See 2(b)(iv). Parts 3 and 4. (c) Nil.

4. No.

	(i) Reimbursed Travel Expenses	(ii) Origin	Destination	Purpose	(iii) Travel Authority	(iv) Payment of Expenses
2(a)—1974						
1.	$ 19.75	Ottawa	Toronto	Meeting with U.I.C. Officials	No listing for D. Coates was found in Public Archives records based on 1974. However D. J. Steele and G. Cousineau were the only officers authorizing and approving these trips.	
2.	$ 22.00	Ottawa	Vancouver	Meeting with U.I.C. Officials		
3.	$ 79.15	Ottawa	Montreal Management Conference			
4.	$ 44.50	Ottawa	Cambridge, Mass.	Attendance as Research Fellow at John F. Kennedy School of Government Graduate School of Education Harvard University		
5.	$ 5.95	Ottawa	Vancouver	Taxi charge omitted from earlier claim		
6.	$ 16.38	Ottawa	Montreal	Meetings with U.I.C. Officials		
7.	$ 8.25	Ottawa	Belleville	Meetings with U.I.C. Officials		
8.	$ 93.25	Ottawa	Vancouver	Meetings with U.I.C. Officials		
9.	$ 59.00	Ottawa	Montreal	Meetings with U.I.C. Officials		
2(b)—1975						
1.	$ 73.80	Ottawa	Quebec City	Manager's Conference	D. J. Steele	D. J. Steele
2.	$171.45	Ottawa	Toronto	Budget Meeting	D. J. Steele	D. J. Steele
3.	$ 21.48	Ottawa	Winnipeg	Regional Comptroller's Conference	D. J. Steele	D. J. Steele
4.	$ 19.00	Ottawa	Winnipeg	National Managers Conference	G. Cousineau	G. Cousineau

STATISTICAL BREAKDOWN OF FARM WORKER, TRACK WORKER AND SIMILAR PROGRAMS

Question No. 1,916—**Mr. Schumacher:**

1. In the years immediately following World War II, for each year of their existence, what was the complete statistical breakdown of (a) the farm worker (b) the track worker (c) other similar programmes?

2. For each year of duration and in each category, what (a) were the numbers participating (b) was the destination in Canada and the length of time stayed at the original destination?

Hon. Bud Cullen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): 1. (a), (b) and (c) Statistics in the form requested are not available. The annual statistical reports do contain statistics on immigrants whose intended employment is agriculture but no specific reference is shown regarding "farm workers", "track workers" programmes or other similar programmes. Information concerning the movement of farm workers from the Netherlands to Canada can be located in the annual reports of the Department of Mines and Resources and the Department of Citizenship and Immigration for the years immediately following World War II.

2. (a) and (b) Not applicable.

Order Paper Questions

LANGUAGE TRAINING CENTRE FOR ARMED FORCES

Question, No. 2,147—**Mr. Brisco:**

1. What is the present status of the new French and English language Training Centre for the Armed Forces?

2. Were the projected costs for the Centre set at $88,000,000 and, if so, have the projected costs increased, or do they remain the same?

Hon. Barney Danson (Minister of National Defence): 1. The megastructure for the Canadian Forces language training and recruit school is now approximately 17 per cent complete and it is anticipated it will be completed in the 1979/80 fiscal year. When completed this facility will house approximately 1600 language students and 760 recruits during peak periods. In addition there will be 513 both military and civilian permanent teaching and training staff plus 170 administrative support personnel.

2. The estimated costs for the project were $87,861,000 but, are now estimated to be $96,600,000.

ACCOMMODATION COSTS—ESTIMATES 1977-78

Question No. 2,187—**Mr. Herbert:**

1. What are the amounts by department, agency or commission, that the Department of Public Works sets down as accommodation costs to be carried in the 1977-78 Estimates?

2. In each case, what is the (a) total square footage utilized (b) percentage change in the (i) area utilized in the past year (ii) amount carried?

Hon. Judd Buchanan (Minister of Public Works): 1. The estimates of the Department of Public Works are not prepared by building up the cost of accommodation by occupancy. Accordingly, the accommodation costs carried in the 1977-78 Main Estimates for the Department of Public Works cannot be detailed by department, agency and commission.

2. (a) and (b) (i) departmental records identify only the amount of space allocated to a client at a point of time. We do not have information as to what use they would make of space, i.e., utilization. (b) (ii) As indicated in the reply to part 1 this information is not available.

ESTIMATES FOR POST OFFICE FACILITIES

Question No. 2,223—**Mr. Herbert:**

In each of the past five years, how much has been carried in the Estimates of the Department of Public Works for (a) the Post Office construction programme (b) other Post Office accommodation costs?

Hon. Judd Buchanan (Minister of Public Works): (a) For the years 1972-73 through 1976-77 the actual costs incurred and funded from the DPW accommodation (capital) program specifically for the Post Office Department are as follows: 1972-73, $9,947,792; 1973-74, $17,955,383; 1974-75, $29,852,882; 1975-76, $53,892,263; 1976-77, $74,508,996. Total: $186,157,316. (b) The Department of Public Works does not prepare estimates for its operating programs by forecasting expenditures for each department or agency which will use its space, nor does it maintain a record of historical costs incurred on a departmental/agency basis. Accordingly no figures can be provided for the costs to operate the accommodation utilized by the Post Office.

[Mr. Cullen.]

TRANSFER OF MAGDALEN ISLANDS UIC OFFICE TO QUEBEC REGION

Question No. 2,253—**Mr. Fortin:**

1. Following the transfer of the Unemployment Insurance Commission office in Îles-de-la-Madeleine from the Maritime Region to the Quebec Region, was there a one week delay in the payment of benefits and, if so, what was the cost of (a) overtime (b) private messenger services (c) air mail (d) others?

2. Are these special measures still in effect today and (a) if not, on what date were they stopped (b) if so, are the beneficiaries still entitled to forward their 31-01 forms on Thursdays?

Hon. Bud Cullen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): 1. Yes. (a) The Commission cannot isolate the cost of overtime. (b) $16.50 per day. (c) Nil. (d) Nil.

2. These special measures are still in effect today, but the beneficiaries are not required to forward their 31-01 forms on Thursdays.

UIC—JEAN-MARIE ALLARD

Question No. 2,254—**Mr. Fortin:**

1. (a) Before (b) since Mr. Jean-Marie Allard's arrival in Montreal in an acting capacity, then as Director of Public Relations for the Unemployment Insurance Commission in Quebec, what was the value of the contracts signed with Studio 2 plus 2 for the (i) Quebec Regional Office (ii) National Office and how many are uncompleted?

2. For each contract, were tenders called and, if so, who were the bidders?

3. Since the denunciation by the Social Credit Party of the Olympic-oriented Posters, was the Director of Information Services, Mr. Jean Labossière demoted and (a) if so, was it because of the denunciation (b) if not, for what reason was he not demoted?

Hon. Bud Cullen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): 1. (a) Nil. (b) (i) $66,070.12; (ii) $13,500. All of these contracts have been completed.

2. Tenders were not called as all contracts were for an amount of less than $15,000 (Treasury Board guidelines).

3. (a) Yes, he has been demoted, but the demotion was not related to the denunciation. (b) Not applicable.

PROPERTY AT 640 ST. CATHERINE STREET WEST, MONTREAL

Question No. 2,278—**Mr. Cossitt:**

1. Did the government cease operating a book store at 640 St. Catherine Street West, Montreal, Quebec and, if so (a) on what date (b) is the premises now vacant and still rented by the government (c) what are the terms of the lease including the (i) expiry date (ii) monthly rental (iii) annual rental (iv) details of any escalation clauses contained in the lease, if any (v) name and address of the landlord, etc.?

2. If the premises remain vacant until the expiry of the lease, what will be the total amount of money paid by the government?

Hon. Judd Buchanan (Minister of Public Works): 1. Yes; (a) November 5, 1976; (b) The premises have been occupied since May 18, 1977 by the Department of the Secretary of State for the organizational activities related to Canada week. Further, the Department of Public Works has a firm commit-

ment from the Post Office Department, Philatelic Services to occupy these premises commencing August 15, 1977. (c)(i) September 30, 1981; (ii) $13,958.85 basic monthly rent; (iii) $167,506.24 basic annual rent; (iv) There are three escalation clauses contained in lease: (a) Tax escalation clause with a "base year" defined as the tax year, 1972-73 and the "proportionate share" being 5.14 per cent. (b) Operating costs escalation clause with a "base year" defined as February 1, 1973 to January 31, 1974 and the "proportionate share" being 5.14 per cent. (c) Cost of living escalation clause "of the cost of living index, as determined by Statistics Canada should show any increase on October 1, 1972, and any subsequent anniversary date during the term of this lease, above the cost of living index as at October 1, 1971, the rent will be increased in a proportionate amount and will become due and payable as increased rent." (v) Oxford Development Group Limited, Shell Tower Building, 1255 University Street, Suite 111, Montreal, Quebec. H3B 3A8.

2. Not applicable.

MEMO SIGNED BY H. R. FINLEY

Question No. 2,279—**Mr. Cossitt:**

1. With reference to the answer by the Minister of Transport to Question No. 785, part 3(f), was a memo issued on July 20, 1976 and signed by H. R. Finley, Director, Aviation Safety Bureau, Department of Transport and, if so, did this memo state in part that "... ..disciplinary or punitive action against the involved controller would not be propitious at this time" and if the matter had nothing to do with the language question in the air, what is the full meaning and intent of the words quoted?

2. How does the Minister of Transport reconcile his negative answer with the statement contained in the memo signed by Mr. Finley?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): 1. Yes. An inter-branch memorandum was prepared and signed by H. R. Finley, Director, Aviation Safety Bureau, Department of Transport on July 20, 1976 addressed to the Director, Air Traffic Services, Department of Transport. The memorandum did state in part that: "... disciplinary or punitive action against the involved controller would not be propitious at this time". As reported in the answer to question No. 785, part 3(e): "the controller involved was severely reprimanded on July 9, 1976, and warned that a further occurrence would not be tolerated". In recognition that the errant controller had already been severely admonished by the unit chief the memorandum in part acknowledged that the action taken was considered, by senior management, as appropriate and sufficient under the circumstances.

2. The answer to this question is contained in (1) above.

BILL C-27

Question No. 2,283—**Mr. Fortin:**

1. Is the Unemployment Insurance Commission and Department of Manpower and Immigration merger advocated in Bill C-27, now before the House, taking place and, if so, on what date will it be completed?

2. Has the temporary staffing policy during the merger of UIC and the Department been applied since March 15, 1977, before the third reading of the Bill and, if so, for what reason?

Hon. Bud Cullen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): 1. (a) No. However, the personnel groups in the national headquarters of the commission and the department are being consolidated in order to facilitate the preparation of the plans to integrate the two organizations. (b) Not applicable.

2. (a) Yes. (b) The staffing policy adopted by the Unemployment Insurance Commission and the Department of Manpower and Immigration on March 15, 1977, establishes a common staffing policy for the commission and department. It will help to ensure an orderly transition to the integrated organization provided for in Bill C-27.

UIC—DISENTITLEMENT UNDER INTERVIEW PROGRAM

Question No. 2,285—**Mr. Fortin:**

Under the H-PEVAIC programme and in compliance with code D-15, have any persons drawing unemployment insurance lost their right to benefits, in accordance with clause 55(6) of the Unemployment Insurance Act and, if so, by region, how many and on what date?

Hon. Bud Cullen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Insofar as the Unemployment Insurance Commission is concerned, yes.

Region	1976 October	1976 November		1976 December
Atlantic	287	323	314	
Quebec	3,190	1,870	2,962	
Ontario	2,137	2,133	1,980	
Prairie	740	635	527	
Pacific	618	656	750	
Total	6,972	5,617	6,533	

	1977 January	1977 February		1977 March
Atlantic	278	376	193	
Quebec	2,092	2,986	—not available at this time	
Ontario	3,093	5,860	—not available at this time	
Prairie	981	893	927	
Pacific	627	827	880	
Total	7,071	10,942		

ONTARIO COLLEGES OF APPLIED ARTS AND TECHNOLOGY

Question No. 2,300—**Mr. O'Sullivan:**

1. How many students entered Department of Manpower and Immigration college preparatory programmes in the Ontario College of Applied Arts and Technology each year 1972 to date?

2. What was the average fee paid?

3. What was the average award to the students?

4. How many left before completing the programme?

5. How many found employment after graduation in the field for which they were trained?

Hon. Bud Cullen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Virtually all full-time training in Ontario is done through the Ontario Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology. The following data covers all full-time skill training, for Ontario. Trainee and cost figures (Nos. 1-4) are by fiscal year, 1972-73 to 1976-77; trainee follow-up data (No. 5) is by calendar year, 1972 to 1975. (1) The number of trainees who started training

for each year is as follows: 1972-73: 16,864; 1973-74: 17,203; 1974-75: 17,316; 1975-76: 20,337; 1976-77: 18,337 (Preliminary, as at March 31, 1977).

(2) The average Purchase Costs per Trainee were: 1972-73: $1,338 (Based on Estimated Purchase Costs); 1973-74: $1,194 (Based on Estimated Purchase Costs); 1974-75: $1,522 (Based on Estimated Purchase Costs); 1975-76: $1,477; 1976-77: $1,651 (Preliminary, as at March 31, 1977).

(3) The average Allowances paid per Trainee were: 1972-73: $1,220; 1973-74: $1,186; 1974-75: $1,216; 1975-76: $1,344; 1976-77: $1,550 (Preliminary, as at March 31, 1977).

(4) The number of Trainees who Discontinued training each year was: 1972-73: 4,997; 1973-74: 5,102; 1974-75: 5,475; 1975-76: 6,301; 1976-77: 5,198 (Preliminary, as at March 31, 1977).

(5) This information is not directly available, since graduates are not required to seek subsequent employment through a Canada Manpower Centre. The information available is from a continuing 100 per cent survey of skill course graduates which shows:

	Percentage of Skill Graduates Employed	
	Before Training	After Training
1972	12.7	72.4
1973	14.1	73.0
1974	14.4	71.3
1975	12.7	65.5
1976	N/A	N/A

The same survey shows that 74.8 per cent of those employed in 1975 are employed in a two-digit CCDO occupation which corresponds with the two-digit CCDO occupation assigned to their skill course. This is not a reliable indicator of whether persons are employed in the field for which they are trained because, for instance, a person trained in agricultural technology (agricultural occupation) may utilize his or her training as a sales representative for a feed company (sales occupation).

CANADA WORKS AND YOUNG CANADA WORKS PROGRAMS

Question No. 2,303—**Mr. O'Sullivan:**

1. What have been the total amounts paid to date since January 1, 1977, to (a) newspapers (b) radio stations (c) television stations serving the constituencies of Hamilton—Wentworth, Hamilton West, Hamilton East, Hamilton—Mountain, Halton—Wentworth and Halton to promote the (i) Canada Works Programme (ii) Young Canada Works Programme and, in each case, what are the names and addresses of the involved media?

2. What has been the total amount allocated under the (a) Canada Works Programme (b) Young Canada Works Programme to the constituency of (i) Hamilton—Wentworth (ii) Hamilton West (iii) Hamilton East (iv) Hamilton—Mountain (v) Halton—Wentworth (vi) Halton?

3. In each case, on what basis was this distribution of funds made?

Hon. Bud Cullen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): 1. (a) (i) $5,487.00; (ii) $5,487.00; (b) Nil; (c) Nil. The following newspapers were used for both the Canada Works and the Young Canada Works programmes' advertising. Acton Free Press, P.O. Box 120, Acton, Ontario; Burlington Gazette, 490 Brant Street, Burlington, Ontario; Caledonia Grand River Sachem, P.O. Box 160, Caledonia, Ontario; Grimsby Independent, P.O. Box 310, Grimsby, Ontario; Oakville Journal Record, 284 Lakeshore Blvd., E., Oakville, Ontario; Calvinist & Contact, 99 Niagara Street, St. Catharines, Ontario; Pioneer, 201 Paradise Road N., Hamilton, Ontario; Hamilton Spectator, 44 Frid Street, Hamilton, Ontario; Kanadski Srbobran, 335 Britania Avenue, Hamilton, Ontario.

2. (a) (i) $100,000; (ii) $296,000; (iii) $364,000; (iv) $100,000; (v) $100,000; (vi) $50,000; (b) (i) $59,000; (ii) $239,000; (iii) $140,000; (iv) $57,000; (v) $44,000; (vi) $44,000.

3. 1977/78 Canada Works program—Phase I: The 1977/78 Canada Works program—Phase I funds were distributed to the above constituencies as follows: Initial Allocation: (1) Estimates of labour force, labour surplus and a labour surplus rate were derived for each constituency for the period December, 1975 to November, 1976. (2) Based on these data $50,000 was allocated to those constituencies with a labour surplus rate below 5 per cent; therefore, Halton received $50,000. (3) A basic allocation of $100,000 was distributed to those constituencies with a labour surplus rate of 5 per cent to 7 per cent; therefore, Hamilton-Wentworth, Hamilton-Mountain and Halton-Wentworth each received $100,000. (4) Constituencies with a labour surplus rate over 7 per cent received a basic allocation of $100,000 and a per capita allocation based on their labour surplus in excess of 7 per cent of their labour force. All such constituencies received $187.33 for each person estimated in the excess labour surplus group. Thus, Hamilton West received a basic allocation of $100,000 and a per capita allocation of $83,000 on the basis of an excess labour surplus of 442. Hamilton East was granted a basic allocation of $100,000 and a per capita allocation of $112,000 on the basis of an excess labour suplus of 600. Supplementary Allocation: The supplementary funds were distributed in direct proportion to the per capita segment of the initial allocations. Thus, basic allocations were excluded from consideration in allocating the supplementary funds. On this basis, Hamilton-Wentworth, Hamilton-Mountain, Halton-Wentworth and Halton received no supplementary funds. The relevant data for the constituencies of Hamilton-Wentworth, Hamilton West, Hamilton East, Hamilton Mountain, Halton-Wentworth and Halton are:

1977/78 Canada Works Program—Phase I

Constituency	Labour Surplus Rate	Labour Force	Labour Surplus	Excess Labour Surplus
		(Average December 1975-November 1976)		
Hamilton-Wentworth	6.00 per cent	49,398	2,964	—
Hamilton West	8.03 per cent	42,921	3,447	442
Hamilton East	8.65 per cent	36,444	3,151	600
Hamilton-Mountain	5.40 per cent	53,802	2,907	—
Halton-Wentworth	5.06 per cent	65,888	3,331	—
Halton	4.88 per cent	53,064	2,588	—

1977 Young Canada Works Program: The 1977 Young Canada Works funds were distributed to the above constituen-

cies as follows: Initial Allocation: (1) Estimates of labour force, labour surplus and labour surplus rates were derived for each constituency for the period May, 1976 to August 1976, for the 15-24 age group. (2) A basic allocation of $25,000 was made to those constituencies with a labour surplus rate of 10 per cent or less; therefore, Halton-Wentworth and Halton each received $25,000. (3) Constituencies with a labour surplus rate over 10 per cent received the basic allocation of $25,000 and a per capita allocation based on their labour surplus in excess of 10 per cent of their labour force. All such constituencies received $171.47 for each person estimated in the excess labour surplus group. Thus, (i) Hamilton-Wentworth was granted a basic allocation of $25,000 and a per capita allocation of $34,000 on the basis of an excess labour surplus of 198; (ii) Hamilton West was granted a basic allocation of $25,000 and a per capita allocation of $110,000 on the basis of an excess labour surplus of 643; (iii) Hamilton East was granted a basic allocation of $25,000 and a per capita allocation of $115,000 on the basis of an excess labour surplus of 668; and (iv) Hamilton-Mountain was granted a basic allocation of $25,000 and a per capita allocation of $7,000 based on an excess labour surplus of 42. Supplementary Allocations: The supplementary funds were distributed in direct proportion to the total funds distributed to a constituency in the initial allocation. The relevant data for the constituencies of Hamilton-Wentworth, Hamilton West, Hamilton East, Hamilton-Mountain, Halton-Wentworth and Halton are:

1977 Young Canada Works Program

Constituency	Labour Surplus Rate	Labour Force	Labour Surplus	Excess Labour Surplus
		(Average May, 1976-August 1976)		
Hamilton-Wentworth	11.41 per cent	14,049	1,603	198
Hamilton West	15.27 per cent	12,207	1,864	643
Hamilton East	16.45 per cent	10,365	1,705	668
Hamilton-Mountain	10.28 per cent	15,302	1,572	42
Halton-Wentworth	9.65 per cent	18,303	1,766	—
Halton	8.76 per cent	14,752	1,292	

AIR CANADA—LEASING OF COMMERCIAL AIRCRAFT TO CUBA

Question No. 2,317—**Mr. Coates:**

1. Did Air Canada enter into a leasing agreement with the Government of Cuba, or its agent, for the leasing of commercial aircraft and, if so, on what date?

2. Is the agreement still in effect and, if so, are aircraft owned by Air Canada presently part of the Cuban air operations and, if so, how many and what types?

3. What is the term of the lease and is it renewable on the present date of termination?

4. Were any Air Canada employees involved in the Air Canada agreement with Cuba and, if so (a) how many (b) what are their names (c) what are their positions with Air Canada (d) what are their respective responsibilities in Cuba (e) how many such employees are presently in Cuba?

5. Were any of the aircraft leased lost in accidents and, if so (a) on what date (b) what type of aircraft (c) were any Canadian lives lost (d) was Air Canada compensated for the losses and, if so (i) on what date (ii) in what amount?

6. (a) For what reason was the leasing arrangement made (b) at whose request was it made (c) was the government consulted and did it give its consent and, if so, on what date (d) were any Cuban aircraft released from the Cuban commercial air operation and, if so (i) what type (ii) how many?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): The management of Air Canada advises as follows: 1. Yes. December 8, 1975.

2. Yes. One Air Canada DC-8-43 is leased to Cubana Airlines.

3. Two years. There is no renewable option under the lease agreement.

4. Yes. (a) One. (b) L. K. Rutledge. (c) Director, Flight Equipment Contracts. (d) None. (e) None.

5. Yes. Two aircraft. (a) March 16, 1976; October 6, 1976. (b) DC-8-43. (c) No. (d) Yes. (i) For the first aircraft, May 20, 1976. For the second aircraft, the airline is awaiting payment presently. (ii) In each case, $1,000,000.

6. (a) Commercial considerations. (b) Cubana Airlines. (c) Yes. February 8, 1976. (d) No. (i) and (ii) Not applicable.

ADULT OCCUPATIONAL TRAINING ACT

Question No. 2,319—**Mr. O'Sullivan:**

1. In the years 1972 to 1976, what was the total cost of the Occupational Training of Adults (OTA) Programme and how was such cost divided between (a) instructor's salaries (b) rental or leasing of teaching facilities and materials (c) training allowances (d) transportation allowances (e) administrative (f) other costs?

2. In each year 1972 to 1976, how many persons in (a) Canada (b) the Atlantic Provinces (c) Quebec (d) Ontario (e) the Western Provinces (f) Yukon (g) NWT (h) the Constituency of Hamilton-Wentworth (i) registered (ii) completed courses provided under the OTA Programme?

3. Of those completing the Programme, how many found course-related employment through the Department of Manpower and Immigration's job placement services?

4. Are those who complete the Programme given priority over others by Manpower for employment opportunities?

Hon. Bud Cullen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Under the Adult Occupational Training Act, there are two programs: the Canada Manpower Training Program (CMTP) and the Canada Manpower Industrial Training Program (CMITP). Data on CMTP and CMITP costs and trainees (parts 1. and 2. of the question) is available only by fiscal year. Data on follow-up of trainees (part 3.) is available, by calendar year 1972 to 1975, for CMTP only.

1. The total cost of CMTP and CMITP for the years 1972-73 to 1975-76 was $1,654,118,331. The cost was divided as follows: (a) and (b) $902,117,203 (a. and b. split not available). (c) $601,664,202 (CMTP only—no allowances in CMITP); (d) $13,717,223 (Trainee Travel and Commuting Allowances). (e) $42,215,260 (Provincial Administration)*. (f) $94,404,443 (Other).

---

*In some provinces provincial administration costs are included in the purchase price of the training.

2. See list below.

3. This information is not directly available, since graduates are not required to seek subsequent employment through a Canada Manpower Centre. The information available is from

a continuing 100 per cent survey of skill course graduates which shows:

	Percentage of Skill Graduates Employed	
	Before Training	After Training
1972	38.0	76.0
1973	37.4	76.5
1974	40.4	75.9
1975	31.0	69.1
1976	N/A	N/A

The same survey shows that 76.3 per cent of those employed in 1975 are employed in a two-digit CCDO occupation which corresponds with the two-digit CCDO occupation assigned to their skill course. This is not a reliable indicator of whether persons are employed in the field for which they are trained because, for instance, a person trained in agricultural technology (agricultural occupation) may utilize his or her training as a sales representative for a feed company (sales occupation).

4. No.

Canada Manpower Training Program and
Canada Manpower Industrial Training Program
Trainees Started, Contracted and Completed

1972-73 TO 1975-76

	Canada	Atlantic Provinces	Quebec	Ontario	Western Provinces	Yukon	Northwest Territories	Hamilton-Wentworth Constituency
CMTP Trainees								
Started								
1972-73	260,945	31,274	129,270	46,548	52,925	454	474	2,722
1973-74	267,684	31,273	129,333	45,986	59,791	771	530	2,664
1974-75	233,181	29,148	99,548	46,199	57,406	442	438	2,472
1975-76	213,216	31,928	73,569	53,098	53,507	421	693	2,868
Completed								
1972-73	229,160	26,153	116,829	37,904	47,612	363	299	2,248
1973-74	220,601	21,513	116,819	31,643	49,782	521	323	1,841
1974-75	201,808	23,629	90,131	36,000	51,428	301	319	1,971
1975-76	190,448	26,552	68,776	45,136	49,230	309	445	2,307
CMITP Trainees								
Contracted								
1972-73	103,283	14,390	31,699	30,481	26,190[1]	111	412	1,474
1973-74	63,955	21,540	14,213	17,500	10,309	190	203	346
1974-75	71,965	10,355	20,559	23,402	16,432	978	239	827
1975-76	63,890	13,134	15,825	18,576	15,336	644	375	521
Completed[2]								
1975-76	38,856	9,215	8,546	10,774	9,792	270	259	N/A

[1] Includes Training-in-Industry for the Yukon.

[2] Only available for 1975-76.

HIGHWAY, AIR AND RAIL SAFETY POLICY

Question No. 2,336—**Mr. Stevens:**

As of December 31 (a) 1968 (b) 1976, how many federal employees were charged with policy-making, or interpretation of policies, regulating highway, air and rail safety?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): Transport Canada advises as follows: Highway Safety: (a) None, as the Highway Safety Branch was not established until after 1968. (b) Six. Air Safety: (a) 324; (b) 419. With respect to the transportation of dangerous goods for all modes of transport, the answers are: (a) 2; (b) 5. The Canadian Transport Commission advises as follows: Railway Transport Committee: (a) As of December 31, 1968; seven commissioners (including chairman) and four others; (b) As of December 31, 1976; nine commissioners (including chairman) and nine others.

[Mr. Cullen.]

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE COMMISSION—THE EMPLOYER-UNION MEETING WHICH WAS HELD ON DECEMBER 8, 1976

Question No. 2,386—**Mr. Fortin:**

1. At the employer-union meeting which was held on December 8, 1976 and in which six UIC managers in Quebec participated with Mr. Pierre Gadbois, Director, heading their group, and five regional union officers led by Mr. Robert Goyette, Regional President, did the five managers accompanying Mr. Gadbois admit that they had not read the document entitled *Cadre des rencontres patronales-syndicales* submitted by the union on May 26, 1976, and did they refuse to have it inserted in the minutes of the meeting?

2. Was the only item on the agenda of the meeting the document mentioned in Part 1?

3. Did Mr. Gadbois in regard to invitations for consultation extended by the union on May 26, August 30, October 17, 1976, consider the document submitted by the union as an obstacle to the meetings?

4. On December 8, 1976, upon reading the document, did Mr. Gadbois indicate he agreed almost completely with the union paper, except for a matter of little importance?

5. Did Mr. Michel Fortin, Chief of the UIC Labour Relations in Quebec, admit to Mr. Robert Goyette, the Quebec President of the Union, that the management refused to study the paper because they thought the union was demanding co-management?

6. Was Mr. Goyette dismissed under these circumstances, even though it was not in keeping with the reasons put forward by management?

7. Since December 8, 1976, has the union invited management to employer-union meetings on particular dates and, has management refused to take part in such meetings?

8. Is the prevailing atmosphere in employer-union relationships in the UIC in Quebec favourable to changes such as the merger proposed in Bill C-27 now before the House and, if so, what are the future intentions of the government?

Hon. Jack Cullen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): 1. No.

2. No.

3. No.

4. Mr. Gadbois indicated he agreed with most of the principles and general objectives in the paper, but expressed serious reservations regarding important details of implementation.

5. No.

6. No.

7. Yes, twice. Management agreed to these meetings but, since the dates suggested were not convenient, proposed alternate dates.

8. Yes, to ensure good communication with all employees and with union authorities by all available means.

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE COMMISSION—LETTER FROM MR. MICHAEL FORTIN

Question No. 2,387—**Mr. Fortin:**

1. On October 8, 1976, was a letter by Mr. Michel Fortin, Regional Director of Staff Relations of the Unemployment Insurance Commission in Quebec, addressed to the Quebec president of the union of employees of the UIC (ESENA-PSAC-QFL), apologizing for the fact that he had been escorted by security guards when, having been suspended for his union activities by the Department, he was on his way to defend grievances at 1441 St-Urbain Street in Montreal?

2. On February 23, 1977 or thereabouts, although Mr. Goyette had been dismissed, but was still President of the Union under the Public Service Staff Relations Act and the constitution of the PSAC, was he again escorted by security guards acting on orders given by Mr. Fortin, on his way to the same place to defend grievances?

3. On September 29, 1976, at the time of Mr. Goyette's suspension for union activities, did Mr. Claude Rouleau, a Staff Relations agent, acting under orders of Mr. Fortin, try to convince local agents and members of the union who had submitted grievances to take their case out of Mr. Goyette's hands?

4. In spite of the letter of apology sent by Mr. Fortin on October 8, 1976, did Mr. Rouleau try again to convince agents and members of the union to take their case out of Mr. Goyette's hands, with such insistence that the Quebec local of the union complained of intimidation and harrassment, particularly during a press conference with the QFL?

Hon. Jack Cullen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): 1. Yes; however, the president of the UIC employees' union had not been suspended for union activities, but for other reasons.

2. Yes.

3. No. It should, however, he pointed out that Mr. Goyette was not suspended "for union activities".

4. Not applicable.

Order Paper Questions

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE COMMISSION—THE DESIGNATION DATE OF A JOB

Question No. 2,390—**Mr. Fortin:**

1. Since March 1976, at UIC, Quebec area, has section B5, indicating job designation date in most of TBCT 360-15 (REV. 1. 76) 7540-21-870-7234 forms commonly referred to as OALO and used to describe the linguistic situation of a job in the Public Service been filled and, if not, does the UIC infringe the Official Languages Act which states that the designation date of a job has to be known when the job is identified as bilingual?

2. Does this practice allow the Commission to delay the designation of jobs whose unilingual incumbent should receive language training, to have more bilingual jobs than the authorities intend to designate and to reject illegally any dispute with respect to bilingualism allowance and, if so, who is responsible for this situation?

3. Since the appointment of an Official Languages Officer at the Unemployment Insurance Commission, Quebec area (a) who filled the job on (i) an interim basis (ii) a permanent basis (b) in each case, for what period, indicating the interim period or other and the permanent period (c) was anyone appointed to that job without competition (d) what became of each ex-employee?

Hon. Jack Cullen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): 1. Yes.

2. No.

3. (a) (i) Mr. Hugues Desmarais, Mr. Guy Lemay, Mr. Jacques Therrien; (ii) Mr. Jacques Migneault, Mr. Hugues Desmarais, Mr. Jacques Therrien. (b) Mr. Jacques Migneault from August 13, 1973 to February 23, 1975, permanent. Mr. Hugues Desmarais from February 24, 1975 to February 25, 1976, interim from February 26, 1976 to May 16, 1976, permanent. Mr. Guy Lemay from May 17, 1976 to August 15, 1976 interim. Mr. Jacques Therrien from August 16, 1976 to March 23, 1977, interim, from March 24, 1977 to the present, permanent. (c) No, except for the periods of interim appointment or remuneration. (d) Mr. Jacques Migneault is now acting manager, Rouyn. Mr. Hugues Desmarais is now PM-4, integration branch. Mr. Guy Lemay has returned to his original duties at the Official Languages Branch (AS-2).

STUDENT SUMMER EMPLOYMENT PROGRAMMES

Question No. 2,420—**Mr. Marshall:**

1. What additional staff was hired and what was the cost to operate the Student Summer Employment Programme (a) Peace and Security (b) Canadian Penitentiary Service (c) National Parole Service (d) National Parole Board (e) Secretariat (f) RCMP under the Department of the Solicitor General?

2. Are any other programmes available for students under the Department?

Hon. Francis Fox (Solicitor General): 1. No additional staff was hired to operate the Student Summer Programmes in the Ministry of the Solicitor General. (a) Peace and Security is not a component of the Ministry of the Solicitor General and therefore there was no specific project under this name as such. However, because Peace and Security has been an important subject of legislation, the Student Summer Employment and Activities Program within the Ministry of the Solicitor General had been designed in relation with this legislation. Therefore all projects had to be related in some way to Peace and Security as a Ministry priority. (b) $18,540.00; (c) $199,-193.24; (d) $21,723.00; (e) $102,759.36; (f) $183,245.55.

2. In 1976, there was no other programme available for students under the Department. However, in 1977, there is another programme called Summer Job Corps which is available for all unemployed young persons.

OPERATING COSTS OF STUDENT SUMMER EMPLOYMENT PROGRAMMES

Question No. 2,421—**Mr. Marshall:**

1. What additional staff was hired and what was the cost to operate the Student Summer Employment Programme (a) Young Canada Works (b) Summer Job Corps (c) Job Exploration (d) Manpower Centres for Students under the Department of Manpower and Immigration?

2. Are any other programmes available for students under the Department?

Hon. Bud Cullen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): 1. (a) Seventy-seven additional staff were hired for the Young Canada Works programmes, the operating costs of which are $3,650,000.* (b) Three additional staff were hired for the Summer Job Corps programmes, the operating costs of which are $415,000. (c) This programme is co-sponsored by the Canadian Chamber of Commerce and the Department of Manpower and Immigration. Projects are administered by local chambers and no additional manpower staff is hired. The programme has a budget of $1.4 million. (d) This programme will hire 1,100 students and recent university graduates for a maximum of eight months to staff the network of Canada Manpower Centres for Students. The programme budget for 1977-78 is $4.8 million.

2. Yes. The Native Intern Program and Native Data Gathering Project will hire a total of 100 native youth in New Brunswick, Alberta and Ontario.

---

* NOTA: It should be noted that in several provinces new hirings took place for the purpose of delivering all Job Creation Branch programmes, but not specifically for the administration of the Young Canada Works programme.

Also available is the Canada Manpower Mobility Program which enables students 18 years of age or older to travel to accept temporary jobs which cannot be filled locally and which have been registered with the CMC by the employer. The financial assistance is in the form of a grant to cover the student's return travel costs from his area of residence to the area of the job and also a living allowance of $20 a day for two days. In addition, in cases where students require assistance beyond the scope of the CMC for Students or where no student centre is available, the services provided through the regular manpower system are available to students.

UIC—MR. FRANK LEBLANC

Question No. 2,430—**Mr. Cossitt:**

1. Is Mr. Frank Leblanc manager of the Ottawa District Office of UIC and, if not (a) on what date did he leave the position (b) on what date was he notified that he would no longer be manager (c) for what reason (d) is he presently on UIC's payroll and what has he been doing since ceasing to be manager?

2. Will Mr. Leblanc be appointed to another position in UIC or in any other government service and, if so, to what position and on what date?

[Mr. Fox.]

Hon. Bud Cullen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): 1. No. (a) April 20, 1977; (b) March 24, 1977. (c) For career development purposes and in the light of his more than two years of dedicated service in the Ottawa District Office Mr. Leblanc has been assigned the duties of Chief, Special Benefit, Ottawa Head Office, at the same classification and level. (d) Yes. On leave.

2. Yes. See 1(c).

CBC "THE FIFTH ESTATE"

Question No. 2,440—**Mr. Cossitt:**

1. Did CBC programme "The Fifth Estate" recently carry the results of an examination of news items carried by CBC English and French networks and, if so, did the examination show that (a) 21% of the English network news items were from Quebec and 46% from the rest of the country (b) 63% of the French network news items were from Quebec and only 15% from the rest of Canada?

2. What are the reasons justifying the low percentage of news items from the rest of Canada used on CBC French network?

Hon. John Roberts (Secretary of State): I am informed by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation as follows: 1. Yes. The results of such an examination were carried on the programme "Fifth Estate" of April 27, 1977. (a) The examination showed that CTV and CBC English television network both carried 21 per cent of Quebec-related news during the three week survey period in January and February 1977. CBC carried slightly more Canadian news than CTV, with the two English networks averaging 46 per cent. TVA, the privately-owned French television network, and the CBC French television network carried on average 63 per cent Quebec-related news and 15 per cent news from the nine other provinces and Ottawa combined.

2. In the period analyzed by the Fifth Estate, the French network carried less news from other provinces than the English network. However, it carried twice as much as the other French-language media, namely 15 per cent compared to 6 per cent. The English network serves a diversified society which reaches right across Canada and which generates events likely to be of interest primarily to that society. The French network serves a more compact society, of which 85 per cent is concentrated in Quebec, and it too generates events which are peculiar to itself and are likely to be of more interest to its people. The preponderance of news from other provinces in the English-language media, including the English network, is due simply to the greater interest of the English-speaking public in such news. Similarly the preponderance of Quebec news in the French-speaking media, including the French network, explains the greater interest which the French-speaking public has in Quebec affairs. It is undeniable that the importance of Quebec events, even more than in the past, commands a larger place in the news in the media: the impact of an independence-oriented government in power, the policies, legislation and initiatives of this government produce a steady flow of news both in Quebec, throughout Canada and abroad and it must be treated accordingly. The time and space occupied by these Quebec events have increased at the expense of all other news of lower priority. Furthermore, this situation of an audience

comprising 85 per cent Quebeckers, at grips with this major political crisis which it is experiencing so intensely, subjects the CBC and the French-language media to an environment and conditioning which make a major difference in how they treat Quebec news and news from other provinces. Finally, as Quebec is involving all Canada in the most serious and profound political crisis since Confederation, it is natural also that the English-language media should give much more attention and time to Quebec events, especially since November 15. It should also be stressed that it is much easier to gather Quebec news for the English network than for the French network to cover the other provinces. English network reporters seldom encounter a language barrier when dealing with Quebec newsmakers, who are nearly all bilingual, whereas the French network reporters are constantly coping with the language limitations of the newsmakers in English Canada who very often are unilingual. Consequently, it is necessary to take into account the constraints and limitations experienced by the French network in producing its news in English Canada.

UIC—FRAUD PROSECUTIONS

Question No. 2,443—**Mr. Cossitt:**

Have prosecutions for defrauding the Unemployment Insurance Commission been taken completely out of the hands of local police forces and placed entirely under control of the RCMP and (a) if so (i) on what date was such a decision made and by whom (ii) for what reason (b) if not, is it the government's intentions to do so?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): I am informed by the Unemployment Insurance Commission and the Department of the Solicitor General as follows: (a) No, (b) No.

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE COMMISSION—REPORT OF JOB OPPORTUNITIES

Question No. 2,458—**Mr. Fortin:**

1. Is the Unemployment Insurance Commission, Quebec Region using, or has it ever used, the document entitled "Report of job opportunities" and, if so, for what purpose?

2. Does UIC use only four figures of the Occupational Code and is the reference data in the report based on seven figures and, if so, is the report fraudulent?

3. Does UIC run the risk of excluding a model (Occupational Code 5199-126) from eligibility to benefits because there is need for automobile assessors (O.C. 5199-118) and that UIC uses only O.C. 5199, whereas the data from the Canada Manpower Centre or any other agency includes the Code's seven figures?

4. Was this issue raised by the five hooded persons who denounced certain UIC fraudulent practices in Quebec and, if so, what did the Department do to correct the situation?

Hon. Jack Cullen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): 1. Yes, in the Montreal area only. It is one of the factors used permitting the agent to assemble information from which he can judge the availability of a claimant.

2. Yes, the agent uses the four digit code as a starting point for the collection of facts for a decision on benefit entitlement but in all cases any further research is based on the seven digit code obtained from the Department of Manpower.

3. See 2.

4. Unknown.

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE COMMISSION—M. L. BOMBARDIER EMPLOYEES

Question No. 2,459—**Mr. Fortin:**

1. Did M. L. Bombardier employees, on Wednesday, April 25, 1977, occupy the UIC office located at 1441 St. Urban Avenue, Montreal, Quebec, in order to find out the decision made regarding their claim for benefits and, if so (a) was a request for disqualification submitted before they were notified by UIC officer, Mr. Jean-Guy Côté, that a decision had not yet been rendered (b) on what date was the decision made?

2. Does UIC management in Quebec make a habit of hiding the truth and, if so, does this behaviour have a negative effect on the unemployed?

Hon. Jack Cullen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): 1. Yes, but on Wednesday, April 27, 1977. (*a*) No. (*b*) Thursday, April 28, 1977.

2. See Beauchesne's Rules and Forms of the House of Commons 171(a), (h), (i) and (q).

PSC—MONEY PAID TO EMPLOYMENT AGENCIES

Question No. 2,463—**Mr. Caccia:**

For the most recent three years for which statistics are available, what is the amount of money paid each year to fee charging employment agencies by the Public Service Commission of Canada to fill full-time and part-time vacancies with government departments and Crown agencies?

Hon. John Roberts (Secretary of State): I am informed by the Public Service Commission as follows: The Public Service Commission has paid no money to employment agencies in each of the last three years in order to fill vacant positions in departments and crown agencies. The Public Service Commission is responsible for the appointment of public servants in accordance with the provisions of the Public Service Employment Act. It does not have the authority to enter into contracts with employment agencies on behalf of government departments. However, departments may contract with such agencies in accordance with the Government Contract Regulations. There is some concern that some departments have used the temporary employment agencies to by-pass normal recruitment procedures. As a result, the Treasury Board in consultation with the Public Service Commission has been preparing policy guidelines concerning departmental use of private personnel agencies which will improve the situation. It is anticipated that these guidelines will be issued in the near future.

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE COMMISSION—GRIEVANCE AGAINST THE UIX REGIONAL OFFICE IN MONTREAL

Question No. 2,543—**Mr. Fortin:**

Was a grievance filed by 167 employees of the UIC regional office in Montreal in December 1976, to protest against the lack of ventilation and humidity and, if so (a) during the hours which preceded the tests conducted by

the Departments of Public Works and National Health and Welfare on December 21, 1976, did the administration order a manual ventilating system "to recreate a normal situation" (b) did the complainants win their case and, if not, for what reason?

Hon. Jack Cullen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Yes. (*a*) No. At the request of the administration, the Department of Public Works operated the air conditioning system manually as soon as the automatic system failed. (*b*) No, because scientific analyses of the quality of the air, of the temperature and of the humidity, conducted on December 21 and January 5 and 6, clearly established that there were no problems in any of the locations tested.

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE COMMISSION—TRAINING MANUAL FOR BCO

Question No. 2,544—**Mr. Fortin:**

1. Does the manual used for training claim control officers at the Quebec regional office of the UIC specify on page 45, that it is better not to inform the claimant that any statement he makes might be used against him, in spite of the intimation of the court that enquiry officers must give a statutory notification to the individuals they are going to question and, if so, for what reason?

2. Does the manual also state on page 46, that the claimant has to declare that he has read the unemployment insurance booklet which accompanies the claim form in order to bring it to the attention of the court if the accused pleads his ignorance of the law and, if so (a) does the UIC suggest that the booklet is complete enough to enable a person who has read it to know all the provisions of the Act (b) in view of the complex nature of the Act and of the fact that the claimant could be intimidated by the presence of the enquiry officer while being asked whether he has read the booklet, could the use by UIC of the answer to that question be considered malicious and even fraudulent?

Hon. Jack Cullen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): 1. Yes. Investigations are designed to determine whether claimants are fulfilling their obligations under the Act and further serve to protect the integrity of the UI Account. Since the Agents objective is not to prepare material for prosecution purposes, the Commission feels that informing the claimant that his statement could be used in evidence against him, would detract from the effectiveness of this type of interview.

2. Yes. (*a*) The booklet in question was replaced nearly three years ago by two others entitled: (i) Your Rights and Obligations. (ii) How to Complete Your Claimant's Report Booklet (i) states: "The Unemployment Insurance Commission has prepared a series of pamphlets with one object in mind to inform and help you. However, it is possible that this pamphlet does not contain all the information you need. We therefore invite you to visit the nearest Unemployment Insurance Commission office. The staff will be happy to answer all your questions." (*b*) No. This question may be asked by a Benefit Control or Insurance Officer for the sole purpose of making sure that the claimant is in full knowledge of his rights and obligations.

FEES PAID TO ANTHONY KEMP ARCHITECTS IN CONNECTION WITH 12-16-18 YORK STREET, OTTAWA

Question No. 2,624—**Mr. Cossitt:**

1. Were certain fees paid to Anthony Kemp Architects in connection with 10-12-18 York Street, Ottawa, which were not authorized in advance by Treasury Board and, if so (a) what was the amount involved and was it in excess of $175,000 (b) what were the dates and the amounts of payments made (c) what are the names and job designations of the National Capital Commission officials who failed to gain such approval?

[Mr. Fortin.]

2. Was Treasury Board approval subsequently obtained and, if so, on what date?

3. At any time, did Anthony Kemp Architects bill the National Capital Commission not only for services performed but for other services, work, etc. that were not performed and was it necessary to take steps to recover the excess amounts paid and, if so (a) what were the names and job designations of any officials taking such action (b) on what date was such action taken and what are all the pertinent details?

4. (a) What was the total sum paid to date in connection with 12-16-18 York Street (b) what is the projected sum to be paid to Anthony Kemp Architects?

Hon. André Ouellet (Minister of State for Urban Affairs): 1. Certain fees were paid prior to receipt of Treasury Board authority to Anthony Kemp Architects in connection with 10, 12 and 18 York Street: (a) (i) $162,014.93—Contract for construction supervision and inspection. (ii) $163,967.38—Interior designs. (b) (i) March 21, 1975 to March 3, 1977, details attached (Table "A"). (ii) March 21, 1975 to March 3, 1977, details attached (Table "B"). (c) According to the provisions of the National Capital Act, the Chairman is the Chief executive officer and there is a General Manager appointed by Order-in-Council. These two officials are the responsible executives for the affairs of the Commission.

2. Yes, March 31, 1977.

3. Yes (a) Chief of the Internal Audit Section of the National Capital Commission took appropriate steps. (b) September 9, 1976. Monthly progress billings from Anthony Kemp had cumulated in excess of actual work performed and no further payments were made until the work had been caught up.

4. In connection with 10, 12 and 18 York Street: (a) $4,155,455. (b) $745,000. (Architect's fees, supervisory fees and fees paid by Kemp for other consulting services and all expenses relating thereto).

(b) (i) Contract for Construction Supervision and Inspection

Date	Total
21-3-75	$6,796.90
02-5-75	8,296.11
16-5-75	9,548.60
20-6-75	7,784.91
01-8-75	7,945.07
22-8-75	7,770.01
17-10-75	7,648.97
31-10-75	12,033.31
12-12-75	1,487.99
09-1-76	7,860.52
06-2-76	7,704.33
09-4-76	7,310.33
09-4-76	9,624.51
30-4-76	12,333.59
11-6-76	7,617.79
27-8-76	7,909.02
27-8-76	4,145.97
27-8-76	4,145.33
01-11-76	4,451.53
01-11-76	4,262.89
17-12-76	4,329.14
03-2-77	232.13
03-2-77	18.00
03-2-77	3,552.50
04-3-77	3,500.00
04-3-77	3,705.48
Total	$162,014.93

(b) (ii) Contract for Interior Designs

Date	Total
06-02-76	$6,253.40
27-02-76	17,258.13
31-03-76	20,974.97
09-04-76	3,238.10
09-04-76	2,954.15
30-04-76	4,889.43
11-06-76	9,029.06
11-06-76	23,644.89
11-06-76	17,154.09
27-08-76	28,445.34
27-08-76	12,440.00
27-08-76	2,031.00
01-11-76	746.00
03-02-77	9,396.83
03-02-77	2,876.60
04-03-77	2,635.39
Total	$163,967.38

10-12-18 YORK STREET, OTTAWA—BY YORK DEVELOPMENTS LIMITED

Question No. 2,625—**Mr. Cossitt:**

1. What are the details of any connection on the part of Senelco Limited with the building at 10-12-18 York Street, Ottawa?

2. To the knowledge of the National Capital Commission, is or was Senelco Limited owned and operated by the same Mr. Warren Beamish associated with By York Development Limited?

Hon. André Ouellet (Minister of State for Urban Affairs): 1. Senelco Limited made the successful proposal as to the use, design and development of the premises at 10, 12 and 18 York Street and a condition of their proposal was that a new company, By York Developments Ltd., would be formed to participate in the project.

2. Mr. Warren Beamish, to the knowledge of the National Capital Commission, was an officer of Senelco Limited.

Question No. 2,626—**Mr. Cossitt:**

1. Did the Chief Architect, Mr. A. J. Capling, of the National Capital Commission travel to Great Britain on government funds to purchase antiques for the building at 10-12-18 York Street, Ottawa and, if so, what is a list of all the items purchased, the amounts paid for each and the total amount of public funds spent?

2. Was Mr. Capling accompanied by a representative of Anthony Kemp Architects of Toronto and, if so, for what purpose?

3. What was the total sum spent by the National Capital Commission on behalf of Messrs. Kemp and Capling for travel, including accommodations, meals and what were the dates they were abroad?

4. How much (a) has been spent to date (b) is projected for all furnishings, antiques, etc., to be placed in 10-12-18 York Street, Ottawa, by the National Capital Commission?

Hon. André Ouellet (Minister of State for Urban Affairs): 1. (a) Yes, in connection with 10, 12 and 18 York Street; (b) $42,831.15—Detailed list follows:

2. Yes, to participate in the selection.

3. $2,826.72—January 28—February 13, 1976.

4. In connection with 10, 12 and 18 York Street: (a) $49,456.15—for antique furnishings; (b) $49,456.15. These furnishings, which include those listed in part 1 (b) of this answer, will form part of the decor inside 10, 12 and 18 York Street. These premises will be leased by tender and the cost of the interior furnishings will be recovered.

Description (in pounds sterling (£)): What the Butler Saw Machine, 230.; Stuffed fox in case, 22.; Portrait Lord Cornwallis, 48.; Penny slot machine, 30.; 2 spirit wine urns, 20.; 2 sherry casks and stands, 2.; Birds in glass case, 100.; American phone, 40.; Silver plate coffee urn, 60.; Silver crepe and heater pan, 40.; Period time clock, 40.; Coffee grinder, 145.; Iron firecrane and chain, 48.; Iron stockpot, 28.; Iron kettle and kettle cradle, 30.; Reconditioned bar billiard table, 400.; Sheffield Plated candelabra, 160.; 8 gas lamp tops, 81.; 6 gas lamp globes, 8.; Model railroad carriage, 319.; Model ship, 162.; 6 locomotive registration plates, 4.; LSWR diamond cast iron sign, 8.; Polyphon Music box, 1,850.; 60′ counter front panelling, 450.; Authentic church pews, 750.; Authentic oil painting of 2 ladies, 40.; Type B pillar box, 75.; 3 carved birds, 57.; 2 torch lamps, 128.; 2 iron dogs, 1.; 3 brass lamps, 234.; Beer engine, 40.; Fairground Centaur, 235.; Pr. Doulton barrels, 150.; Wine Cask, 40.; Crown Inn Sign, 65.; Large picture frame, 21.; Pr. brass chandeliers, 174.; Copper street lamp with bracket, 40.; 4 large oil painting by Sir Alfred East, 1,600.; Bottle with marble on top, 2.; 3 stone wine jars, 5.; Portrait "The Vicars Daughters", 43.; Large turkish rug, 58.; Victorian Organ, 52.; Portrait of lady sewing, 75.; 2 framed battle prints, 36.; 2 picture frames, 0; 2 Victorian infantry sword, 40.; William standard sword, 20.; Light infantry sword, 18.; George V Sword, 30.; Blue cloth art helmet + case, Sword with leather case, Case and belt, Spare knot cross, belt, pouch etc., 200.; Blue cloth officers uniform, 46.; Mahogany fireplace, 3 stained glass windows floral design, Stained glass Shakespeare, Stained glass crest, 30 ± etched glass pieces, Metal pub sign, Back bar base, Cabinet, Stained glass screen 2 lites, Stained glass screen 1 lite, Portal, Portal, Pr. doors, Pr. doors, Iron panel, Mantel, Stained glass 3½ circles, Round headed screen, Portal—no door, 14 ± doors with glass, 3,800.; 2 jeroboam oversized wine bottle, 24.; 2 wine bottles, 25.; 1 whisky bottle, 7.; Sunglazed bin labels, 25.; Rotating wax seal, 74.; Cask tilt, 46.; Cork screw, 46.; 2 Cork screws, 32.; Cork screw, 24.; Cork screw, 46.; Cork screw, 52.; Bar corkscrew, 21.; 3 wine taps, 26.; Stone statue and base, 270.; Coffee urn, 21.; Flemish tapestry 3 riders, 1,900.; Flemish tapestry fighting scene, 2,000.; Blue jardiniere + stand, 68.; 2 British Rail lamps (see #18 over 2), Pressure gauge, 2 small railway lamps, Glass case for train coach, 89.; Chest of 40 drawers wooden letters, 750.; 2 stained glass windows Astley, 100.; 4 flower pattern windows, 190.; 2 plant stands, 450.; 4 iron screens, 455.; Circular iron grate, 85.; Painted glass table tops, 500.; 3 Chinese floral flower pot stands, 375.; 6 Trafalgar windows, 1,250.; Beer engine, 125.; Repairs to Trafalgar window, 100.; 2 Stained glass window Astley Wine (1 only) 150.; 4 Flower pattern glass windows (small), 190.; 2 Plant stands, 450.; Roast beef trolley, 750.; 7 wine buckets and stands, 280.; £23,405.. £23,405 @ $1.83—$42,831.15. Description: 1 off-2 wheel coffee grinder, $750.00; Wood framed stained glass sunrise, $450.00; Stained glass dome, $650.00; Pair of etched glass doors with moulded frame, $1,100.00; Word carved

mantle, $175.00; Suspended Light Fixture, $3,500.00. Total—$6,625.00.

Question No. 2,627—**Mr. Cossitt:**

1. Was a contract awarded by the National Capital Commission to Fuller Construction in the amount of $2,820,000 for certain work at 10-12-18 York Street, Ottawa and, if so (a) on what date was the contract awarded (b) on what date was such expenditure authorized by either Treasury Board or by Order in Council and, if authorized by the latter, what is the number and date?

2. Were payments made to Fuller Construction in excess of the amount of the original contract and, if so (a) how much additional monies were paid (b) on what dates (c) what are the details of work such payments covered (d) was the payment approved by Treasury Board or by Order in Council in advance and (i) if so, what are the details (ii) if not, for what reason?

Hon. André Ouellet (Minister of State for Urban Affairs): 1. Concerning 10, 12 and 18 York Street a contract was awarded as follows: (a) February 11, 1975 (b) February 6, 1975—T.B. Minute 733572

2. Yes. (a) $ 308,210 (b) Progress payments—February 6, 1975, September 7, 1976 (c) A more detailed description of the changes and additions and breakdown of the added cost are as follows: (1) Steam and water connections $28,428; (2) Changes to fire protection system necessary to meet Dominion Fire Commissioner's requirements $11,027; (3) Architectural and structural changes to meet on-site needs $55,014; (4) Changes in basement and ground floor to meet tenant's requirements $16,551; (5) Additions to mechanical and electrical equipment and design changes to meet newly defined tenant's requirements in kitchen and restaurant areas $111,-957; (6) Additions to mechanical and electrical systems and the inclusion of a catwalk in the theatre $85,233; (d) No (i) N/A (ii) It was extra work the need for which became apparent as work progressed. Treasury Board authority received January 12, 1976—TB—741018.

Question No. 2,628—**Mr. Cossitt:**

To the knowledge of the National Capital Commission, have representatives of the Auditor General been investigating or examining any aspects of the accounts in connection with 10-12-18 York Street, Ottawa and, if so, on what dates and for what reasons?

Hon. André Ouellet (Minister of State for Urban Affairs): No. But office of Auditor General was informed by National Capital Commission in January 1977 of its actions in connection with the development at 10, 12 and 18 York Street.

Question No. 2,629—**Mr. Cossitt:**

1. To the knowledge of the National Capital Commission, what association does Mr. Frank Galway of King, Ontario, have with By York Development Limited, Mr. Warren Beamish, Mr. David MacDonald, Senelco Limited, the National Capital Commission and the building at 10-12-18 York Street?

2. On what date and for what reason did such association begin?

Hon. André Ouellet (Minister of State for Urban Affairs): 1. Mr. Frank Galway of King, Ontario introduced himself to the officials of the Commission on April 27, 1977 as being recently authorized to vote all the shares of By York Developments Limited. His association with the persons of corporations mentioned in the Question is not known to the officials of the Commission nor is he associated in any way with the Commission or Commission property at 10, 12 and 18 York Street.

[Mr. Ouellet.]

2. Not known.

Question No. 2,630—**Mr. Cossitt:**

1. Is or was it projected that 10-12-18 York Street, Ottawa, owned by the National Capital Commission would be occupied as a theatre and restaurant?

2. What is the total cost to date and the projected cost to the taxpayers for the building and renovations and is the figure in excess of $5,000,000?

3. Is the interior of the building finished and, if not (a) on what date will tenders be called to complete it (b) what is the estimated cost of completing the interior?

Hon. André Ouellet (Minister of State for Urban Affairs): 1. Concerning premises at 10, 12 and 18 York Street: Yes, and this use is planned to be self-financing over a period of time.

2. Cost to date—$4,155,455. Projected cost—$5,700,000.

3. No. (a) It is anticipated that tenders will be called within three months. (b) $1,000,000.

Question No. 2,631— **Mr. Cossitt:**

1. Is Mr. Warren Beamish, Mr. David MacDonald or By York Development Limited suing the government in connection with a matter involving the property at 10-12-18 York Street, Ottawa and, if so, on what date was a writ issued and what is the exact name or names of those bringing the action?

2. Does the suit allege approximately $4,500,000 in damages and, if not, what is the exact amount?

3. In what ways do the claimants allege that they were damaged?

Hon. André Ouellet (Minister of State for Urban Affairs): 1. Concerning 10, 12 and 18 York Street, Yes; Writ issued in the Supreme Court of Ontario—February 1, 1977. Plaintiff named—By York Developments Limited. NCC's defence and counter-claim of $1,919,000 was filed March 24, 1977.

2. $4,310,000.

3. $85,000—Damages for alleged wrongful termination of alleged management agreement. $4,150,000—Damages for alleged wrongful breach and repudiation of alleged agreement. $75,000—punitive and exemplary damages. Total: $4,310,000.

Question No. 2,632—**Mr. Cossitt:**

1. What are the funds paid by the National Capital Commission to date or projected to be paid to By York Development Limited in connection with the property at 10-12-18 York Street, Ottawa?

2. On what dates were payments made and what was the amount and purpose of each?

3. What is a complete description of the nature of any agreement or lease that existed at any time between the National Capital Commission and Mr. Warren Beamish, Mr. David MacDonald, By York Development Limited or Senelco Limited?

4. Was the lease broken by the National Capital Commission and, if so, on what date and for what reasons?

Hon. André Ouellet (Minister of State for Urban Affairs): 1. In connection with 10, 12 and 18 York Street, $225,318.93.

2. Details attached, statement "(C)".

3. The question deals with matters raised in the litigation and is sub-judice.

4. The question deals with matters raised in the litigation and is sub-judice.

BY YORK DEVELOPMENT

Date	Purpose Operational planning Expenses	Operational Planning Fees	Amount
15-11-74 Oct/74		4000.00	$4000.00
15-11-74 Nov		4000.00	4000.00
13-12-74 Dec		4000.00	4000.00
20-12-74 #1	2305.47		2305.47
17-01-75 #2	2171.70		2171.70
24-01-75 Jan/75		4000.00	4000.00
21-02-75 Feb		4000.00	4000.00
21-02-75 #3	3365.07		3365.07
21-03-75 Mar		4000.00	4000.00
11-04-75 #4	2134.66		2134.66
25-04-75 #5	3672.17		3672.17
30-05-75 #6	835.38		835.38
23-06-75 Apr		4000.00	4000.00
23-06-75 May		4000.00	4000.00
23-06-75 June		4000.00	4000.00
18-07-75 July		4000.00	4000.00
22-08-75 Aug		4000.00	4000.00
29-08-75 #7	1318.78		1318.78
29-08-75 #8	2803.75		2803.75
29-08-75 #9	868.80		868.80
19-09-75 Sept		4000.00	4000.00
03-10-75 #10	7372.24		7372.24
17-10-75 Oct		4000.00	4000.00
07-11-75 #11	1176.26		1176.26
21-11-75 Nov		4000.00	4000.00
19-12-75 Dec		4000.00	4000.00
16-01-76 #12	2805.09		2805.09
16-01-76 #13	2153.97		2153.97
16-01-76 Jan/76		4000.00	4000.00
13-02-76 #14	3257.01		3257.01
13-02-76 #15	2950.27		2950.27
13-02-76 Feb		4000.00	4000.00
12-03-76 Mar		4000.00	4000.00
31-03-76 #16	7339.76		7339.76
30-04-76 #17	4342.57		4342.57
22-06-76 #18	7454.24		7454.24
14-05-76 Apr		4000.00	4000.00
22-06-76 #19	5807.88		5807.88
28-05-76 May		4000.00	4000.00
22-06-76 June		4000.00	4000.00
13-09-76 July		4000.00	4000.00
13-09-76 Aug		4000.00	4000.00
19-08-76 #20	17432.75		17432.75
19-08-76 #21	9098.30		9098.30
18-11-76 Sept		4000.00	4000.00
18-11-76 #22	14753.39		14753.39
18-11-76 #23	23899.42		23899.42
Total	$129318.93	$96000.00	$225318.93

Question No. 2,633—**Mr. Cossitt:**

1. To the knowledge of the National Capital Commission, did a shipment of wine arrive from France for use at 10-12-18 York Street, Ottawa and, if so (a) was it addressed to By York Development Limited, Mr. David MacDonald, Mr. Warren Beamish or Senelco Limited?

2. Were any of the above parties able to pay the account involved on delivery and, if not (a) was it referred to the National Capital Commission (b) what was the amount of the account?

3. Did the Commission take any action in the matter?

4. Was the wine in any way addressed to the Commission?

5. Did the Commission have to put up funds, specifically $50,000, to pay for the shipment and, if not, what action did the Commission take?

Hon. André Ouellet (Minister of State for Urban Affairs): 1. Yes. For use at 10, 12 and 18 York Street, (a) By York Developments Limited.

2. None of those parties mentioned paid the amount invoiced. (a) Yes; (b) $49,137.46.

3. Yes.

4. No.

5. The commission paid $49,137.46 and accepted delivery from the supplier. A requirement of a tender in answer to a public invitation for proposals re the future operation of 10, 12 and 18 York Street will be that the successful tenderer acquire these wines at the actual cost incurred for them by the National Capital Commission.

Question No. 2,634—**Mr. Cossitt:**

Were antique suits of Armour purchased in England by the National Capital Commission for 10-12-18 York Street, Ottawa and, if so (a) how many (b) at what cost (c) by whom (d) on what date?

Hon. André Ouellet (Minister of State for Urban Affairs): For 10, 12 and 18 York Street, no. (a) N/A; (b) N/A; (c) N/A; (d) N/A.

Question No. 2,635—**Mr. Cossitt:**

1. Were the original submissions to the National Capital Commission for 10-12-18 York Street, Ottawa, by By York Development Limited or any of its associates in any way compiled by Anthony Kemp Architects and, if so, has Anthony Kemp Architects worked for both the National Capital Commission as landlord and By York Development Limited or any of its associates as projected tenants?

2. Has the NCC, at any time, had to pay fees to Anthony Kemp Architects which should have been paid by By York Development Limited or its associates and, if so, what were the amounts and dates involved?

3. Is the NCC aware of any unpaid fees to Anthony Kemp Architects by By York Development Limited or any of its associates and, if so, what are the amounts involved?

Hon. André Ouellet (Minister of State for Urban Affairs): 1. The name Anthony L. Kemp appeared as the architect responsible on the submission made by Senelco Ltd. to the National Capital Commission re 10-12-18 York Street. Anthony L. Kemp was retained to do work as an architect on the development at 10-12-18 York Street by the National Capital Commission, the owner of the premises. Except as in sentence one hereof the officials of the National Capital Commission have no knowledge whether Anthony L. Kemp architect was ever engaged by By York Developments Limited or any associate thereof.

2. No.

3. No.

Question No. 2,639—**Mr. Cossitt:**

Did a non-government employee, Mr. David MacDonald travel to England with all expenses paid by the taxpayer for the purpose of purchasing antiques to be used by his firm in the event that it was successful in obtaining a lease at 10-12-18 York Street, Ottawa owned by the NCC and, if so (a) what was the entire cost of the trip, including transportation, accommodation, meals, etc. (b) what are the reasons justifying expenditure by the NCC of public funds to aid the business ventures of a private individual?

Hon. André Ouellet (Minister of State for Urban Affairs): In connection with 10, 12 and 18 York Street, yes. (a) $1,413; (b) Mr. David MacDonald travelled to England on instructions of the National Capital Commission, with expenses paid,

for the purpose of assisting in the acquisition of artifacts for the use in the interior design of the property at 10, 12 and 18 York Street.

Question No. 2,640—**Mr. Cossitt:**

Did Mr. Anthony Kemp, an architect from the City of Toronto make three trips to England at taxpayers' expense for the purpose of purchasing antiques for use at 10-12-18 York Street, Ottawa and, if so, what was the total expense involved, including transportation, accommodation, meals, etc?

Hon. André Ouellet (Minister of State for Urban Affairs): In connection with 10, 12 and 18 York Street, yes; Trip No. 1—$1,017.90; Trip No. 2—$1,338.32. (N.B.—Included in part 3 of reply to question No. 2626, answered this day). Trip No. 3—$1,597.86.

FURNITURE PRODUCTION

Question No. 2,649—**Mr. Lambert (Bellechasse):**

For the fiscal year (a) 1975-76 (b) 1976-77 what was the total furniture production for (i) Canada (ii) each province?

Mr. Hugh Poulin (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): Statistics Canada reports the following: Statistics are not collected on furniture production. However, the attached chart provides data on the value of shipments by manufacturers. Since most companies operate on a calendar year, the data is provided on this basis rather than on the fiscal year basis as requested.

Value of Shipments of the Furniture and Fixtures Industries
1975 and 1976

	1975[1]	1976[2]
	—thousands of dollars—	
Newfoundland	966	[3]
Prince Edward Island	[4]	[4]
Nova Scotia	9,300	8,459
New Brunswick	12,007	13,291
Québec	494,569	511,325
Ontario	676,180	756,782
Manitoba	56,896	58,073
Saskatchewan	2,541	[3]
Alberta	50,073	45,407
British Columbia	60,921	59,061
Yukon and North West Territories	[4]	[4]
Canada	1,363,703	1,453,691

[1] Source: Annual Census of Manufactures

[2] Estimated; Source: Inventories, Shipments and Orders in the Manufacturing Industries (Catalogue No. 31-001)

[3] Estimate not available

[4] Confidential

10-12-18 YORK STREET, OTTAWA—BY YORK DEVELOPMENTS LIMITED

Question No. 2,720—**Mr. Cossitt:**

1. Has the National Capital Commission made some sort of settlement or is it in the process in any way of dealing with By York Developments and/or Mr. David Macdonald, and/or Mr. Warren Beamish, and/or Senelco Limited, and/or Mr. Frank Galway, over the government owned property at 10-12-18 York Street, Ottawa, in regard to a Writ for alleged damages of about $4.5 million issued against the government on the part of By York Developments?

2. To the knowledge of the NCC has or will the Writ be withdrawn and, if so (a) approximately on what date (b) what are all details of any settlement, agreement, payments etc., that have been made or will be made or have been assured to any of the parties concerned (c) what are the names of all parties involved in any such arrangements?

Hon. André Ouellet (Minister of State for Urban Affairs): 1. Concerning 10, 12 and 18 York Street, No.

2. The officials of the NCC have no knowledge that a Writ issued on 1st February, 1977 is being or will be withdrawn.

Question No. 2,721—**Mr. Cossitt:**

1. To the knowledge of the National Capital Commission, on what occasions in the past few months has Mr. Frank Galway of King, Ontario, visited Ottawa and did he have any discussions with NCC personnel and, if so (a) on what dates and what are the details of the subject matters dealt with (b) what are the names and job designations of all NCC or other government employees who met or talked with Mr. Galway or communicated with him in any way at any time?

2. Did any NCC personnel encourage, condone, or in any way suggest etc., that Mr. Galway obtain controlling interests in By York Developments and, if so, what assurances if any were given Mr. Galway that the NCC would then be prepared to carry on the original intention to lease the property at 12-16-18 York Street, Ottawa, to By York Developments or its successors?

Hon. André Ouellet (Minister of State for Urban Affairs): 1. (a) To the knowledge of the officials of the National Capital Commission, Mr. Frank Galway of King, Ontario visited Ottawa on April 27th, May 17th and May 26th, 1977 and, at his request, met with officials of the National Capital Commission on these dates. The subject matter dealt with was enquiries by Mr. Galway concerning National Capital Commission requirements and the possibility of By York Developments Limited reopening negotiation with the National Capital Commission with respect to Commission property located at 10, 12 and 18 York Street. (b) The General Manager of the National Capital Commission, the Acting Director of Property of the National Capital Commission, the Legal Adviser to the National Capital Commission, the Project Engineer for 10, 12 and 18 York Street.

2. No.

Question No. 2,722—**Mr. Cossitt:**

1. To the knowledge of the National Capital Commission at the present time where is the approximately $50,000 worth of wine reportedly paid for from public funds for 10-12-18 York Street, Ottawa, on behalf of By York Developments Limited, stored?

2. Is there any indication as yet that the government will recover this expenditure and, if so, what are all details of such possible recovery?

Hon. André Ouellet (Minister of State for Urban Affairs): 1. The wine intended for use at 10, 12 and 18 York Street is on National Capital Commission property in safe storage.

2. A requirement of a tender in answer to a public invitation for proposals re the future operation of 10, 12 and 18 York Street will be that the successful tenderer acquire these wines at the actual cost incurred for them by the National Capital Commission.

CANADA WORKS AND YOUNG CANADA WORKS APPLICATIONS AND APPROVALS IN HAMILTON AREA

Question No. 2,742—**Mr. O'Sullivan:**

To date, how many applications for the (a) Canada Works Programme (b) Young Canada Works Programme, have been received from the Constituency of (i) Hamilton-Wentworth (ii) Hamilton West (iii) Hamilton East (iv) Hamilton Mountain (v) Halton-Wentworth (vi) Halton and. in each case, what number and percentage of the applications have been successful?

Hon. Bud Cullen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration):

	(a) Canada Works			(b) Young Canada Works		
	Applications received	Applications approved	Percentage approved	Applications received	Applications approved	Percentage approved
(i)Hamilton- Wentworth	9	2	22	5	4	80
(ii) Hamilton West	30	7	23	30	16	53
(iii) Hamilton East	13	4	30	9	6	66
(iv) Hamilton Mountain	20	2	10	19	6	31
(v) Halton-Wentworth	8	2	25	16	6	37
(vi) Halton	8	3	37	11	6	54

Note: To June 3, 1977.

CROWN ASSETS DISPOSAL CORPORATION—SALARIES

Question No. 2,743—**Mr. Robinson:**

What is the salary of the (a) Executive (b) Director (c) Chairman (d) Vice-Chairman (e) board members of Crown Assets Disposal Corporation?

Hon. Jean-Pierre Goyer (Minister of Supply and Services): (a) N/A. (b) N/A. (c) The president and general manager of the corporation acts as chairman of the Board. The president and general manager does not receive a salary in her capacity as chairman; she does however receive a salary as president and general manager, and is classified at a level SX-1. ($27,500 to $36,500) (d) The corporation does not have a vice-chairman of the board. We do have a vice-president of the corporation; he does not however receive a salary for this responsibility. (e) The board consists of seven members. Five who do not receive any salary, and two non-governmental representatives who receive an indemnity. The student representative receives $75.00 per meeting, and the industry representative receives $150.00 per meeting.

UIC—INTERNAL FRAUD INVESTIGATORS

Question No. 2,765—**Mr. Cossitt:**

1. Does any internal fraud squad or anything of a similar nature, exist within the Unemployment Insurance Commission, particularly in the Toronto area and, if so (a) what are the details of the work it performs (b) on what date was it established?

2. Is the government aware of any serious morale problem existing within the UIC in the Toronto area and, if so, what are the details in this regard?

Hon. Bud Cullen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration):

1. No.

2. No.

CBC FRENCH LANGUAGE TRANSMITTER AT BELLEVILLE, ONT.

Question No. 2,768—**Mr. Matte:**

1. Did CBC construct a French language transmitter at/or near Belleville, Ontario and, if so (a) is the station channel 14 (UHF) (b) what is the broadcasting power of channel 14 (c) on what dates did construction commence and finish on the project (d) what was the approximate cost of construction (e) on what date did broadcasting commence (f) what is the estimated radius that the broadcast signal will carry (g) is it possible for the signal of the transmitter to interfere with the broadcasting clarity of channel 29 Buffalo (UHF) and, if not, for what reason is that broadcasting signal interfered with?

2. Does CBC possess data, or has it or anyone acting on its behalf furnished surveyed figures showing (a) what the English/French population ratio is in the Belleville channel 14 broadcasting area (b) what percentage of the population, whose mother tongue is French, speak (i) French (ii) English as their daily language?

3. What are the reasons justifying the establishment of a French television station at the expense of the taxpayer in a predominently English speaking area?

4. Will the government discontinue other such projects in view of its announcement in the Throne Speech that certain bilingual costs be reduced?

5. Will channel 14, Belleville cease transmitting and, if so, on what date?

6. What is the mailing address of channel 14, Belleville?

Hon. John Roberts (Secretary of State): I am informed by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation as follows: 1. Yes, at Read Village near Belleville. (a) No—channel 15 UHF. (b) 10 kw from the transmitter. (c) Commenced approximately June 1976, completed approximately March 1977. (d) $800,000. (e) May 1, 1977. (f) The Grade "B" contour extends to a 28-mile radius. (g) CBC is not aware of any mechanism that would cause interference with channel 29 and has heard of no complaints regarding interference caused by the CBC station.

2. Yes. (a) Mother tongue: English 152,600, French 2,600 (1971 Census). (b) According to language data in the 1971 census, approximately 40 per cent of the people whose mother tongue is French use French "most frequently in the home". Census figures are not readily available slowing the language used by the remainder or for "daily language" use, but it can be presumed that the majority of the remainder speak English "most frequently in the home".

3. The 1968 Broadcasting Act states that "all Canadians are entitled to broadcasting service in English and French as public funds become available", and requires that the national broadcasting service "be extended to all parts of Canada as public funds become available".

4. To be answered elsewhere.

5. No.

Order Paper Questions

6. CBC-TV Transmitter Site, P.O. Box 100, Cobourg, Ontario.

Insofar as the Secretary of State is concerned: 4. No.

AUDIT SERVICES BUREAU

Question No. 2,777—**Mr. Bawden:**

1. What are the services which the Audit Services Bureau, Department of Supply and Services, provides to other departments and agencies?

2. Does the Annual Report of the Department of Supply and Services state that 10,000 audits were performed by the Bureau during the 1975-76 fiscal year on 40 departments and agencies and, if so, were the audits performed at the request of the department or as requested by the Auditor General and, if not, for what reason were they performed?

3. What was the total cost for the 10,000 audits?

4. How many auditors in the private sector were contracted to perform the 10,000 audits?

5. How many persons are employed in the Bureau?

6. What were the customer clients requesting the services of the Bureau and what was the fee-for-services charged in (a) 1974 (b) 1975 (c) 1976?

Hon. Jean-Pierre Goyer (Minister of Supply and Services): 1. The Audit Services Bureau provides, on request, auditing and related services to federal government departments and agencies.

2. Yes. This service is optional and is carried out upon request from federal departments and agencies.

3. $14,499,609.

4. 125 auditors (30.5 staff years.

5. 632 at May 31, 1977.

6. See list below.

Fee for services charged client departments. (Note: Prior to FY 1975/76 the bureau was on a partial recovery basis.)

Client Departments	1974/75	1975/76
Agriculture	$ 30,000	$ 221,000
Anti-Inflation	—	13,709
Atomic Energy	—	6,000
Canadian Dairy Commission	80,000	90,000
C.I.D.A.	1,070	306,102
Canadian Livestock Feed Board	—	20,000
C.R.T.C.	24,093	22,799
Communication	40,064	255,000
Consumer and Corporate Affairs	224,370	160,420
E.M.R.	143,120	60,226
Environment	69,027	599,865
External Affairs	—	2,400
Finance	35,822	23,684
Indian and Northern Affairs	3,500	756,960
Industry, Trade and Commerce	184,231	509,877
Information Canada	—	23,310
Insurance	—	1,573
Justice	—	15,000
Labour	—	49,900
Manpower and Immigration	712,733	4,153,866
National Defence	84,000	132,095
National Harbours Board	64,216	83,183
National Health and Welfare	64,073	1,411,861
National Research Council	—	10,212
National Museums	24,525	55,451
Northwest Territories	35,000	59,757
Public Service Commission	1,050	8,346
Public Works	1,844	201,444
Regional Economic Expansion	564,304	1,681,042
Science and Technology	—	4,712
Secretary of State	5,000	284,577
Solicitor General	45,000	16,258
Statistics Canada	23,271	18,000
Services Canada	204,022	214,031
Supply Canada	2,014,000	2,036,096
Transport	14,968	49,206
Treasury Board	—	7,000
Unemployment Insurance Commission	909,497	868,185
Urban Affairs	—	11,500
Veterans Affairs	—	16,200
Yukon	—	29,924
Miscellaneous	32,636	8,838
	$5,635,436	$14,499,609

[Mr. Roberts.]

EXPENDITURES—SAULT STE. MARIE

Question No. 2,796—**Mr. Symes:**

What was the total amount spent in Sault Ste. Marie from October 1972 to date by the Department of Agriculture?

Hon. E. F. Whelan (Minister of Agriculture): $107,470.

EXPENDITURES—SAULT STE. MARIE

Question No. 2,797—**Mr. Symes:**

What was the total amount spent in Sault Ste. Marie from October 1972 to date by the Department of Communications?

Mr. Ross Milne (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Communications): October 1972 to date, $562,163.

EXPENDITURES—SAULT STE. MARIE

Question No. 2,799—**Mr. Symes:**

What was the total amount spent in Sault Ste. Marie from October 1972 to date by the Ministry of State for Urban Affairs?

Hon. André Ouellet (Minister of State for Urban Affairs): Nil.

EXPENDITURES—SAULT STE. MARIE

Question No. 2,802—**Mr. Symes:**

What was the total amount spent in Sault Ste. Marie from October 1972 to date by the Department of Finance?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): Since October, 1972, the Department of Finance has made payments amounting to $1,173,401.71 to Sault Ste. Marie under the Municipal Grants Program.

EXPENDITURES—SAULT STE. MARIE

Question No. 2,803—**Mr. Symes:**

What was the total amount spent in Sault Ste. Marie from October 1972 to date by the Department of Veterans Affairs?

Hon. Daniel J. MacDonald (Minister of Veterans Affairs): In so far as the Department of Veterans Affairs is concerned: $504,228.15.

EXPENDITURES—SAULT STE. MARIE

Question No. 2,811—**Mr. Symes:**

What was the total amount spent in Sault Ste. Marie from October 1972 to date by the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources?

Hon. Alastair Gillespie (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): The Department of Energy, Mines and Resources reports as follows: $8,625.

EXPENDITURES—SAULT STE. MARIE

Question No. 2,816—**Mr. Symes:**

What was the total amount spent in Sault Ste. Marie from October 1972 to date by the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce?

Mr. Hugh Poulin (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): In so far as the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce is concerned: For the period 1 Oct. 72 to 30 June 77

Fiscal Year	Amount
1972/73	$41,425
1973/74	$173,378
1974/75	$129,466
1975/76	$409,346
1976/77	$144,740
1977/78	$11,028

EXPENDITURES—SAULT STE. MARIE

Question No. 2,817—**Mr. Symes:**

What was the total amount spent in Sault Ste. Marie from October 1972 to date by the Ministry of State (Fitness and Amateur Sport)?

Hon. Marc Lalonde (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Student-athletes from Sault Ste. Marie received the following grants-in-aid during the period from October 1972 to the present: 1975-76—$1,200, 1976-77—$1,400. However, it should be noted that the majority of the contributions from the Fitness and Amateur Sport Branch go to national sport governing bodies for such projects as leadership, training, various competitions, athlete training programs etc. Thus, while it is impossible to identify recipients from a particular locale, undoubtedly there were athletes, coaches and other participants from Sault Ste. Marie who benefited from this support.

EXPENDITURES—SAULT STE. MARIE

Question No. 2,818—**Mr. Symes:**

What was the total amount spent in Sault Ste. Marie from October 1972 to date by the Department of Public Works?

Hon. Judd Buchanan (Minister of Public Works): The total amount spent in Sault Ste. Marie from October 1, 1972 until June 30, 1977 is $4,065,025 from Department of Public Works' appropriations. This department has also spent $9,156,418 on behalf of other government departments.

EXPENDITURES—SAULT STE. MARIE

Question No. 2,823—**Mr. Symes:**

What was the total amount spent in Sault Ste. Marie from October 1972 to date by the Department of Justice?

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Justice): If it is intended by this question to include the fees paid to legal agents of the Minister of Justice in Sault Ste. Marie, please consult the replies given to the following questions: Question 62, tabled May 6, 1974. Question 2,232, tabled July 18, 1975. Question 979, tabled April 27, 1977. Information regarding other types of expenditures made in Sault Ste. Marie is not readily available.

CBC—ENGLISH LANGUAGE RADIO—WOODSTOCK, NEW BRUNSWICK

Question No. 2,829—**Mr. Fairweather:**

1. Are the people of Woodstock, New Brunswick, able to receive CBC English Language radio and, if not, are plans underway to remedy this deficiency?

2. What is the effective receiving range of the Fredericton CBC station CBZ?

Hon. John Roberts (Secretary of State): I am informed by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation as follows:

1. The community of Woodstock receives basic CBC English-language radio service via CJCJ, an affiliated station. It carries approximately 26 hours a week of CBC programming. The CBC's Radio Affiliates Replacement Plan has been initiated to provide complete CBC service to a number of locations now receiving partial service through affiliates. Woodstock is one of the locations listed in the plan. The present schedule calls for the installation of a CBC English-language radio transmitter there within the next five years.

2. Coverage assessment is based on daytime reception, which in the case of CBZ is as follows: north 29 miles, east 51 miles, south 29 miles, west 27 miles.

ARBO SERVICE INC.

Question No. 2,830—**Mr. Yewchuk:**

1. In (a) 1976 (b) April to June 1977, did Arbo Service Inc. personnel travel from Fabreville, Quebec to Ottawa to perform services on House of Commons grounds and, if so, in each case (i) on how many occasions (ii) at what cost (iii) providing what services?

2. Could the services have been provided by local firms and, if so, at what cost?

Hon. André Ouellet (Minister of State for Urban Affairs): 1. (a) No. Arbo Service Inc. did not perform services on House of Commons grounds in 1976. (b) Yes. Arbo Service Inc. provided arborist services on House of Commons grounds (i) on two occasions between April and June, 1977; (ii) at a cost of $3,079.00; (iii) to provide tree trimming and tree takedown services.

2. In response to public tender call a master contract, based on firm unit prices, was awarded to the lowest qualified bidder Arbo Service Inc. for the period from April 1, 1977 to March 31, 1978. This firm has an Ottawa office at 196 Bronson

Avenue. The work performed on the House of Commons grounds was part of this master contract. Local firms did bid on this work.

STUDENT SUMMER EMPLOYMENT PROGRAMS

Question No. 2,836—**Mr. Marshall:**

With reference to the answer to Question No. 2,424, what is the breakdown of the number of students hired by the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development and the allocation of funds, by province under (a) the Northern Programme (b) Parks Canada (c) Park Awareness (d) the High School Programme?

Mr. B. Keith Penner (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development):

	Northern (a) Program	Parks Canada (b) Summer Recruitment	Parks (c) Awareness	High School Program (Indian (d) Affairs Program)	Total
British Columbia		33	—	598	631
Alberta		7	12	176	195
Saskatchewan		14	—	410	424
Manitoba		12	7	418	437
Ontario		42	18	264	324
Québec		30	5	228	263
New Brunswick		5	—	132	137
Nova Scotia		11	—	99	110
Prince Edward Island		4	—	—	4
Newfoundland		6	—	—	6
Yukon	70	—	—	4	74
Northwest Territories	42	—	—	—	42

Dollars

	Northern (a) Program	Parks Canada (b) Summer Recruitment	Parks (c) Awareness	High School Program (Indian (d) Affairs Program)	Total
British Columbia		76,878	—	159,971	236,849
Alberta		16,100	38,952	120,024	175,076
Saskatchewan		27,235	—	122,553	149,788
Manitoba		23,405	9,021	147,024	179,450
Ontario		30,852	42,420	172,891	246,163
Quebec		68,560	8,985	111,698	189,243
New Brunswick		8,575	—	46,569	55,144
Nova Scotia		18,865	—	14,631	33,496
Prince Edward Island		6,834	—	—	6,834
Newfoundland		10,290	—	—	10,290
Yukon	49,644	—	—	7,000	56,644
Northwest Territories	30,300	—	—	—	30,300

LAC ST. JEAN INTERNATIONAL CROSSING (SWIMMING) COMPETITION

Question No. 2,846—**Mr. Gauthier (Roberval):**

Has the Department of National Health and Welfare subsidized the Lac St. Jean International Crossing (Swimming) Competition and, if so, in what amount annually since the creation of the contest?

Hon. Marc Lalonde (Minister of National Health and Welfare): No.

AGRICULTURAL STABILIZATION BOARD—SALARIES

Question No. 2,852—**Mr. Robinson:**

What is the salary of the (a) Executive (b) Director (c) Chairman (d) Vice-Chairman (e) board members of the Agricultural Stabilization Board?

Hon. E. F. Whelan (Minister of Agriculture): The chairman, vice-chairman and member of the Agricultural Stabilization Board do not receive a salary or other remuneration from the Agricultural Stabilization Board. These offices are held in addition to their normal appointments as associate deputy minister, assistant deputy minister (Economics Branch) and director general (Operations Directorate, Research Branch) respectively with Agriculture Canada.

[Mr. Ouellet.]

SOLAR WATER HEATING UNITS

Question No. 2,859—**Mr. Robinson:**

1. To the knowledge of the government, has the United States, Great Britain, Holland, France, Portugal and Australia obtained Sample Solar Water Heating Units from the Van Leer Springs factory in South Africa?

2. Will the government consider the advisability of obtaining a sample heating unit for Canada as one way to reduce the energy crisis?

Hon. James Hugh Faulkner (Minister of State for Science and Technology): In so far as the National Research Council is concerned, the answer is as follows: 1. Unknown.

2. There are no plans for testing solar water heating units appropriate in much hotter climates than Canada's, as they tend not to fulfill the requirements of northern temperate to arctic climate.

NATIONAL CAPITAL COMMISSION—PERSONNEL

Question No. 2,866—**Mrs. Pigott:**

1. What are the names and dates of service of the last five (a) Chairmen (b) General Managers of the National Capital Commission?

2. On what date is the present General Manager, Mr. Charron, scheduled to leave his position?

Hon. André Ouellet (Minister of State for Urban Affairs): 1. (a) Pierre Juneau, November, 1976 to date; Edgar Gallant, September, 1973 to June, 1976; Douglas H. Fullerton, September, 1969 to June, 1973; Alfred J. Frost, January, 1968 to August, 1969; S. F. Clark, October, 1961 to December, 1967. (b) Jean Charron, March, 1975 to July, 1977; Alex Morin, February, 1971 to March, 1975; Eric W. Thrift, October, 1960 to February, 1971; Allen K. Hay, 1954 to September, 1960. (No record of a general manager being appointed prior to 1954)

2. Mr. Charron, General Manager, will leave his position on July 14, 1977.

PRIVATE EMPLOYMENT AGENCIES

Question No. 2,877—**Mr. McKenzie:**

1. Has the National Research Council obtained (a) part-time (b) full-time employees from private employment agencies in (i) British Columbia (ii) Alberta (iii) Saskatchewan (iv) Manitoba (v) Ontario (vi) Quebec (vii) New Brunswick (viii) Nova Scotia (ix) Prince Edward Island (x) Newfoundland and, if so, in each case, how many?

2. Are such employees paid from supplementary estimates and, if not, from what estimates are they paid?

3. By province, what was the (a) average hourly rate paid to employment agencies (b) average hourly rate paid to employees (c) total amount paid by the National Research Council in (i) 1975 (ii) 1976?

Hon. James Hugh Faulkner (Minister of State for Science and Technology): In so far as the National Research Council is concerned, the answer is as follows:

1. (a) Part-Time:	1975	1976
(i) British Columbia	4	6
(ii) Alberta	none	none
(iii) Saskatchewan	1	1
(iv) Manitoba	1	1
(v) Ontario	124	10.5
(vi) Quebec	none	none
(vii) New Brunswick	none	none
(viii) Nova Scotia	3	2
(ix) Prince Edward Island	none	none
(x) Newfoundland	1	1
Total	134	116

(b) Full-time: None

2. No, paid from regular operating funds appropriated by Parliament for the National Research Council.

	(a) Average hourly rate paid to Employment agencies		(c) Total amount paid	
	1975	1976	1975	1976
(i) British Columbia	5.08	8.92	19,035.	20,112.
(iii) Saskatchewan	6.6	5.45	13,331.	200.
(iv) Manitoba	5.20	6.30	858.	700.
(v) Ontario	5.50	5.94	186,174.	171,664.
(viii) Nova Scotia	5.00	3.70	8,886.	5,289.
(x) Newfoundland	4.58	4.75	1,300.	500.
(ii), (vi), (vii), (ix)—none			Total: 229,584.	198,466.

(b) Not known, contract is with employment agency.

Order Paper Questions

NEW BANK OF CANADA BUILDING

Question No. 2,879—**Mr. Stevens:**

1. Is the total cost of the new Bank of Canada building $57.3 million plus $5.3 million for the cost of architectural, consultant and inspection fees and $4.2 million for the cost of fitting up the building, i.e., the cost and installation of office furniture and special purpose facilities?

2. Based on the number of usable square feet in the new building, what is the total cost per square foot of the project?

3. Who received and will receive the estimated $5.3 million for architectural, consultant fees and the cost of insurance and, in each case, in what amount?

4. What is the breakdown of the $4.2 million estimated for the purchase and installation of office furniture and special purpose facilities?

5. What is the cost for furnishing (a) the Governor's office (b) each Deputy Governor's office (c) the general foyer of the complex?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): 1. The costs quoted in the question include not only those for the new building but also those for the renovation and integration into the complex of the original Head Office building. See answer to Question No. 1,875—Mr. Herbert.

2. The cost per square foot reflects the renovation and integration of the original Bank Building into the new complex above and below grade, and the exceptional security requirements of the construction below grade. Based on a total construction cost of $57.3 million, the price per gross square foot of the project is $69. A net to gross ratio of 84 per cent is achieved in the design.

3.

	Amount Paid	Individuals or Firms Paid
Architectural and Associated Consulting Services	$3,202,833	Marani, Rounthwaite and Dick/A. Erickson C.D. Carruthers & Wallace Consultants Limited Ardec/Brais, Frigon, Hanley, Brett, Minty & Rinfret R.M.B. Technical Services Limited Garden, McMillan, Architects and Consultants Van der Meulen and Associates Ltd. Fairhall and Moffatt Limited Construction Control Limited J.R. Bain Associates Limited Hough, Stansbury and Associates Ltd. Bernard and Associates Inc. W. B. MacIntyre, P. Eng. Kenstruction Services Limited J.J. Lunz, Roofing Consultant and Inspection Service
On Site Inspection Services		
Structural Engineering	165,471	C.D. Carruthers and Wallace Consultants Ltd. McRostie, Genest, Middlemiss R.M.B. Technical Services Limited J.D. Paterson and Associates Ltd.
Mechanical Engineering	17,992	Ardec/Brais, Frigon, Hanley, Brett, Minty and Rinfret
Electrical Engineering	95,191	Ardec/Brais, Frigon, Hanley, Brett, Minty and Rinfret Ferguson, Brosz and Associates Ltd. William Lam Associates Inc.

Order Paper Questions

	Amount Paid	Individuals or Firms Paid
Insurance and Legal	336,188	Lukis, Stewart, Price, Forbes & Co. Ltd., Gowling and Henderson, Barristers and Solicitors
Other—Scheduling, Quantity Survey, etc.	16,325	Pedrette, Associates Ltd.
		The Shawinigan Engineering Co. Ltd. T. Philip, P. Eng.
	$3,834,000	

Allowance for future payments $1,466,000.

4.

	Estimated in $ Thousands
Desks, chairs, storage walls, divider panels and accessories.	2,530
Millwork and furnishings for library, trading rooms and other special purpose areas.	592
Window blinds	204
Interior office planting	85
Other	22
Contingency	300
	3,733
Architectural and consulting fees	464
	4,197

5. (a) and The offices of the Governor and Deputy Governors are, and will continue to be, furnished with furniture that has been in use in the Bank for some years. (c) $3,800.

COMMUNITY—CO-OPERATIVE TELEVISION SOCIETIES BROADCASTING UNITED STATES TELEVISION SIGNALS

Question No. 2,882—**Mr. Brisco:**

1. By province, how many community cooperative television societies are broadcasting or re-broadcasting U.S. television signals by (a) cable (off air) (b) re-broadcasting transmitter (on air)?

2. How many have been or will be notified this year that their licences to re-broadcast U.S. television signals will not be renewed by (a) cable (off air) (b) re-broadcasting transmitter (on air)?

3. What communities are affected and what is the name of each such society?

Mr. Ross Milne (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Communications): The Canadian Radio-television and Telecommunications Commission (CRTC) has submitted the following: 1. Atlantic Provinces: (a) None; (b) None. Quebec Province: (a) One cable system which carries a U.S. station St-Zacharie; licensee—Antenne TV St-Zacharie; (b) None. Ontario Province: (a) None; (b) None. Prairie Provinces: (a) three—Regina Cablevision Co-operative, Regina, Saskatchewan; Mankota Television Co-operative Association Limited, Mankota, Saskatchewan; The Battlefords Community Cablevision Co-operative, Battleford and North Battleford, Saskatchewan; (b) None. Pacific and Northern Region: Following is a list of community cooperative television societies which are broadcasting or rebroadcasting U.S. television signals:

Licensee	Location
Campbell River TV Association	Campbell River, B.C.
Genelle TV Co-operative Society	Genelle & Lower China Creek, B.C.
*Grand Forks Cable Television Co-operative Association	Grand Forks, B.C.
Riondel Community Cable Video Society	Riondel, B.C.
South Slocan Television Co-operative Association	South Slocan, B.C.
Texada Community Television Association	Vananda, B.C.

*Authorized (not implemented)

(b)Four

	CALL SIGN AND LOCATION
The New Denver-Silverton Co-operative Television Society	CHSL-TV-1 New Denver, B.C.
Mount Sentinel TV Society Co-operative	CHMS-TV-1 Crescent Valley, B.C. CHMS-TV-2 Passmore, B.C.
Arrow Lakes TV Society	CJNP-TV-2 Nakusp, B.C.

2. (a) None. (b) The four rebroadcasting stations located in the Pacific and Northern Region were notified on May25, 1977 that their licences would not be renewed after September 30, 1977.

3. See answers to Question 1 (a) and (b).

BUREAU OF PENSIONS ADVOCATES

Question No. 2,883—**Mr. Robinson:**

What is the salary of the (a) Executive (b) Director (c) Chairman (d) Vice-Chairman (e) board members of the Bureau of Pension Advocates?

Hon. Daniel J. MacDonald (Minister of Veterans Affairs): (a) Not applicable. (b) Not applicable. (c) Chief Pensions Advocate, $27,500-$36,500; (d) Deputy Chief Pensions Advocate, $25,400-$42,100; (e) Not applicable.

ATOMIC ENERGY CONTROL BOARD—SALARIES

Question No. 2,888—**Mr. Robinson:**

What is the salary of the (a) Executive (b) Director (c) Chairman (d) Vice-Chairman (e) board members of the Atomic Energy Control Board?

Hon. Alastair Gillespie (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Atomic Energy Control Board reports as follows: (a) Executive President $37,500-$47,500; Directors $32,483-$35,600. (b) Not applicable. (c) Not applicable. (d) Not applicable. (e) Board members of AECB are not paid a salary.

CANADIAN DAIRY COMMISSION—SALARIES

Question No. 2,892—**Mr. Robinson:**

What is the salary of the (a) Executive (b) Director (c) Chairman (d) Vice-Chairman (e) board members of the Canadian Dairy Commission?

Hon. E. F. Whelan (Minister of Agriculture): Salary Range: (a) and (b) N/A; (c) Chairman, $31,500-$41,500; (d) Vice-Chairman, $27,500-$36,500; (e) Board Member, $27,500-$36,500.

CANADIAN GRAIN COMMISSION—SALARIES

Question No. 2,902—**Mr. Robinson:**

What is the salary of the (a) Executive (b) Director (c) Chairman (d) Vice-Chairman (e) board members of the Canadian Grain Commission?

Hon. E. F. Whelan (Minister of Agriculture): Salary Range: (a) and (b) N/A; (c) Chairman, $33,300-$46,300; (d) Vice-Chairman, $29,000-$40,800; (e) Board Member, $29,000-$40,800.

CANADIAN LIVESTOCK FEED BOARD—SALARIES

Question No. 2,906—**Mr. Robinson:**

What is the salary of the (a) Executive (b) Director (c) Chairman (d) Vice-Chairman (e) board members of the Canadian Livestock Feed Board?

Hon. E. F. Whelan (Minister of Agriculture): Salary Range: (a) and (b) N/A; (c) Chairman, $33,300-$46,300; (d) Vice-chairman (Part-time), Per diem of $175.00; (e) Board members (Part-time), Per diem of $125.00.

EXPENDITURES IN KOOTENAY WEST

Question No. 2,913—**Mr. Brisco:**

What is the best estimate of the amount spent by the Ministry of State for Urban Affairs in the Constituency of Kootenay West from (a) 1968 to 1974 (b) 1974 to date?

Hon. André Ouellet (Minister of State for Urban Affairs): Nil.

EXPENDITURES—KOOTENAY WEST

Question No. 2,920—**Mr. Brisco:**

What is the best estimate of the amount spent by the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development in the Constituency of Kootenay West from (a) 1968 to 1974 (b) 1974 to date?

Mr. B. Keith Penner (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): (a) 1967-68 to 1973-74 $879,000; (b) 1974-75 to date $982,000.

FRANCOPHONE DISTRICTS IN CANADA

Question No. 2,928—**Mr. Epp:**

1. Is the government setting up Francophone Districts throughout Canada and, if so (a) under what authority (b) how many and in what locations?

2. What factors or criteria are used to determine if an area of the country qualifies or is eligible to be designated as Francophone?

Hon. Robert K. Andras (President of the Treasury Board): 1. No.

2. Not applicable.

[*English*]

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, if questions No. 1,572 and 1,919 could be made orders for return, these returns would be tabled immediately. Once again, the reason for answering in this way is the rather bulky nature of the answer in each case.

[*Text*]

GOVERNMENT EXPENDITURES FOR ADVERTISING 1959, 1968, 1971 AND 1975

Question No. 1,572—**Mr. Hnatyshyn:**

What was the government's total expenditure on all forms of advertising for the year (a) 1959 (b) 1968 (c) 1971 (d) 1975 and what was the breakdown by department?

Return tabled.

DEPARTMENT OF MANPOWER AND IMMIGRATION

Question No. 1,919—**Mr. Schumacher:**

1. In the Department of Manpower and Immigration, Immigration Division, how is the organizational chart set up for (a) headquarters (b) regional offices (c) overseas offices (d) local offices and, in each case, what is the (i) name (ii) title (iii) job description (iv) management level (v) qualification (vi) salary (vii) location (viii) position in the chain of command of each incumbent?

2. In each branch of the Department relating to immigration management at all levels, including information services, how is the organizational chart set up for (a) headquarters (b) regional offices (c) overseas offices (d) local offices and, in each case, what is the (i) name (ii) qualification (iii) job description (iv) title (v) management level (vi) salary (vii) location (viii) position in the chain of command of each incumbent?

Return tabled.

* * *

[*English*]

STARRED QUESTIONS

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, would you please call starred questions Nos. 1,493, 1,731, 2,718 and 2,875.

[*Text*]

*THE GULFSTREAM 2 EXECUTIVE JET

Question No. 1,493—**Mr. McKenzie:**

1. Has the government purchased the Gulfstream 2 Executive Jet and, if so (a) how many (b) what was the purchase price (c) for what purpose (d) who uses such a jet?

2. What is the cost per hour of operating the Jet?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Rod Blaker (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Supply and Services): 1. Yes. a) One b) $4,232,000. (U.S. dollars) paid on delivery (Ottawa International Airport). c) The aircraft will be used for the following purposes: (1) in-flight calibrating and inspecting of aids to air navigation located at 60° latitude North, (2) calibrating and inspecting

Class II ILS systems installed at various airports; (3) as an in-flight base for the development of new inspection and calibration procedures; (4) spot-checking of aids to air navigation following reported detunings exceeding established tolerances and resulting from the replacement of certain defective parts; d) MOT personnel are responsible for the above-described tasks.

2. The operating cost for that aircraft varies between $600 and $670 per hour. Since it is used for calibration, the Gulfstream 2 has been granted an exemption under the provisions of Section 6, Part XVII, Schedule 3 of the Excise Tax Act.

*ISSUE OF GREEN UNIFORMS TO SEA AND AIR CADETS

Question No. 1,731—**Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich):**

1. Is it the intention of the government to proceed with the issue of green cloth uniforms to the Sea and Air Cadets rather than the traditional uniforms?

2. What is a description of the new uniforms to be issued?

3. Is it the intention of the government to permit cadets to wear their traditional uniforms or are they to be withdrawn from use?

4. Were the changes decided upon after consultation with, and agreement of, the two national cadet movements?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Jacques-L. Trudel (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Treasury Board): Mr. Speaker, the answer to the first question is yes.

2. The uniforms are made of the same material as the Canadian forces uniforms. The basic uniform consists of a green bush style jacket, trousers, black boots, and a green beret. A green T-shirt is worn under the jacket in summer, and a green turtle neck sweater in winter. A green 100 per cent wool gabardine top coat is also part of the basic uniform. Distinctive corps and squadron headdress and accoutrements are now under consideration, by league officials.

3. Cadet corps and squadrons may retain the old, single service uniforms to wear on ceremonial occasions. Stocks of these uniforms, however, will not be replenished by DND.

4. The new green uniform was procured only after its adoption was agreed to by the presidents of the Navy, Army Cadet and Air Cadet Leagues of Canada at the ninth meeting of the National Cadet Advisory Group held on 6 December, 1974.

*WORLD SUPPLY OF OIL AND GAS

[*Text*]

Question No. 2,718—**Mr. Fairweather:**

To the knowledge of the government, did a recent United Nations study by geologists and economists conclude that the world's supply of oil and gas is unlikely to be depleted within a century?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Maurice Dupras (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, the answer to the question of the hon. member for Fundy-Royal is as follows: The study referred to appears to be the recently-released report of the UNITAR Conference on future world supply of oil and gas, held last July in Laxenburg, Austria. This conference concluded that additional oil and gas resources would probably be available at least until their use is replaced by renewable energy sources, even if this transition period should last a hundred years or more. This conclusion is considerably more optimistic than other assessments of world hydrocarbon resources. Most of the "new" oil which the conference is purported to have revealed had been known to exist, but most of this oil is locked in our own Athabasca and Venezuela's Orinoco oil sands and heavy oil deposits and the oil shales of the western U.S., and in the still unrecoverable portions of known conventional oil fields. There are also huge but presently inaccessible gas resources in tight rock formations, high pressure zones and other sources unexploitable today due to high cost or lack of technology. The report also suggests that major hydrocarbon resources may lie offshore beneath the continental slopes and deep ocean floor, more in fact than beneath the continental shelves where oil and gas are currently being produced. This concept is purely speculative with no direct evidence available to support it, since only a handful of wells has been drilled on the continental slopes or the deep ocean floor to date and these have discovered no indications of commercial oil and gas deposits. As technology advances and conventional oil fields become depleted, some of these sources of oil and gas will be tapped, just as Canada is presently starting to tap its own oil sands deposits. However, the cost of recovering much of these resources such as those below the deep ocean floor will likely be prohibitive, even with escalating international prices for oil, so much so that other cheaper and nuclear will replace oil and gas for many of their present uses.

*PERSONAL STAFF OF HON. MEMBER FOR CROWFOOT

[*Text*]

Question No. 2,875—**Mr. Coates:**

1. Since the honourable Member for Crowfoot was appointed a Minister without Portfolio, how many persons have been appointed to his personal staff?

2. In each case (a) what is his/her name (b) what are his/her qualifications (c) on what date was he/she appointed and at what salary?

3. In each case, in what locations will the staff appointed by the honourable Member for Crowfoot be employed and in what province?

4. In the case of those persons not employed in Ottawa, will there be any special travel arrangements that will allow them to commute between the location in question and, if so, what are such arrangements?

5. Are there any persons, other than those indicated who are involved in the activities of the honourable Member for Crowfoot in a direct way and, if so (a) what are their (i) names (ii) qualifications (iii) responsibilities (b) how are such persons remunerated whether by contract or salary (c) what are the amounts associated with such work from a dollar point of view with regard to both income and expenses?

[*English*]

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, the answer to the question is as follows: 1. 4.

2.

(a)	(c)	Salary
Mr. Peter Thomson	1.6.77	Up to $30,000 p.a.
Mr. D. H. Kuntz	27.6.77	Up to $22,900 p.a.
Mrs. L. Bergh	21.4.77	Up to $22,900 p.a.
Mrs. P. Egan	21.4.77	Up to $17,900 p.a.

(b) Overall suitability of each individual's professional, academic and personal qualifications in relation to the job requirement.

3. With the exception of Mr. Kuntz, all are employed in Ottawa. Mr. Kuntz is employed in Alberta, working out of Camrose.

4. Treasury Board Travel Directive applies to Mr. Kuntz. Camrose is his headquarters and when away from his headquarters on duty approved by the Minister, travel expenses may be claimed.

5. Staff assigned by House of Commons—information should be requested from House of Commons officials.

● (1540)

Mr. Beatty: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Among the question which the parliamentary secretary said would be answered today there is not one question in my name. I placed some of my questions on the order paper over one year ago. I refer particularly to question No. 632 relating to a trip taken by the then secretary of state in July, 1976, some 13 months ago. I have drawn this question to the parliamentary secretary's attention several times. I cannot understand why the government needs 13 months to answer a question. The secretary of state is now a different person. Why is there not sufficient staff to provide the answer to my question? I again draw the question to the parliamentary secretary's attention and ask him to provide an answer soon.

Mr. Cossitt: Mr. Speaker, I, too, rise on a point of order. A few moments ago the Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Goodale) said the government was answering 102 questions today. On the surface, that sounds an impressive number, but if one looks beneath the surface one will see that we are in almost the same situation as we were when the House ended its sitting just over a week ago.

I recall raising at least five times the fact that the first 26 questions on the order paper are in my name. They have been on the order paper since October 12. Some were on the order paper in a previous session of parliament, and some of them have remained on the order paper for one year and a half. They have to do with such matters as the CBC international service and what appears to be the interference by the Department of External Affairs in programming to eastern Europe. It has been suggested that the CBC was told what it could or could not say in reflecting the Canadian way of life to communist countries. There are questions concerning cabinet ministers who make frequent use of government aircraft for private and pleasure purposes. These questions remain unanswered. I recall the parliamentary secretary's assuring the House, unless I misunderstood, that the questions would be answered by the time the House adjourns. The adjournment is coming tomorrow.

He may claim now that he meant the questions would be answered by the time the session ends. I point out that the session could continue another year, which he knows. Must we wait another year for answers to questions which should have been answered 11 months ago? When will this foolishness end? Though he claimed the government is answering 102 questions today, can he say when my questions will be answered? If he cannot say, perhaps the Minister of Transport (Mr. Lang) can say when a question which concerns him will be answered. On the program "Cross-country Check-up" last year a caller called the radio station to ask the Minister of Transport why five women, private people and not employees of the government of Canada, used a Jetstar to fly into Saskatoon, shortly after the minister had flown in on another Jetstar. The minister assured the listener that he would look into it and supply a public answer immediately.

I, in turn, put the question on the order paper. No immediate answer has been forthcoming. Apparently nobody knows the answer. I think that either the parliamentary secretary or the Minister of Transport, who is mainly responsible for delaying the answers relating to the use of aircraft under his jurisdiction, should tell the House why in the name of the devil they are hiding the truth from the Canadian people. There are smiles on the faces of certain ministers who shrug this off as a joke. The Canadian people do not think it a joke when information is withheld from parliament.

Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, I will determine what has happened to the answer relating to the refuelling of the aircraft in Saskatoon. I thought it would have been answered by now. I think the hon. member should recollect the matter more correctly. If my memory serves me right, the caller asked about an aircraft refuelling in Saskatoon in which there were five pretty girls. I have determined that it was an aircraft carrying, among others, the Minister of State for Fitness and Amateur Sport on a trip to the west. I will obtain further details for the hon. member.

Mr. Goodale: Mr. Speaker, I assure the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Cossitt) that he can expect answers shortly to many questions to which he referred a few moments ago. I hope many will be answered tomorrow. I confirm the intention, which I have repeated several times, to bring forward answers to questions standing on the order paper at this time, before the end of the session. I cannot give that assurance with respect to questions which may appear after this time.

Mr. Speaker: Shall the remaining questions be allowed to stand?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

ENERGY

CONSIDERATION OF PROPOSALS FOR NORTHERN GAS PIPELINE

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (President of the Privy Council) moved:

That this House recognizes the social, economic, environmental and energy issues surrounding the question of northern gas pipelines and, believing that the resolution of these issues must reflect the national interest, approves the position of the government that all relevant reports must be considered before deciding on a pipeline and its route.

He said: Mr. Speaker, at the beginning of my remarks I should like to set out the circumstances surrounding the debate in which we shall engage for the next two days. You will recall that we were urged a number of times, particularly by members of the official opposition, to provide for a debate on the northern pipeline issue before the government reaches a decision. Notably, the hon. member for Moose Jaw (Mr. Neil) on April last, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Clark) in May last, and the hon. member for St. John's West (Mr. Crosbie) in May last, all joined together in asking that the House of Commons and its members be given the opportunity to express its views on these complicated questions before a decision is taken by the government.

● (1550)

Therefore, it will be no surprise to hon. members that it is not my intention in this statement to make any announcement with respect to a decision but, rather, to indicate some of the issues which have to be considered and some of the problems which are involved in dealing with this important matter. Inasmuch as the government is in the process of considering these problems, the contributions made by hon. members to this debate will be very valuable indeed.

Mr. Speaker, when I participated in the debate on the northern pipeline question in this House on May 13, I pointed out that it raised important issues that had to be considered carefully not only by members of parliament, but also by the Canadian people as a whole. Today I would like to try to provide an overview of the long train of events leading up to the point of decision that we now face and to outline the important considerations—tangible and intangible—that have to be weighed in the balance in reaching a judgment as to which of the various alternative courses of action open to us will best serve the national interest.

As all of us are well aware, Mr. Speaker, the pace of development of the north has accelerated substantially over the past two decades and more, fostered by the expansion of rail, road, air and communication links, the considerable enlargement in available government services, and the rapid growth of a number of territorial communities. Through the early and mid-1960s, the pace of exploration for oil and gas in both Alaska and the Canadian north began to gather momentum. It began to accelerate still faster with the discovery of petroleum at Prudhoe Bay in 1968 and at Atkinson Point in the Mackenzie Delta in 1970.

While most of us have welcomed the quickening pace of northern development, we have also become increasingly conscious of the need to ensure at the same time that such development is in harmony with nature and with the people who live there. In 1970, for example, the federal government issued initial guidelines providing for the protection of native rights, the expansion of native employment opportunities, and safeguarding of the environment and ecology of the north in the event of future construction of oil or gas pipelines. Substantially more detailed provisions were established in the expanded guidelines that were subsequently issued in 1972. In the same year the government also issued a statement on northern development in the seventies which elaborated this concern that industrial growth should be in accord with the people and the environment of the territories.

In the following year, 1973, the federal government announced its readiness to enter into negotiation with the Indian and Inuit people of the north to provide a settlement of claims for the loss of interests that had not been extinguished by treaty or superseded by law. During the course of these ongoing negotiations, the federal government has recognized that a settlement cannot be confined only to material benefits, but also must recognize the aspiration of native people for a much enhanced role in the making of decisions involving their communal life.

In March, 1974, Canadian Arctic Gas filed its long expected application for a pipeline across the Yukon North Slope and the Mackenzie Delta and up the Mackenzie Valley to trans-

port both Canadian and U.S. natural gas to markets in southern Canada and the lower 48 states. In that same month, the federal government appointed Mr. Justice Thomas Berger to undertake an inquiry into the social, economic and environmental impact on the north of this project—and of the subsequently proposed Maple Leaf line—which was unprecedented in its depth and breadth.

As the House is aware, late in the proceedings the Foothills group sponsoring the all-Canadian, Maple Leaf line from the Mackenzie Delta submitted an alternative proposal for a line that would carry gas from Prudhoe Bay to Fairbanks, from which it would run southeastward along the route of the Alaska Highway through the southern Yukon Territory, across the northeast corner of British Columbia and southward in Alberta to branch lines transporting the gas to western and midwestern U.S. states.

When it became apparent that this proposal was being given serious consideration by Canadian and U.S. regulatory authorities and, further, that it offered the possibility of an interconnection for Delta gas through a line running southwest along the Dempster Highway, the government quickly established a three-member board under the chairmanship of Kenneth Lysyk, Dean of Law at the University of British Columbia, to launch a preliminary inquiry into the socioeconomic impact of such a project. At the same time, my colleague, the Minister of the Environment, (Mr. LeBlanc), also launched a preliminary inquiry under his department's environmental assessment and review process. As the government has emphasized, in the event that a decision were made to endorse a project along the lines of that proposed by Foothills (Yukon), further socioeconomic and environmental studies would be undertaken to determine how best to minimize any potentially adverse impacts identified by the preliminary inquiries.

Now I should like to say a word about the recommendations which have come forward from these various inquiries. Members of the House have now received copies of the first volume of Mr. Justice Berger's eloquent report, which concluded that no pipeline should be built across the Yukon North Slope or the Mackenzie Delta because of unacceptable environmental risks that it would create, and that no pipeline should be built along the Mackenzie Valley for ten years in order to provide time for the settlement of native claims and implementation of measures to provide native people with a greater measure of self-determination. The summary of the forthcoming second volume of his report, which was released late last week, outlines Mr. Justice Berger's proposals for minimizing the adverse social, economic and environmental impact if a decision should be reached in favour of building a line along the route proposed by Canadian Arctic Gas.

The House will recall that the report of the National Energy Board ruled the so-called Maple Leaf line out of contention, as did the applicant, on the grounds that insufficient reserves in the Mackenzie Delta made it uneconomic and unfinanceable. The board concluded that both Canadian Arctic Gas and the Foothills (Yukon) project, with provision for a connecting line to feed Delta gas into the express system at Dawson, could transport Canadian and U.S. supplies to southern markets economically and at reasonably similar costs.

The board considered that both projects could contribute significant industrial benefits to the Canadian economy and create an equally significant increase in employment opportunities during the construction phase. In the case of Canadian Arctic Gas, for example, the board estimated that over a five-year period 25,000 man-years of employment would be created directly and 220,000 created indirectly as a result of that project. Like Mr. Justice Berger, the NEB reached a judgment that the environmental impact of the proposed line along the Yukon North Slope would be intolerably severe. The Board concluded that the environmental impact of the Foothills (Yukon) line would be acceptable because for the most part it would follow established corridors. It also concluded that that route was preferable from a socioeconomic point of view because fewer native people would be affected, because those in the Yukon Territory were more accustomed to industrial development, and because negotiations on native claims were more advanced than some of those in the Northwest Territories.

● (1600)

It is clear that in reaching its conclusion in favour of the Foothills (Yukon) system, the National Energy Board gave substantial weight to the proposed conditions to preserve Canada's option to have Delta gas connected with the express line in order to provide for its economic transport to southern markets as and when required to supplement declining reserves from conventional areas in the west.

The environmental assessment panel established under the chairmanship of Dr. Harry Hill last week expressed the view that a southern Yukon pipeline route was environmentally preferable to a Mackenzie Valley line. At the same time it emphasized that considerably more study was required in order to devise measures to minimize the environmental impact of such a line, and considered that further information was required to assess the impact of a line along the Dempster Highway to provide access to Delta gas.

The report of the Alaska Highway pipeline inquiry under the chairmanship of Dean Lysyk, which was made public last Tuesday, provides a further valuable insight into many critical factors that all of us must take into account. That inquiry recommended that a start on construction of any pipeline through the southern Yukon be deferred until August 1, 1981, to provide time for the settlement and implementation of native claims.

Regardless of what decision was eventually reached regarding the routing and timing of a pipeline, the report proposed that the federal government make an interim advance payment of $50 million in respect of such a settlement to a special trust account, with the accumulating interest from August 1 of this year being allocated to serve the various interests of native people in the Yukon. In addition, the report expressed the view that no conclusion could be reached about the social and

economic feasibility of a connecting line to Delta reserves along the Dempster Highway on the strength of existing information.

While the National Energy Board proposed that the project company building a pipeline through the southern Yukon be required to provide a payment of up to $200 million to help cover identifiable economic and social costs, the Lysyk inquiry contended that such costs should largely be met through tax revenues. It contended that any company building a line along this general route be required to pay a minimum of $200 million into a Yukon heritage fund in order to compensate Yukon residents for adverse impacts which could not be readily calculated on a dollar and cents basis.

May I say a word now about Canadian-U.S. options. Both Canada and the United States are now faced with the difficult task of weighing all the advantages and disadvantages, all the costs and benefits that are involved in each of the various alternative courses in order to reach a judgment as to which will best serve the public interest of each country. The United States, which experienced a critical shortage of gas during a prolonged period of severe cold weather last winter, faces a choice of joining with Canada in the construction of an overland pipeline that would transport gas from Prudhoe Bay in Alaska to the lower 48 states, of opting for an all-American system involving an Alaskan pipeline and liquefied natural gas transport ships, or whether to forgo any delivery system now and instead devote its resources to development of other energy alternatives.

In Canada, we are faced with a decision essentially involving three basic choices: of approving a system generally in line with that proposed by Canadian Arctic Gas; of approving a system along the lines of that proposed by Foothills (Yukon), with or without provision for a connection for Canadian Delta gas, or of deferring construction of any pipeline for the foreseeable future and either awaiting bigger finds of Delta-Beaufort Sea gas to justify a Maple Leaf route, or concentrating our resources instead on the development of other sources of energy supply.

Perhaps the best starting point for consideration of the factors that we in Canada must weigh in the balance is the need for natural gas as it relates to the national energy strategy. My colleague, the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Gillespie), will be participating in the debate later, but in order to maintain a proper balance of the various factors involved in a decision of this kind I think it is appropriate that I should refer in the over-all context to the question of energy demand and supply.

One of the central goals of that strategy is to ensure that by 1985 and thereafter Canada's dependence on imported foreign oil does not exceed one-third of total domestic consumption. The magnitude of the challenge we face in meeting that goal was clearly underlined by the National Energy Board in its recent report on Canadian oil supply and requirements. Failing the adoption of decisive policies and programs to reverse the trend, the board estimated that Canada might be forced to rely on foreign oil imports to supply anywhere from 52 per cent to 62 per cent of its oil requirements by 1985, and perhaps even more in the next decade. Such heavy dependence on foreign oil supplies would expose this country to a number of risks which I am sure my colleague, the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources, would like to deal with later.

There are two basic thrusts to the policies we have been developing to restrain the extent of our dependence on foreign petroleum supplies. One is that of greatly intensifying conservation in our consumption of energy. The other is that of substantially increasing the supply of many alternative sources of new energy capacity that are open to us.

The existing reserves of natural gas found to date in the Mackenzie Delta are estimated by the National Energy Board to amount to 5.3 trillion cubic feet, which is a relatively small volume when measured against the high expectations for discoveries that most of us had earlier in the 1970s. Nevertheless, it is the board's view that this could provide one of the cheapest alternative sources of new energy at present available, one that its calculations suggest could supply some 10 per cent of domestic gas consumption for a period of several years. That is almost double the U.S. demand that could be met from present reserves in Prudhoe Bay.

The National Energy Board estimated that Canada could have a requirement for natural gas from the Arctic to meet the prospective domestic demand and existing export contracts as early as 1981 if Alberta strictly enforced its formula for reserving supplies to meet its own requirements or as late as 1985. In the event that it were decided to terminate exports by the end of this year, the board estimated the supply of gas from conventional sources would be sufficient to meet Canadian demand until around 1989. But apart from the effect of such a policy on our relations with the United States, the board also concluded that the adoption of this course could lead to a sharp decline in exploration and discovery of new reserves.

In reaching these conclusions, however, the board also underlined the fact that it was, in its words, "bedevilled by the inability to accurately predict demand and supply . . ." On the supply side, uncertainty is created by the present difficulty of determining to what extent the development of the existing surplus of natural gas from conventional areas is a temporary phenomenon and to what extent it may reflect accelerated development of new reserves in response to substantially higher wellhead prices. On the demand side, there is uncertainty about how the balance may be struck between increased conservation of gas consumption and the development of new markets for gas to provide a substitute for oil or other energy forms. As a consequence, we are faced with deciding not only whether we should build a northern pipeline, but also with considering when Arctic gas might be required to meet Canadian needs.

● (1610)

The tapping of Canadian gas from the western Arctic, of course, is only one of several alternative sources of new energy that we might draw on in the future. Exploration for conven-

tional sources of petroleum in the conventional areas of western Canada has, as I indicated earlier, been growing rapidly and yielding significant new discoveries. Extensive discussions have been under way for some time with the producing provinces about steps that might be taken to accelerate development of the tar sands and heavy oil deposits, both of which Canada possesses in abundance. Our nuclear power capacity is being steadily expanded, along with the development of new hydroelectric facilities. Exploration for oil and gas is being actively pursued in the eastern Arctic and the deep offshore area of the Beaufort Sea. Extensive research is being conducted into the feasibility of various forms of renewable energy such as that from the sun, wind and tides.

As I suggested previously, one of the important elements that we have to weigh is whether investment of scarce resources in a northern pipeline to open up access to Delta gas, or in the development of some of these other alternative energy sources I have just mentioned, would yield the best return to this country. It may well be that when all the factors are considered, the conclusion that emerges is that our interests will be better served by following the latter course. Before reaching that conclusion, however, one of the factors which we would obviously have to weigh is the possible effect of such a decision in sharply curtailing future exploration in the western Arctic in the absence of any other measures to sustain it.

We are also reminded by the many reports that have been submitted to us that economic considerations are not the only ones that we must assess in reaching a judgment on the issue before us. We must also be deeply concerned about the impact of a pipeline on the northern people, particularly native people, and on the fragile northern land and the wildlife that it supports. In the case of the environment and the ecology, our concerns must be to forgo routes which would have a harshly adverse impact that could not be overcome by any reasonable means, and of reducing the adverse impact of other routes to the greatest possible extent.

It is a fact that if a pipeline is built, some degree of environmental disruption is inevitable. For this, there is a cost that has to be paid, now or in the future. But the cost can be quite high or relatively low, depending on a number of factors. In the next few days of debate I believe those factors must be taken into account. The only basis for sound environmental protection is sound environmental information. Though we know a great deal about many of the problems associated with the construction of northern pipelines, we will have to know a great deal more. If we know enough, if we take environmental factors into account during decision-making, and if we relate those factors to final design and mitigative measures, we can reduce environmental costs to acceptable limits.

I should point out that the El Paso proposal is not without environmental risk to Canada. While the direct environmental effect on this country of a gas pipeline across Alaska would be relatively small, the same cannot be said of the necessary port installations on Prince William Sound and in southern California. These installations do pose certain threats to fisheries resources that may be of more than local importance.

The tankers carrying liquefied gas are not a serious threat in themselves. The possibility exists, however, that increased traffic along the coast increases the possibility of collision with coastal oil tankers travelling to and from Valdez in Alaska. The results of such a collision could be devastating to coastal and marine life. Major concerns with the El Paso proposal, therefore, result not from the pipeline itself but from the necessary ancillary facilities and concurrent transportation methods.

In the case of the natives of the north, our concern must be twofold: to minimize the adverse impact of any pipeline and to maximize the benefits that it can provide. Mr. Justice Berger pointed this out in the first volume of his report, "Native society is not static". The report of the National Energy Board made a similar point: "The north at this time may be said to be a land in transition". Also, the board asserted the following:

> The move of natives away from the traditional ways of life, living in small groups and relying almost entirely on hunting and fishing, is a recognized fact. Many native northerners now live in communities where schools and social services are available. Hunting and trapping still take place, but more on a seasonal basis. Little wage employment has been created and many of the people receive welfare payments.

The short-term dislocations and disruptions which could be faced by members of some native communities, and some of the potentially adverse impacts that could be felt over the longer term, must also be weighed against the long-term benefits that a pipeline could provide directly and indirectly in the form of job training, new job opportunities, opportunities for the development of native enterprises, possibilities of access to natural gas fuel to northern homes at significantly lower cost than that of other available fuels. While the pipeline operation itself would not provide substantial employment opportunities, many northerners are convinced that it would serve as a catalyst in promoting other resource and hydro developments. These, in turn, would provide jobs for the growing number of young people in the territories who will be looking for employment on a full-time or part-time basis in the years that lie immediately ahead.

At the same time, however, it is also important that the construction of a pipeline should not prejudice the settlement of native claims, nor unduly impede the implementation of the new social framework established as part of such settlements under which native people will acquire an increased opportunity to shape their own development in future.

It is very important to remind the House that even if the government should reach a decision to enter into talks with the United States on the possibility of a pipeline generally following one or the other of the two major overland routes, that would by no means resolve the issue. As I pointed out earlier in my remarks, the United States must also determine which alternative best serves its own interests. In the event that it reached the tentative conclusion that the alternative which might best serve its interest coincided with our own, there would undoubtedly be a good many important questions to be resolved to the satisfaction of both countries before any final agreement could be reached between the two governments.

Mr. Fraser: Right on, Allan.

Mr. MacEachen: Any final decision about proceeding with construction of a pipeline would also depend on reaching satisfactory terms and conditions with the companies involved in both countries and in satisfactory arrangements being made to ensure financing of the project. Consequently, it would be a serious mistake to assume that a decision on our part—

Mr. Fraser: Could ever possibly be made.

Mr. MacEachen: —to enter into discussions with the United States would lead automatically to a foregone conclusion, namely, a decision to authorize an overland pipeline. If we assume that all the hurdles I have just mentioned could be overcome, and if a decision were made by the government to approve an overland pipeline, it would be the intention of the government, as the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) said at his press conference last week, to implement such a proposal by legislation.

● (1620)

By following this course, parliament would be assured of the right to provide or withhold its sanction for an undertaking of such vast dimensions and major implications for our country. While it is, of course, not possible to anticipate in advance the form such legislation might take, it is conceivable that it might provide for the route to be followed, establish terms governing the granting of a right-of-way, impose terms for the protection of the environment, for minimizing adverse social and economic impacts and maximizing the benefits for the people of the north, and spell out the major terms and conditions agreed on with the United States and the participating company or companies.

I can assure the House that it would be our intention that such legislation would provide for the establishment of a single agency to co-ordinate and supervise the exercise of authority in all matters pertaining to a northern pipeline that are under the responsibility of federal authorities. This agency would be expected to co-operate closely with the provincial governments, territorial governments as well as with the National Energy Board, which possesses a great deal of experience and expertise in regulating the physical aspects of pipeline construction. In our view, a single agency of this kind would be essential to minimize duplication and confusion and to ensure that the intentions of parliament were fulfilled expeditiously and efficiently.

Before I conclude, Mr. Speaker, let me observe that undoubtedly there will be those who will argue that we lack sufficient information even now to make a decision in principle on the question. In an imperfect world, there is no such thing as perfect knowledge.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. MacEachen: There are some critical elements that must be weighed in the balance involving developments in the future that we cannot possibly foresee with certainty—elements such as national and international energy supply, demand and costs. Because of the long lead time required to develop the new energy resources that will be urgently required in the years ahead, we are faced with the necessity of making decisions now based on the best evidence currently available. To defer a decision would itself be an important decision because it would have the effect of foreclosing some of the options still open to us. Hon. gentlemen have not been entirely enthusiastic about my concluding comments on this issue.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. MacEachen: I can well understand their somewhat uneasy reception of these cold facts. Now they can take the floor and tell the government how, exactly, it ought to put all these considerations together into an integrated package.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Joe Clark (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I should begin by saying, on behalf of all members, that it has been a long time since the House of Commons has heard a speech like that. We are a little puzzled as to why the President of the Privy Council (Mr. MacEachen) made the lead speech on this matter. Frankly, what concerns us most is that perhaps he has been given the north in exchange for CIDA. A procedural expert near the exit which the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) is seeking from the debate suggested that the President of the Privy Council spoke because the motion was in his name. I simply say that we on this side of the House would have been delighted to have given unanimous consent if someone else had wanted to lead off.

We are discussing, and will be deciding, this question in an atmosphere that can best be called an Alice in Wonderland atmosphere. In effect, as the minister stated, three routes are at issue. One is a route from Prudhoe Bay, down the Mackenzie, which was recommended by Canadian Arctic Gas and studied by the Berger inquiry and the National Energy Board. Second, along the Alaska Highway, which was recommended by the Foothills group and studied by Dean Lysyk and the National Energy Board. Third, the Dempster connection to the Delta, proposed as possible by the National Energy Board but studied by nobody.

Mr. Justice Berger, having studied the Mackenzie Valley route, prefers the Alcan route, which he has not studied. The NEB, having studied Berger, recommends access to the Dempster route, which it has not studied. The Lysyk group, the third inquiry in a venture conceived, originally, to achieve Canadian access to the Canadian reserves, recommends a route which gives Americans access to American reserves, with the possibility of connection to Canadian reserves, assuming the viability of the Dempster connection, which nobody has studied.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Clark: In each case, to a more or less degree, the inquirers recommend routes they have not studied. The fault in this bizarre situation does not rest with the various inquiries,

each of which has worked effectively and well within difficult constraints of time and information, nor with the various applicants, Arctic Gas and the Foothills group which spent immense amounts of money, time, imagination and care in making their cases. The result, instead, rests with the government of Canada, which runs the north like a colony and has known for at least a decade that the society and economy of that region were bound to be profoundly affected by a pipeline possibility. Yet despite that warning, despite Ottawa's absolute jurisdiction, we have to make this decision without a northern energy policy, without a national energy policy, without a northern development policy, and without any clear or consistent approach to native rights or the northern ecology.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Clark: Sadly, this kind of incompetence is not confined to the north. There is no more alarming evidence of that than the continuing erosion in the position of our dollar in world currency markets. The fall in the Canadian dollar, and let us not kid ourselves that this is simply a technical adjustment, is not the result of any single event in any single part of the country. As has been stated so explicitly by the *Wall Street Journal*, among others, it is the price of years of economic mismanagement by this incompetent government.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Clark: That kind of incompetence creates problems well beyond the north. These problems will become much more severe if the Government of Canada continues to fail to develop an effective integrated energy policy for Canada. When the energy crisis broke in 1973, reaction was swift virtually everywhere but in Canada. In the United Kingdom, for example, development of North Sea oil and gas reserves was speeded up by the world price increases. The result is that North Sea oil and gas are already coming onstream. By 1980 the United Kingdom will be self-sufficient in energy and may, in fact, even be an exporter. But not Canada.

• (1630)

The changed price situation of the crisis gave Canada the opportunity to become self-sufficient in energy. That opportunity has not been entirely lost. But it sets the context for the decision on a northern pipeline. That decision must contribute to the goal of making Canada self-sufficient in energy by the 1990s—not self-reliant, which is the minister's phrase, because the word "self-reliant" is simply a euphemism for using not foreign exchange to buy resources, but self-sufficient, bringing our domestic demand and our domestic supply into harmony. That is a realizeable goal, and it is necessary.

A failure to strive for self-sufficiency could be very costly to Canada. The National Energy Board estimated, in February of this year, that Canada will be a net importer of more than half a million barrels of oil per day in 1985, and a million in 1990, if the present inadequate supply and demand policy remain in place. The dollar cost of that level of importation is roughly calculable. It is more than $10 billion a year added to Canada's balance of payments deficit by 1990—assuming only moderate inflation and moderate price increases for energy. That is an added level of deficit that could be sustained by some economy, but not by Canada's.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Clark: Canada's economy is dominated by the resource and service sectors, and burdened by a very heavy public sector. We have traditionally paid for our international deficits with resources. Our manufacturing sector—traditionally weak, and getting weaker under the policies of this government—cannot carry the burden. Japan, with its world-scale factories and disciplined labour force, can perhaps pay for its oil with television sets and toasters, Canada cannot.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Clark: The consequences of the looming oil deficit are chilling. The Canadian dollar could fall to 70 American cents by 1985. High cost imported goods will add enormously to domestic inflation. Unemployment could rise to 15 per cent nationally, and it could stay there for decades. But that is not the worst. At least one major international report now concludes that there will be a world energy shortfall coinciding with Canada's new position as a major importer, and there is the real possibility that the OPEC cartel will curtail production and impose, for its own reasons, a type of world rationing system.

The inevitable result would be domestic rationing of oil as early as 1985. That is eight short years away. The social and political costs of such rationing are literally incalculable. Our industries would have to shut down for periods. Unemployment would rise even above the 15 per cent figure. Our cities, dependent as they are on a high degree of personal mobility, would be disrupted as people crowd into the urban core. That is a prescription for chaos. That kind of situation can be averted by action today against the crisis of tomorrow. It can be avoided by a vigorous effort to make up lost time and to work toward energy self-sufficiency by 1990. Reaching that goal requires federal effort on both the supply and demand fronts. First, there must be a far more effective program of energy conservation.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Clark: The introduction of the two-price system for oil, and the phased move to the world price, are necessary on grounds of equity, on grounds of allowing Canadians to adjust gradually to the new price structure. But we must face the fact that it has discouraged the efficient use of scarce energy resources. This is all the more reason why Canada should have had in place long ago a serious program of energy conservation. The new national home insulation program—first proposed by this party—is one delinquent step in the right direction. But it has been four years in coming and it will be another four years before it has meaningful impact.

The government's official target for the annual increase in energy consumption is 3½ per cent per year. That is no target at all.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Clark: The government's own officials, who have by and large left the service of the government, in delivering a justified and effective criticism of the minister say that growth can be held to 2 per cent without economic disruption. That should be a firm commitment of the federal government of Canada. Serious consideration should be given to a program of tax rebates for energy-efficient automobiles. The government should have produced, as it promised it would more than two years ago, appliance efficiency labelling. It should establish minimum standards for appliance efficiency. It should encourage corporations, through tax deductions or rebates, to conduct internal energy audits—to determine where industrial savings can be made. We need a far better performance on conservation than we have been receiving from this government.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Clark: The second step to energy self-sufficiency demands what amounts to a crash program to develop the tar sands and heavy oil deposits of western Canada, and also to develop clear guidelines and incentives to encourage exploration and development in the north. The third step must be a determined effort to substitute other energy sources for oil. Over the long term, of course, the emphasis has to be on renewable forms of energy such as solar power and tidal power. Canada's efforts in this regard are paltry compared with the research and development work done in other countries. We need, also, to give far more priority to research into coal gasification, and other alternatives. For the nearer term, we must look very seriously to the substitution of natural gas for oil. Our natural gas supply now exceeds Canada's immediate requirements, and expansion of those resources could very well be vital to the goal of energy self-sufficiency in Canada.

We are faced now, and the government perhaps next week, with making a decision regarding the pipeline. Canada could make a route decision with much more certainty if the government had been doing its job in the north over the last decade. The settlement of land claims has been delayed this long because, as late as 1973, the Prime Minister of Canada refused to admit that our native people have legitimate claims.

An hon. Member: That's right.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Clark: The Hill report is a testimony to how very little advance research into environmental conditions has been done by this government in the north. Indeed, our present knowledge of northern ecology owes more to the pipeline and petroleum companies than it does to this government. The only consistent northern development policy of this government has been to run the north badly from Ottawa. Stark testimony to the total absence of any co-ordinated northern policy can be seen in the uncompleted Dempster Highway, the federal furniture rotting in the rain at Norman Wells, the refusal to bring any certainty to guide resource exploration and development, and the absolute irresponsibility of federal officials in the Northwest Territories in encouraging small communities and small business to expand in anticipation of a Mackenzie Valley line that will not be built.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Clark: It is in that context of incomplete data, and the absence of energy, northern or native policy—all due to a dereliction of duty by the government of Canada—that we now must choose a route. We have the benefit of extensive reports by public commissions and private groups and companies. On the basis of available information, this party would be prepared to support a route along the Alcan corridor—provided certain firm conditions are met. Before coming to those conditions, I want to remind the House that Canada has two basic interests in pipeline policy. Our primary interest, our primary goal, is to deliver Canadian resources to Canadian markets. Our secondary goal is to help our neighbour and ally, the United States, deliver their resources to their markets.

● (1640)

At the moment, the Alcan proposal serves only that secondary goal. It moves American reserves but it does not move Canadian reserves. The National Energy Board has recommended a route which would bring Alcan within 480 miles of the Delta, and it is imperative that the government of Canada and the Alcan proponents begin immediately environmental and other studies to tell us whether a Dempster connection is feasible. At the same time, the government and the proponents should review and report upon any other feasible route connecting Canadian reserves to Canadian markets. In concert with those route studies, the Canadian government, which has done everything it could to discourage exploration in northern Canada, should immediately introduce clear, firm regulations and effective incentives to stimulate the search for new Canadian reserves.

Let me come to the secondary—although, of course, important—Canadian goal, of helping the United States. The government of the United States may decide to ask for a route across Canadian territory to serve American needs. Naturally, we should respond positively; but naturally, too, we should put a price upon access to our territory, as they, in reverse circumstances, would put a price. It should be a reasonable price, taking account of the disruption the route will cause Canada and taking account of the fair return we should require for granting a right of way. Our negotiators should, of course, impose conditions. They should also explore the possibility of other arrangements softer than conditions which might be of advantage to Canada, whether those involve access from the Yukon across the Panhandle or concessions on trade or on other fronts.

Work should proceed as quickly as possible. The government must make a serious effort to settle outstanding land claims within 12 months. The minister says it is possible. We intend to hold him to the undertaking that it is possible. We think most serious consideration should be given to the Lysyk proposal for a substantial $50 million advance payment to allow native communities in the Yukon to prepare for the impact of the pipeline. We support the recommendation for a Yukon heritage fund of at least $200 million, paid by Foothills to the Yukon on the condition that it be managed by the elected members of the Yukon legislative assembly. However, we do not think that agreement should be contingent on a prior settlement of land claims.

There is one important associated matter related to timing. As hon. members know, we now have a so-called "bubble" in our gas supply position in Canada. We have a temporary surplus, most of it in the hands of small, independent producers in Alberta. In our view, the federal government should begin immediate consultation with the government of Alberta with an eye to the possibility of issuing temporary export permits for the sale of a significant part of this surplus gas to the United States. If the federal and Alberta governments feel that these volumes could well be needed in the longer term to meet domestic demand, any offer of short-term export to the United States could be conditional on a swap arrangement which would assure us at least an option on equivalent volumes of U.S. gas once the pipeline is operating. That kind of arrangement could earn Canada valuable export dollars now—as much as $500 million a year—as well as provide revenues for independent producers who might well find it difficult to hold gas in these volumes in reserve for any period of time. Naturally, such an agreement could also help the United States bridge its needs through the period necessary to prepare for northern pipeline construction.

Concerning the Alcan route specifically, certain firm conditions must attach. First, planning should go ahead on the basis of provision for the eventual addition of Canadian northern gas to the system. That is, it should permit a spur to the Mackenzie Delta and Beaufort Sea fields. The basic pipeline itself must be planned with sufficient capacity to handle the addition of Canadian supplies. Only if this is the case will the pipeline make sense from a purely Canadian perspective. Only if this is the case will the pipeline contribute to the achievement of energy self-sufficiency by 1990.

Second, the Government of Canada should insist that no Canadian government guarantees be attached to the basic pipeline project. As the basic project now stands, and until a decision on a northern spur is taken, it will serve only American needs. American guarantees should, therefore, be sufficient. Canada should not be expected to underwrite what will be at first, and perhaps forever, a purely American project. Third, Canadians—and especially northern Canadians and others along the route—should extract the maximum possible benefit from the construction itself, so the construction should be planned for the maximum possible Canadian content in materials.

This pipeline should not be regarded just as a public works project. We must recognize the Canadian business needs business because of the conduct of this government. Because of the economic failure of this government, Canadian manufacturing is now operating at only 80 per cent of capacity, creating massive unemployment. There is a job-creation capacity in this pipeline. In the community of Edson, which happens to be in my own constituency and which is along the route, this project could provide 20 to 40 permanent new jobs, and the effect would be the same at other points along the route.

Fourth, the same principle of maximum benefit should apply to equity participation and to pipeline hiring practices. The pipeline crosses Canadian territory, but it also crosses northern Canadian territory. Northern Canadians must extract from it the maximum benefit. For that reason, northerners should have preference in all hiring connected with northern pipeline construction. For the same reason, northern communities should have, where it is feasible, access to gas energy supplies for their own needs from the pipeline.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Hnatyshyn: Do you want my pen to take notes, Allan?

Mr. MacEachen: If your leader would say something, it would help.

Mr. Clark: I am prepared to put up with a great deal from the President of the Privy Council, but after his speech I am not prepared to accept a suggestion from him that I should say something.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Clark: As a final condition of approval, we insist upon the creation of a single authority or independent regulatory agency. It should be new, and it should last only for the life of the project and not become another perpetual agency in the long list of perpetual and often unnecessary agencies maintained by this government. It should have—and this is of fundamental importance—clear authority over all the other agencies and departments whose conflicts now complicate life in the north. This agency must have a mandate to oversee and regulate technical and social problems connected with the pipeline. It should have attached to it a planning body designated by the elected governments of the Yukon and of the provinces through which the pipeline passes to deal specifically with the social and economic impact of the pipeline on the north.

Mr. Gillespie: Senior to the NEB?

Mr. Clark: The legislation to establish this authority should be presented to parliament at the earliest possible opportunity, no later than next fall. The Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Gillespie) asks if it should be senior to the National Energy Board. He knows that the National Energy Board is responsible for making decisions on pipeline approvals and matters of that kind. This agency, as recommended by, I believe, all the commissioners of inquiry, should deal with

getting the project done. We think that is needed. As the minister would know from his flights at a high level over the territory, one of the very serious problems relating to the development of the north now is that there is a plethora of federal government agencies, all going in different directions, all competing with each other and all getting in the way of people who want to build the north, whoever they are and whatever their goals. We have to end that kind of duplication and have one agency which can legitimately claim to be representative of the elected opinion of the people of the territory and of the provinces through which the pipeline will run. The legislation to establish this authority should be presented to parliament at the earliest possible opportunity, certainly no later than next fall.

In addition, there is another role for parliament. It is one thing to express opinions, as parliament is doing today, but the House of Commons also has an obligation to oversee the development of a project which can have a profound effect upon our future. The decision on a route will be made in cabinet, in secret. The conditions will be discussed in negotiations, in secret. Before and after passage of any legislation parliament will be a spectator, powerless to influence a major Canadian development. That is the style of operation of this government, and it is one of the reasons our country is so badly prepared for the decision we must take on a pipeline. This question is far too important to leave out parliament.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

● (1650)

Mr. Clark: Therefore, sir, we believe and trust that any member opposite who has any respect for parliamentary traditions will support our proposal, that the Standing Committee on National Resources and Public Works should have a continuing right to monitor the pipeline question. It should be consulted regularly on the progress and nature of negotiations with the United States, on the progress of construction, on the degree to which conditions are being honoured, and on other questions. Sir, as is clear, this is more than a debate about a pipeline. It is, instead, a debate about the future shape of our country. Canada today is the sick man of the international economy. By almost every measure imaginable, this country is failing to live up to its promise and potential. By almost any measure imaginable this country is in the worst economic shape of any of the major powers.

What is at stake today in Canada is whether this country enters the twenty-first century as a hopeless economic invalid, or whether it starts now to recover its lost momentum. This decision can contribute to Canada's economic renewal, provided it is taken within the kind of comprehensive strategy of energy self-sufficiency I have outlined. Or it can be just one more bleak milestone along the route we have travelled the last ten years, the route of national decline and international dependency. The alternatives are clear. The choice can begin with a choice of a pipeline route. We have indicated today the position which we, in this party would take, not simply in relation to the pipeline but also in relation to the context of national development and development of a national energy policy within which a pipeline decision must be made.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I see the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Gillespie) rising. Is he rising for the purpose of asking a question?

Mr. Gillespie: Yes, Mr. Speaker. Would the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Clark) permit a question?

Mr. Clark: Mr. Speaker, I should be delighted to answer the minister's question.

Mr. Gillespie: Mr. Speaker, as I understood the Leader of Opposition's position, his party would support the Alcan route, subject to certain conditions. Has he ruled out categorically the possibility of the CAGPL route?

Mr. Clark: I beg your pardon, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Gillespie: Has the Leader of the Opposition categorically rejected the option of the CAGPL route?

Mr. Clark: Mr. Speaker, I think I indicated in the House clearly to everybody, including the minister, that on the basis of available information we think preference should be given to the Alcan route. We say that on the basis of information available to the House of Commons. We do not rule out anything categorically the details of which we do not know and which the minister may know.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[*English*]

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 40, to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles)—Veterans Affairs—Number of widows not receiving pensions and low level of disability pension—Government action; the hon. member for Central Nova (Mr. MacKay)—Royal Canadian Mounted Police—Ministerial responsibility for operation of security services—Knowledge of minister of allegedly illegal activities; the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre (Mr. McKenzie)—The Canadian Economy—Measures to stop exodus of capital to United States—Reason real estate developers will not invest in Canada.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

ENERGY

CONSIDERATION OF PROPOSALS FOR NORTHERN GAS PIPELINE

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. MacEachen:

That this House recognizes the social, economic, environmental and energy issues surrounding the question of northern gas pipelines and, believing that the resolution of these issues must reflect the national interest, approves the position of the government that all relevant reports must be considered before deciding on a pipeline and its route.

Mr. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby): Mr. Speaker, in a minute I shall set out our reasons for making an unequivocal commitment in principle to the Alcan route if a pipeline is to be built in northern Canada. Before doing so I shall express a personal lament for the sad state to which the President of the Privy Council (Mr. MacEachen) has fallen. We all know the President of the Privy Council to be an intelligent man. He is an eloquent man, and from time to time has shown himself to be a man of passion. I think particularly of some notable debates on the rules and the use of Gaelic. I am seriously concerned about the sad state to which the government has let the President of the Privy Council fall. Not only is he reduced to uttering texts prepared by mere bureaucrats; he is reduced to uttering texts prepared apparently by a committee of bureaucrats, by an interdepartmental committee the zenith of whose intellectual accomplishment was enshrined in that complicated sentence I attempted to copy down which is to this effect: there are no perfect answers in an imperfect world.

Mr. MacEachen: You missed it.

Mr. Broadbent: I misquoted. Obviously, the sentence was more complex than I suggested. Having studied for months, indeed years, Canada's energy position, and having given particular attention to pipelines in the north, the government's performance was remarkable. What did the minister do? The high point of the minister's speech came when he asked the opposition parties for their suggestions.

Mr. Allmand: Isn't that why you wanted this debate? Be honest.

Mr. Broadbent: Speaking as an old professor, I must take the minister to task for his knowledge of history. I was fascinated when, at the beginning of his remarks the President of the Privy Council told us he was going to tell us something of the history of the pipeline decision. My ears perked up. I thought, "My God, we are going to hear a Liberal minister tell the truth". Alas, Mr. Speaker, I should have known better. We heard a careful selection of the facts presented by the President of the Privy Council.

Before I deal with the circumstances of this particular energy decision, or of the decision we are to make in Canada which will have an important bearing on our future, I want to speak on the history of this decision. The facts I shall put on record are somewhat different from those the minister mentioned. I do not do so because of some interest in intellectual or political history. I do so because the facts will document that the Liberal Party of Canada, right up to this afternoon, has no coherent policy, that the Liberal Party of Canada, step by step as far back as 1968, made a commitment, without thinking clearly of the broader ramifications, to the Arctic Gas proposal. Now, because of a series of historic events over which the government had no control, it has stumbled willy-nilly on the right decision not announced this afternoon, namely, the decision to adopt the Alcan route if a pipeline is to built.

Mr. Allmand: What a joke!

• (1700)

Mr. Broadbent: I say this is important because we on this side of the House, and I am sure I speak for all the opposition parties, are tired of energy decisions made on an ad hoc basis one after another in the total absence of a national energy policy.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Broadbent: As early as 1968 the federal government made very clear that it supported in principle a Mackenzie Valley pipeline. In that year the federal government established an interdepartmental committee which had one purpose only, which was to investigate the possibility of bringing Prudhoe Bay oil through the Mackenzie Valley. It sent the then chairman of the National Energy Board, that so-called independent body to which the government refers from time to time, to the United States to see whether the Americans might be interested in such a proposition. The only consultation in which the government engaged outside its own bureaucratic ranks in 1968 was with the oil industry. No native people were consulted. No northerners were consulted, whether native or non-native. It is certain that no one interested in environmental aspects was consulted.

Two years later, in 1970, the government published its northern pipeline guidelines to which the minister referred in his opening remarks. What he did not say was that those guidelines gave the green light to industry to prepare a Mackenzie Valley pipeline proposal. The Leader of the Opposition has already referred, correctly, to the kind of encouragement which was offered the small businessmen in the north in anticipation of the building of a pipeline right up the Mackenzie Valley. There is no doubt that this paper, which the minister mentioned but from which he did not choose to quote, represented approval in principle for the construction of a Mackenzie Valley pipeline.

At that time, close co-operation between government and industry was under way in an attempt to head-off all criticism which might crop up in connection with such a proposal, and various government departments, including the Department of Indian Affairs and the Crown corporation, Northern Transportation Limited, maintained that internal assessments of environmental and social damage could be trusted; that the minister could rely on internal studies and internal information

exclusively when making decisions on this matter. Native land claims were not even mentioned in the document to which the minister referred. The minister did not mention it, but the title of that document was "Canada's North, 1970-1980". I repeat, there was no question of establishing any independent inquiry outside the federal bureaucracy.

Most important for the future of a national energy policy in Canada, this approach, so solemnly established by the Liberal government, was directly in line with the continental energy policy which the administration was then following. The Mackenzie Valley pipeline would supply additional frontier oil and gas from Canada which would be sold to the United States for needed export dollars. Government departments were instructed to increase preparations for the building of a pipeline. Only the NDP at that time opposed such a course of action, this selling out of our energy resources in northern Canada, this total failure to consult the native people, this total lack of concern for environmental considerations.

Then we come to 1972 and the general election of that year. In 1972, out of the blue it was announced that the government intended to build a Mackenzie Highway, the purpose of which was asserted to be the opening up of the Mackenzie Valley and the provision of support for the construction of a pipeline. It soon became evident that once again environmental research had been conducted into this proposal either internally or through external sources and that no native communities affected by such a proposal had been consulted; they had been excluded from any consideration by the government in relation to such a proposal. Moreover, the government steadfastly refused to accept that the building of a pipeline would prejudice native land claims. Rather, the administration maintained its continentalist policy of selling off Canadian energy resources to the United States. This was in the context of the 1972 election campaign. The government was already locking itself into an Arctic Gas type of proposal.

However, the election results were not exactly what the government desired. A minority government was formed and the opposition of the NDP to the whole drift of the Liberals totally thoughtless, totally aimless energy policy brought the cabinet temporarily to its senses. Seeing it could not proceed with its Mackenzie Valley project involving the selling out of Canadian energy, the ignoring of native rights and disregard for the environment while still surviving as a government, it appointed the royal commission headed by Mr. Justice Berger. It is no coincidence, I emphasize, that there was a minority government at that time, with the NDP as the crucial variable.

The subsequent history is well known. Because of Mr. Justice Berger's accomplishments, the right of public participation in the work of royal commissions has been solidly established, native peoples in the Mackenzie Valley will have time in which to get their claims settled and an opportunity to shape their economic future. The Arctic Gas proposal was dead—or at least I thought so until a few minutes ago when the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Gillespie) got to his feet. Last but not least, during the course of Mr. Justice Berger's inquiry, the Alcan proposal was born. I should add that without the important precedent set by Mr. Justice Berger it is almost certain that the National Energy Board would not have brought in the recommendation that it did, nor would inquiries have been launched into the impact of an Alcan pipeline on affected communities.

The point I wish to make is this: in addressing ourselves to the Alcan proposal—and I am still assuming that even this government will not make a decision in favour of the Mackenzie route in face of the overwhelming evidence—we must recognize what has been done already for the country by Mr. Justice Berger's inquiry and keep its important implications in mind. We must remember that the issue in building a pipeline is much broader than that of the materials and labour involved, important as such considerations are. What is at stake is the entire question of the way in which we choose to treat our northland and those who live in it. We have learned that the future of the north depends to a large extent on what happens during the next decade. That became very clear to anyone reading Justice Berger's report. We need time to allow the indigenous native peoples to prepare themselves for entry into the wage economy; there can be no doubt about that.

● (1710)

Mr. MacEachen: In saying that, you distress me.

Mr. Broadbent: Perhaps the minister will re-enter the debate and actually say something next time. I would welcome that. The point I want to make is that in saying this we are not turning back the clock or recommending that that be done. We are saying that as a nation we must take a longer historical perspective and that to wreak irretrievable social, economic and environmental damage in any part of our north simply for short-run purposes would be a decision for which future Canadians would condemn us.

All of this, I stress, must be kept in mind in assessing the Alcan proposal. All of this, I stress, came out of the Berger proposal. During that inquiry it became clear for the first time, as I have said, that a route via the Alaska Highway could have considerably reduced social and environmental consequences compared with a pipeline up the Mackenzie Valley to the Delta. Accordingly, Justice Berger heard much environmental evidence on precisely this route. Following these hearings with care, the New Democratic Party soon supported in principle the idea of this route as being essential for future study. My colleague, the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Leggatt), submitted a brief on behalf of our party to the Berger inquiry over a year ago making precisely this point.

Subsequently, Mr. Speaker, the Alcan proposal itself was officially made by the financial groups who were interested in it. This was followed by the Lysyk inquiry and Dr. Hill's study. They have now verified that such a pipeline can be built with an acceptable degree of negative social impact. However, the important question we now face is whether the pipeline will be built within that acceptable degree of negative impact. For this reason, we must not be pushed or rushed into any hasty construction; and for this reason, also, the crucial recommen-

dations of the Hill and Lysyk inquiries must be accepted and implemented as soon as possible by this government.

I want to make some very specific suggestions with reference to this acceptance in principle. First, we recommend that a delay of at least four years be accepted—and I underline "at least four years". In practice, this means a delay of only about a year beyond the time schedule proposed by the Alcan people themselves, a delay which will likely be taken up with unexpected preconstruction activities anyway, according to the most recent and systematic reports which have been submitted to President Carter in the United States. It is important that we take this time to ensure fair treatment for the Yukon Indians and that we should keep in mind that the delay might in fact slightly exceed the four-year limitation. That is why we want to underline, in face of what the government might decide to do, the need for a minimum four-year period.

In terms of the very legitimate interests and concerns of our American neighbours, it is clear from other reports submitted to President Carter that the United States has at least until the late 1980s before Alaskan gas is needed in that country. This gives our American friends additional time to wait for us to do the right thing in Canada in terms of our energy needs, our environmental requirements and the rights of our native people.

The second matter that I want to stress is the need for over-all control of the project. It is clear that additional research must be conducted into the detailed social and environmental consequences of the project, so that appropriate mitigative and preventive measures can be taken. Without this control, the report tells us that the degree of adverse impact on the people of the Yukon would probably be unacceptable. It is, therefore, incumbent upon the government, in the event that it approves, as we hope it will, an Alcan pipeline, to ensure proper control of this project is exercised, beginning immediately, through such a controlling body.

The third question concerns compensation. The National Energy Board recommended the payment of up to $200 million by the company to compensate for social damage suffered by Yukoners. Dean Lysyk has amended this proposal slightly into a definite $200 million for the creation of a Yukon heritage fund. This seems a sensible proposal to us, as it is clear that some form of general compensation is entirely due. Evidence before the Lysyk inquiry concerning the building of the Alaskan oil pipeline, which would have similar impact to the building of the Alcan gas pipeline, showed that during construction of the oil pipeline nearly half the population of wage earners suffered a loss in real income. That, Mr. Speaker, to the people who live in that part of Canada is a supremely important fact.

In learning from this experience, Mr. Speaker, we must also see to it that steps are taken to ensure that the residents of the Yukon—and I stress, also, the residents of northern British Columbia, an area through which a great part of the pipeline will pass—are not subjected to astronomical increases in inflation. I think in particular of food, housing and utility costs, and I will say something specific about that in an amendment.

The fourth area of concern that I want to stress is that an advance payment of $50 million be given to the Yukon Indians at once so that they may start immediately to establish the new institutions they plan following their land claims settlement. We think this is a good proposal and that it is in the interests of all parties in the north and in the south that it be acted upon immediately.

A few words about the employment consequences of the Alcan route. There will be some important advantages to Canada in building this pipeline, in terms of job-creation. With proper control, the Canadian economy will receive some stimulus in supplying steel. I think immediately of families in Welland, Sault Ste. Marie and Regina which are dependent upon the steel industry, particularly the steel pipeline industry. They will get tangible benefits from this decision. Northerners, of course, will have increased employment opportunities. That, too, goes without saying. What I am saying, on behalf of my colleagues, is that through federal government action we must ensure that the probability of increased jobs in the steel towns of the south and increased employment for northerners on the spot become not just a probability but a certainty.

Another advantage of the Alcan proposal is that although it is clearly premature to say that a link with the Mackenzie Delta via the Dempster Highway would be acceptable on the basis of the known evidence, the Alcan proposal does at least offer the potential for such a link in the future when we might require it. Most of all, Mr. Speaker, the Alcan proposal gives the people of Canada time—time to develop a more comprehensive energy policy, and time to consider a balanced and long-term approach to northern development. It has been the absence of a coherent national energy policy that has led to the demands of many for frontier gas at once, in the fear that we were imminently running out of supplies. That has been particularly felt throughout southern Canada. It has been the absence of a coherent strategy for future northern development that has led many people in the north, not just in Inuvik but other communities, to seek pipeline construction as their only salvation. Both of these hastily drawn conclusions are wrong.

● (1720)

The point is, as the Hill and the Lysyk reports make clear, their principal recommendations do not lock us in if we accept them in terms of other possibilities. They give us time to plan, not only for the north but time to plan for a comprehensive policy which is totally lacking at the national level at this time.

I listened with agreement in almost every detail to the Leader of the Official Opposition (Mr. Clark) in terms of his proposals about the need for a national energy policy and his criticism of the total absence of one coming from the present cabinet. We need a policy which will seriously deal with energy conservation. The approach of the federal government to this is laughable. The minister knows that a report on the leading industrial countries which was published in the last year shows that Canada and the United States have the worst record in terms of energy conservation policies.

It is a shame that such a policy exists and should be passed off as being credible in the real world. A national policy of some depth would give emphasis to developing alternative energy resources. The hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands (Mr. Douglas) has spoken a number of times on what should constitute such an approach. Such a policy should ensure a fair distribution of the consumer burden on higher energy costs, which is totally absent at this point in the national policy. A comprehensive policy should ensure that increased corporate returns, which are now going out in the hundreds of millions of dollars, be directed to the development of additional domestic oil and gas resources for Canadians as a condition for their being maintained. It is a scandal that hundreds of millions of Canadian dollars should be going out to multinational oil companies with no requirement that those funds be reinvested for development in Canada.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Broadbent: With specific reference to the Alcan proposal, which I have indicated we support in principle, I should like to move, seconded by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles):

That the motion be amended by changing the period at the end thereof to a comma, and by adding immediately thereafter the following words:

"and after considering the evidence and reports of the relevant inquiries, this House approves the granting of a certificate for a pipeline through the southern Yukon as recommended in principle by the National Energy Board and the Lysyk and Hill inquiries, with particular reference to the following conditions:

(1) That an Alcan pipeline authority be established immediately comprised of representatives of the native communities, labour, small business, consumers and conservationists from the affected pipeline corridor and from the federal, provincial and territorial governments, and that this authority be empowered to manage the regional impact of pipeline construction especially with respect to employment practices, and food, housing and utility prices as well as assuming the other responsibilities recommended by the above inquiries;

(2) That a "Canada first" priority be enforced in hiring, contracting and supplying the pipeline with particular preference to local residents of the Yukon, British Columbia and Alberta in the vicinity of the pipeline route;

(3) That no pipeline construction precede a fair settlement of the affected native land claims; and

(4) That no pipeline construction commence before August 1981, and that the interval be used to inquire further into the local impact of pipeline construction, to determine final route selection, and to control project planning;

and furthermore that exports of Canadian natural gas licensed for delivery to the United States after 1985 be considered as credits to be redeemed from the United States on an equivalent BTU basis."

The amendment concerning gas exports after 1985 would save Canadians roughly 4.1 trillion cubic feet of gas, but would cut off that amount from the United States markets which need it. It would merely require that it be repaid at some future date, at a time when the Americans have an adequate supply to do so, an adequate supply established by the pipeline itself. If we are concerned about Canadian interests in the pipeline, surely this should be a paramount consideration. It is consistent with our already established policy of phasing out oil exports. It gives the United States considerable notice and, most importantly, it will add considerably to Canadian energy supplies after 1985 and hence to the flexibility we need for meeting our future energy needs. This action should be undertaken by this government whether or not we approve a northern pipeline.

In accepting this course of action which we have proposed this afternoon, we believe Canadians will have an opportunity to rethink our policies on northern development and establish an over-all national energy policy. It will be a chance to step back. It will be an opportunity for some breathing time. We in the New Democratic Party are proud to have been an integral part of this process. The onus is now clearly with the government to seize this opportunity to do future good for the country and, in particular, for the future well-being of the north and its people.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Order, please. There has been an amendment moved by the hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby (Mr. Broadbent). The hon. President of the Privy Council (Mr. MacEachen).

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether you propose to put the amendment or whether you propose to declare it out of order immediately, as I believe it should be. If you have any intention of putting the motion, I should like to argue against its regularity so that we would have an opportunity to prevent—

An hon. Member: It has some substance.

Mr. MacEachen: —this amendment from defacing the order paper.

● (1730)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Order, please. That is about what the Chair was going to say. Since this is a long and complicated amendment, perhaps the hon. member would permit me to take it under consideration as to its procedural acceptability and without prejudice to the debate. We can hear arguments later on this amendment.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gérard Laprise (Abitibi): Mr. Speaker, I wanted to take part in the debate because I believe this is a basic issue which must be analysed so that a realistic decision can be taken in the interest of the nation that we represent in this House. We know that Mr. Justice Berger has suggested that the Canadian government place a ten year moratorium on the construction of any pipeline in the Mackenzie area. However, since the recommendation made in the Berger report, major changes have been brought to the Foothills pipeline project. Whether these changes were postponed voluntarily or not, it remains that the National Energy Board believes that this moratorium is not necessary for the Alcan route since it has agreed to it.

This ten year moratorium would enable the natives of the Northwest Territories to establish more freely their claims and to negotiate without any pressure, as was the case for the Inuit

of James Bay. This would also enable Canada to improve its natural gas transportation technology and eventually find other more ecologically safe answers, both for transportation and for our real needs and energy requirements. The National Energy Board has also made an investigation in this regard and its conclusion was approximately the same as that of the Berger study. The National Energy Board also believes a pipeline through the Mackenzie Valley would be disastrous from all aspects. I am in total agreement with this point. The National Energy Board was, however, given its agreement to the Alcan proposal. The Alaska Highway Pipelines distribution system will receive natural gas from Prudhoe Bay in Alaska and will deliver it to the United States.

This proposal was made to meet the most urgent needs while allowing for a better transportation policy for northern Canada supplies to be developed. Therefore, the Alcan route is the most adequate in the present situation and I can only support it, even though I have a few reservations. While all industrialized countries are beginning to show concern about the accumulated deterioration of their natural environment, we ourselves continue to exhaust our resources for short term economic reasons and we continue to shatter the harmony between man and his environment.

Mr. Justice Berger showed clearly in his report to what extent the natural balance in the northwest is precarious. I understand that footprints and tire imprints can take up to ten years before disappearing. What will the prints made by 7,000 men, 50,000 vehicles, and so on leave us? Already, in certain areas of the Arctic, the Inuit are catching oil-covered seals, not to mention the animals that will no longer be proper for human consumption, the threatened species, and the risks of irreversible pollution which are more than possible; they are obvious. I think that Mr. Justice Berger's proposal to set up a sanctuary for some species is a necessity if we want to preserve them as well as their habitats. In addition to all the anticipated ecological deteriorations, another matter of concern arose in the minds of the people of the Yukon. Recently, a pump station of the Trans-Alaska oil pipeline exploded. It is only one accident among so many others that the government must anticipate. So steps will have to be taken to prevent this kind of accident from occurring, and in view of the possibility that always exists we will have to come up with top safety systems. One only has to remember how many times this kind of accident happened either at sea or on land. On land leaks and explosions are more harmful, and recuperation is difficult on land. In a few years we will probably start thinking about dressing the wounds that we will have opened in those yet virgin habitats.

It is certainly necessary to develop a minimum of our natural resources but does our export of natural gas to the United States justify that rush for gas dollars? All those who studied the Berger report agree on one point: the construction of pipelines in the north could have alarming effects on the environment and the animal species, man included. In the balance of Canada's future improvement, is the environmental loss worth the economic gain? Because this is indeed an economic need. The government's commitments to export natural gas represents about 40 per cent of our total annual production. Our consumption of natural gas represents about 80 per cent of our total energy consumption, and it was proven to every conscious mind that our need for natural gas can easily be reduced, and it is quite inevitable that in a relatively near future we will have to make room for renewable energy.

Natural gas is used mainly for heating and several qualified scientists say that in this area of consumption several types of renewable energy can be used. If one looks at the statistics of government grants for energy research and development one readily realizes that for this government renewable energy is not an urgent imperative. In 1976-77, less than 4 per cent of the amount allotted for energy research and development went to renewable resources. The government suffers from tunnel vision when looking at the future and that is why no figure is put on the commercial nature of natural gas.

The current energy crisis will come to an end only when governments realize that renewable energy is the solution we shall finally have to accept. If the reason for this technological dealy is economic in nature, this is only one more evidence of the incompetence of our political magnates. The most important factor in any project which is in the common good, as the building of this pipeline is supposed to be, is the human factor itself. Well, the human aspect in the regions which will be affected by the building of a pipeline will be subjected to heavy pressure due to the fact that a large portion of the population there is made up of Indians. As a matter of fact, it will not be possible to extract one single cubic centimeter of natural gas within Indian territories without damaging an environment which is, in most cases, their only source of income. Moreover, it is also their only reason to live.

Once more this would mean taking control over significant parts of their lands. And whatever the aspect of future negotiations, the result will probably be as usual that the government will assume resource development rights, and the native people will lose access to certain lands in consideration of the settlement of their claims to land they were already owning in any case, monetary compensation. As long as the native people will live on resource-rich lands, they will be up against the big capitalistic machine, and even if there are democratic negotiations, they will end up socialized, with compensatory goods that are foreign to their natural culture.

One point made by corporations competing for the relevant pipeline was that of benefits to native people. There is reference to 4,000 direct and indirect jobs. There is reference to reduced unemployment and minimized welfare reliance. There is also reference to the jobs native people ask for. In fact some do, but others do not. I suggest no one here can state in conscience whether they want those jobs or not, or even whether those jobs will be created. Mr. Justice Berger had this to say in his report:

> There is abundant reason to doubt that a pipeline would provide meaningful and ongoing employment to many native people. The pipeline contractors and unions have made it plain that native northerners are not qualified to hold down skilled positions in pipeline construction, and that they will be employed largely in unskilled and semi-skilled jobs. Once the pipeline is built, only about 250

people will be needed to operate it. Most of these jobs are of a technical nature and will have to be filled by qualified personnel from the south.

As I said, suggested benefits to native people are short-term benefits. This in no way resolves that particular problem, nor the language and race problems that are bound to crop up. Seven different dialects are currently spoken in these lands. And I would call on those who know what happened in the early 70's on the Quebec north shore and Labrador to remember the discrimination against native employment. Natives were tied to menial tasks, without any access to better working conditions to which every Canadian is entitled.

Experience has shown me that most native people looking for paid work wanted to earn enough money to buy the tools which they need to continue to lead their own way of living. The Inuit more particularly are proud people who want to assert their independence and self-determination. They have clearly shown it on several occasions, especially at James Bay. I do not think that menial work is conducive to the independence of an ethnic group. In addition, if the native people want better paid and more qualified jobs, they will have to learn to speak our language and get some education. This could eventually mean their assimilation by new needs rather than the improvement of their human and social condition. In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I want to insist on the fact that the construction of a pipeline in northern Canada could jeopardize a unique habitat in Canada and our native people. For those reasons, I wish to state my systematic objection to the Arctic Gas pipeline route.

One must chose the lesser of two evils, and as the Foothills Pipe Lines project will allow us to arrive at a better Canadian gas transportation policy for the future, I support it, conditional upon the following, however: That the government see to it that the Americans do not reap all the benefits of the undertaking by letting us shoulder all ecological damages; that the government negotiate with our natives with every consideration they are entitled to as original owners of the territories concerned; that it allow them to assert themselves without imposing upon them a way of life to which they were not born and, as our needs for natural gas are very relative, without imposing any temporal constraints upon them as has been the case with the James Bay Inuit with regard to negotiations; that the government see to it, without any further delay, that all forms of energy capable of replacing more wisely and progressively the consumption of natural gas be considered with a view to meeting social and conservation requirements before political and economic needs; that the government give more importance than it does now to the long term factor so that the energy and ecology situation does not find itself again in a bind in the future; and finally, that the government put off the construction of pipelines in virgin areas of the northwest until such time as all means have been developed to protect the environment, and negotiations with our native people have led to equitable conclusions.

[Mr. Laprise.]

● (1740)

[*English*]

Mr. Jim Fleming (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Fisheries and the Environment): Mr. Speaker, for some years now this government, members of this House, and people across Canada have been concerned with the question of pipelines through Canada's north to bring gas to southern markets. Prompted by the tremendous pressure for additional gas in the United States now and the possibility of future increased Canadian demand, the investigation of and discussion on northern pipelines have been extensive and sometimes exhaustive. But now is the time for a decision.

Members of this House have before them the results of the Berger inquiry into the Mackenzie Valley pipeline proposal, the National Energy Board report on the whole northern pipeline issue, the report of the environmental assessment panel on the Alaska highway proposal, Dr. Hill's report, and finally, the Lysyk report on the potential socio-economic impact of the Alaska highway pipeline. In the course of all these inquiries and studies the people of Canada were consulted extensively, and this is particularly true of those living in areas most likely to be affected by any pipeline.

I can honestly say that few issues in Canadian history have received as much attention and debate. This is a reflection of the importance which Canadians place on this issue, and it is also a reflection of the lengths to which the government has gone in order to ensure that, when the time comes for decisions, those decisions can be made rationally and based upon the best available information.

The inquiries that have taken place during the past three years have added a great deal to our previous knowledge of the north, its people, and the impact of possible pipelines along several proposed routes. Let us consider the facts. I believe everyone in this Chamber recognizes that northern Canada is a unique part of this country and that part of that uniqueness stems from its fragile and in many ways very special environment. For many years federal departments, including the Department of Fisheries and the Environment, have conducted major comprehensive programs of investigation and research centred on special northern characteristics, the effects of its vigorous climate, its special soil conditions, its unique wildlife, and how these relate to the culture, lifestyle and aspirations of those native to the north.

All of these examinations, both regular programs and special inquiries, had one objective in common—better protection of the north and better management of its natural resources. But to protect and to manage properly, we must have a basic understanding of such diverse subjects as geology, vegetation, lakes, rivers and streams, wildlife, fish and sea mammals. Gaining this understanding has not been easy—northern areas are vast and funds are not unlimited. Still, we have accomplished and learned a great deal. Canadian knowledge of our northern frontier is as good or better than that of any other nation with large northern areas.

In our search for basic knowledge we discovered that the north held significant mineral and petroleum resources. By the 1960's significant petroleum resources had been identified in the Arctic coastal waters and Arctic islands. This was an interesting discovery but one that did not assume major importance until the western nations realized that they had a problem of energy supply. It was then, in the late 1960's, that interest in the development of northern petroleum resources began to surface.

In December, 1968, the government set up a task force on northern oil development and from this arose the special environmental social program—a program designed to uncover the possible impact of a northern pipeline.

The specific aim of that program was to gain the knowledge necessary for the protection of the northern environment and the social and cultural life of those native to the north. Even then it was realized that there had to be a balance between development and the protection of the human and physical environment of the north.

The geographic scope of the program was very broad, covering the entire Mackenzie Valley region north of the 60th parallel, the sensitive northern Yukon slope to the Alaska border and southward in Yukon to include the Old Crow flats.

Without belabouring the point, I want to say that the knowledge we have gained from this program—contained in 270 separate research reports—has been invaluable both to the government and to all of the inquiries that have looked into the question of northern pipelines. The program also led to the tabling in this House on June 28, 1972, of the Expanded Guidelines for Northern Pipelines. The guidelines served to spell out the kinds of information required when a pipeline company applies for a land use permit under the Territorial Lands Act, administered by the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development (Mr. Allmand).

● (1750)

Other mechanisms have also been set up to ensure proper development in the north. The environmental assessment and review process, established by cabinet in 1973, requires a detailed and comprehensive assessment of the potential environmental impact of any project involving federal lands or federal money or sponsored by a federal department. The Environmental Assessment Panel, established to examine the possible impact of the proposed Alaska highway pipeline, submitted an interim report to my minister only a day or so ago.

Another important feature of our efforts to minimize social and environmental disruption in the north is the support of this government for the corridor concept. What this means is that we try to minimize or lessen the impact of development by channelling it into one corridor. To fail to do so would simply mean random development with widespread impact in many areas. I do not think we can afford that. It is imperative, I think, that when we consider pipeline routes, we also consider associated developments. These other facilities must, of course, be examined on their own merits as well. As one of the witnesses before the recent hearings of the Environmental Assessment Panel in Whitehorse put it, we, as a country and as a people, cannot afford wholesale environmental destruction by insignificant increments.

In its support of this concept the government has initiated a number of other programs which have been accelerated to meet the challenge of constantly changing contexts. We are looking at the possible impacts of a pipeline on the high Arctic. Efforts have been made to accelerate the gathering of baseline data in southern Yukon, and we have joined with industry in research on the Beaufort Sea. The end product of all these ventures, whether strictly federal or carried out in co-operation with industry, will be increased understanding of what is acceptable development in Canada's north and where in the north that development should take place.

To this point I have spoken about the environmental and social criteria which the Minister of Fisheries and the Environment (Mr. LeBlanc) believes must be applied in making a decision on northern pipelines. There are, of course, many other factors to be considered which I am sure will surface, or have already done so, during this debate.

However, I do want to emphasize that the government has been preparing for this decision for some time. The Department of Fisheries and the Environment, both alone and in co-operation with others, has been studying the potential impact of northern pipelines for several years now, and more knowledge is being gathered every day.

I would like to turn now to the individual proposals for northern pipelines and mention some of the potential environmental effects of each.

The government is required to make two decisions very shortly. First, it must decide whether or not to permit the construction of a gas pipeline in the western Arctic. Second, if a pipeline is allowed, the government must decide through which corridor it should pass.

Essentially there are two proposals before the government. The first is a proposal by Canada Arctic Gas Pipeline Limited to construct a buried gas pipeline through northern Yukon and down the Mackenzie Valley carrying both Alaskan and Canadian gas.

Second, there is a proposal by Foothills Pipe Lines (Yukon) Limited to construct a buried gas line along the Alaska highway in the southern Yukon passing through B.C., Alberta and Saskatchewan, where it would join existing pipeline facilities. The latter pipeline is intended to carry only Alaskan gas, although Canadian gas could be transported by constructing a lateral line following the Dempster Highway, if such a link were found to be environmentally and socially acceptable.

Another proposal, the Foothills Mapleleaf Line down the Mackenzie Valley, has been withdrawn at the request of the company.

Finally, we must remember the El Paso proposal to carry gas across Alaska and then by tanker to southern markets. While this proposal is obviously not the subject of an applica-

tion to the Government of Canada, it may have a bearing on our decision.

All of the Canadian proposals have been the subjects of one or more public inquiries as well as extensive scientific evaluations. The National Energy Board has reported on the three major Canadian proposals. The Berger inquiry has published the first volume of its examination of the Arctic Gas and Foothills Mapleleaf proposals. The Environmental Assessment Panel has completed its report on the Alaska Highway proposal, as has the Lysyk inquiry. I do not intend to pass judgment on the findings of these inquiries today, but these investigations, combined with a great deal of research by the government, have identified the primary environmental concerns associated with each proposal.

Let me deal first with the potential effects of the El Paso proposal. While the direct environmental effect on Canada of a gas pipeline across Alaska would be relatively small, the same cannot be said of the necessary port installation on Prince William Sound. That installation would pose certain threats to fisheries resources which may be of more than local importance.

The tankers carrying chilled gas are not a serious threat in themselves. The possibility exists, however, that increased traffic along the coast increases the possibility of collision with coastal oil tankers travelling to and from Valdez. The results of such a collision could be devastating to coastal and marine life in Canada. Major concerns about the El Paso proposal, therefore, result not from the pipeline itself but from the necessary ancillary facilities and concurrent transportation methods.

The Arctic Gas and Foothills proposals have much more direct environmental impacts on Canada's north. A pipeline along the northern Yukon coast, across the Mackenzie Delta and down the Mackenzie Valley has a very high potential for environmental disruption.

The Delta and northern Yukon are vital breeding areas for many species of animals, birds and sea mammals. There are no alternative breeding grounds which could support these populations to the same degree. Populations of birds that range all across North America, whales that roam much of the Arctic and north Pacific, as well as one of the last surviving large herds of caribou could be permanently reduced.

In addition, heavy construction work necessary for the building of any pipeline could disrupt the biological productivity of the Delta, coastal plain and inshore waters. Such a disruption would have a severely negative effect on the wildlife on the entire continent and on the oceans, even in areas far from the pipeline itself.

Further down the proposed Arctic Gas line, in the Mackenzie Valley itself, environmental problems tend to be more of a geotechnical or engineering nature. Finding stable ground—stable enough to ensure pipeline integrity—is just such a problem. The problem is particularly acute in areas of discontinuous permafrost where either chilling the gas or warming it could cause frost heave or excessive settling of the pipe. There are also problems associated with ancillary structures such as excessive noise from compressor stations, the construction of access roads and others. Mr. Speaker, may I call it six o'clock?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): It being six o'clock, I do now leave the chair until eight o'clock p.m.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 8 p.m.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Before we continue with the debate I should indicate that the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby (Mr. Broadbent), the decision on which had been reserved by the Chair, raises some special concerns from the procedural point of view. The amendment would, it seems to me, change substantially the motion now before the House. I believe strong representations were made that, when this matter was to be brought on for debate, no position would be put forward in the motion and that any decision would be consequential upon the discussions which would take place during these two days. The amendment put forward by the hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby does exactly that: it takes the general nature of the motion before the House and transforms it into a course of action which, to me, is a substantial deviation from the intent of the motion.

Further, the amendment introduces propositions which seem to me entirely independent of the basic motion, and therefore on procedural grounds I think the amendment is in great difficulty. However, I would want to listen in the normal way to arguments in support of the amendment on procedural grounds, and to arguments against it. Then I will examine the matter and make a ruling.

In other circumstances I would insist on this being done at this moment. However, we are now embarked in a limited debate on a matter of wide interest and importance and it would be unfair to hon. members to take time from that limited allotment to argue these procedural points. I am concerned in case I might set a precedent by leaving a procedural question of this importance and significance outstanding during two days; I think it ought not to be taken as a precedent for future reference because of the extraordinary nature of this particular discussion.

If there is any indication that this matter may come to a vote today or tomorrow, the matter will have to be settled before any vote can take place.

Third, I am concerned about what might happen if any other amendment were to be put forward. Any member putting forward another amendment would be prejudiced by the fact that there is this amendment in the hands of the Chair, and this amendment, as I said before, seems to be in great procedural difficulty, subject of course to any arguments which may be presented.

In an effort to do justice to all these important considerations, I am prepared to defer consideration on procedural grounds of this amendment for two days, provided that we do not face the difficulties I just mentioned, that is to say, provided we are not confronted with another amendment; for if we are confronted with another amendment, which we would have to turn to one side because we have one amendment in our hands already, or if we are confronted with the possibility of a vote, obviously, this procedural matter will have to be settled. But as long as neither of those events takes place I would be prepared to defer argument and decision on the procedural aspects of the motion for two days, and beyond the two days, in order to maximize the opportunity for members of the House to participate in this important discussion.

● (2010)

Mr. Jim Fleming (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Fisheries and the Environment): Mr. Speaker, when I left off at six o'clock I was outlining some of the difficulties to be reckoned with in pipeline operations such as discontinuous permafrost, the provision of suitable access roads, and so on. However, on a comparative level, the potential environmental problems likely to be encountered on the Alaska or Klondike highways are generally less severe than those on the Mackenzie Valley line. Both of these possible alternatives use existing corridors. The areas through which these routes pass are less critical to the survival of major migratory species, and the region is less biologically productive at the peak breeding season.

Certainly there are difficulties associated with the Alaska Highway route, especially in the first 150 miles. Here there are specific areas containing unique and endangered species. There is a higher risk of major or minor earthquakes here than along the Klondike diversion proposed by the National Energy Board. There is also the hazard of discontinuous permafrost and ice rich soils in this portion of the proposed line. It appears, however, that most of these obstacles can be minimized through effective engineering or by changing the route so as to avoid specific problem areas.

A number of other challenges present themselves. There could be local damage to forests and other plant life. Revegetation in the Yukon is a very slow process. The aesthetic value of the land might be harmed, particularly in the northern section of the Alaska Highway. The access provided by right of ways and compressor station service roads might open areas to larger numbers of people and this could be a definite threat to wildlife and fisheries resources. And in the case of the possible Dempster lateral, both the highway and the pipeline would cross the migratory path of the Porcupine caribou herd. This latter aspect is of special concern to the Department of Fisheries and the Environment.

On the whole, however, the potential environmental problems on the Alaska Highway or Klondike routes do seem more predictable than those likely to be encountered on the Mackenzie Valley route, and because they are more predictable, environmental protection measures can be more easily and more effectively devised.

The possibility still exists, however, that Canada may need the resources offered by the Mackenzie Delta and Beaufort Sea. The exploitation of those resources will, in itself, bring significant environmental problems. The Department of Fisheries and the Environment has anticipated this and has begun a technology development program to help us deal with potential problems associated with on-shore collection and processing and off-shore exploitation operations. The program is being carried out over a five-year period.

As you can see, Mr. Speaker, a great deal of evidence has been collected in the last few years in anticipation of the construction of northern pipelines.

Mr. Nielsen: Not by the government.

Mr. Fleming: If the hon. member were here this afternoon when I delivered the first part of my speech he would not have said what he has just said. I share the minister's pleasure that the Department of Fisheries and the Environment has been able to help the various inquiries and the public by supplying as much information as possible.

At the same time, I, like other members of the House, am aware that there is a wide diversity of opinion on the need for a northern pipeline, the route it should take, how it can best be controlled and how subsequent or consequent development can be handled. That was the reason the government commissioned the several enquiries, and that is why we are here today.

The building of a pipeline involves not only the environment but important economic issues as well. Let me assure you, on behalf of my minister, that the Department of Fisheries and the Environment does strive for a sense of perspective and reasonable pragmatism in environmental issues. It is a fact that if a pipeline is built, some degree of environmental disruption is inevitable. For this there is a cost that has to be paid—now or in the future. But the cost can be quite high or relatively low depending on a number of factors. I believe those factors must be taken into account in moving toward a decision.

The only basis for sound environmental protection is sound environmental information. Though we know a great deal about many of the problems associated with the construction of northern pipelines, we will have to know a great deal more. If we know enough, if we take environmental factors into account during the decision-making, and if we relate those factors to final design and mitigative measures, we can reduce environmental costs to acceptable limits.

Mr. Erik Nielsen (Yukon): Mr. Speaker, I rise to take part in this debate as probably the only impartial member of the House of Commons with respect to the subject matter we are discussing. No one could be less concerned than I about regional interests when discussing the routes of the proposed pipeline—I speak on the assumption that a decision will be taken to construct the pipeline.

Before dealing with the remarks of the President of the Privy Council (Mr. MacEachen) and of the Leader of the New Democratic Party (Mr. Broadbent) I think it is worth while putting on the record an assurance I was very glad to see in the light of the assertion made by the leader of my party. I refer to a statement made by the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) on July 28 at a press conference with respect to the ultimate method of disposing of the pipeline question, and I read from page 12 of the transcript of the press conference on that date. As part of his answer the Prime Minister said:

> The only thing I think I can safely say is that because of the multiplicity of these reports and because of the variety of concerns which have to do not only with energy and its transportation but with the financial implications, its job creation implications, with the rights of the native peoples in the North, and with the environment—they have to deal obviously with the problem of foreign affairs in relation to the United States—because of this complexity it is inevitable that if we do build a pipeline, it will have to be by legislation. In other words, we will have to come to parliament with a law saying that A, we are building the pipeline and, B, this is the route, and, C, this is what we will do with respect to financing and, D, there are the measures we are taking for the environment and E, this is the kind of contract we are making with the United States. I am just making the point that it would be a very complex series of decisions which I think would be best debated by parliament and therefore would be placed in the form of legislation, if we decide to build a pipeline.

That is the first definitive and positive statement which has appeared with respect to this subject matter finding its ultimate form by way of legislation before this House. So once a decision is made—and it is anticipated one will be made next week, possibly next Monday—we look forward to the honouring of that commitment by the Prime Minister to see that there is a debate here before a pipeline is built.

Having sat here as long as I have, I was disappointed to see the Prime Minister leave the Chamber before the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Clark) had completed his comments and before the Leader of the New Democratic Party and the spokesman for the Social Credit Party had delivered theirs. It was a hollow comment on the assurance given to us by the President of the Privy Council that the views of parliamentarians in this, to my mind, rather useless and meaningless debate, will be taken into account. The hon. gentleman said they would be given careful consideration, but I know the Prime Minister does not waste his time reading the comments of the leader of the NDP or of the spokesman for the Social Credit Party. However, his attitude serves to draw attention to the flaccid place this Chamber has become under the present government. Oh, there is nothing personal intended as far as the leader of the NDP is concerned. His speech was one of the more coherent I have heard him make in all the years I have been here.

Mr. Broadbent: Good to have you back!

Mr. Nielsen: The President of the Privy Council spoke about the measures successive governments have taken to encourage northern development. I can only recall the days when such imaginative leadership was shown by the right hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker) and the then minister of northern affairs, the hon. member for Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain (Mr. Hamilton). They envisioned opening up the north to the development of its resources and embarked upon an imaginative program of building roads, bridges and other means of communication. I recall the words of the next prime minister of that day charging us with spending money like drunken sailors. He charged us with building roads from igloo to igloo in the north. The government of that day made a fair number of yards in southern Canada with that kind of accusation, yet one of the roads, indeed the specific road criticized by the Liberal prime minister of that day as being from igloo to igloo, was the self same Dempster highway that we are discussing in this debate today.

● (2020)

This was a road which was commenced in 1958, 80 miles of which were constructed by 1963 when the government changed. Immediately construction of the road ceased. It was the philosophy of the government of that day that there were oil reserves in the north which would benefit Canadians. That was the philosophy behind the commencement of the construction of that particular road. We were charged with wasting money, so construction of that road was halted in 1963. After the discovery of oil in Prudhoe Bay the government belatedly recommenced construction of the road and now, all of a sudden, it has become one of the most important links in the route to the Arctic which, I am certain, will eventually tap Canadian reserves of gas and oil in the Arctic.

We are speaking not only of gas in the Delta but of oil in the Yukon, oil in the Yukon, oil in the Eagle plain and in the Peel plateau. I do not know whether the President of the Privy Council has any idea where these places are; I doubt very much whether he has ever been to the north. I would invite him to the north, as I would invite the hon. gentleman who is now his colleague who is seated beside him. Let him come to the Yukon and have a look. I know the hon. gentleman has been to Inuvik. Now being a member of the cabinet he is obviously expressing the view of the government when he says that there must be a pipeline. That was the statement he made. Whether he meant that there should be a pipeline along the Mackenzie to attract the political allegiance of the citizens of Inuvik is something else again.

I would invite the President of the Privy Council to come and wander with me through my constituency at something less than 4,000 feet above the Dempster highway, as his colleague to his left did when he made the observation, "I can't see anything wrong with this route for a pipeline".

Mr. Gillespie: You are exaggerating again.

Mr. Nielsen: Perhaps it was 3,500 feet, I do not know. In any event, it was too high to get an on the ground look at what the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Fisheries and the Environment (Mr. Fleming) was talking about, of which he knows nothing when he speaks of permafrost, the flora and fauna and the ecological problems of the Yukon.

Mr. Gillespie: The "Flora" is all on your side of the House.

Mr. Nielsen: As a Yukoner and as a northerner I appreciate the good intentions of you southerners, but you do not know

the north because you do not come to the north. The first prime minister in Canada's history who visited above the 60th parallel was the Right Hon. John G. Diefenbaker, and he did not stop at Whitehorse as Prime Minister Trudeau did, and who has yet to come back. We are all waiting for the second coming, Mr. Speaker.

When the right hon. member for Prince Albert was prime minister he travelled the Yukon. He went to Dawson City, to Mayo, to Haines Junction. So did the Leader of the Opposition and so did his predecessor. They did not stop in the urban community of Whitehorse; they listened and found out about things. I am afraid that this government is sadly lacking in its knowledge of the north because it simply does not go up there.

I was really intrigued by the "knowledgeable expressions"—question mark—of the President of the Privy Council when he joined in the debate. The only reason I can attribute to his leading off the debate rather than the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Gillespie), who is the minister responsible here, is that he wants to wind up the debate. I hope that the juggling of time will allow that, though he might find himself in a pinch, as is often the case in the House. As my colleague comments, he can always do another flyover.

The only comment I can make about the minister's interjection in the speech of the Leader of the Opposition, when he asked whether the Leader of the Opposition had dismissed the CAGPL proposal, is that it was either a very facetious question or a very inane question. The minister shakes his head: it was not facetious so it must have been inane. I cannot understand how the minister can ask whether the CAGPL proposal has been dismissed by the Leader of the Opposition unless the government is still considering it; and I cannot credit that conclusion because it would mean that the government is considering an application made by an applicant which had already withdrawn the application it had made. Again the minister shakes his head. We must all be misinformed; I thought it was common knowledge that Arctic Gas had withdrawn its application.

Mr. Gillespie: You must come down here more often.

Mr. Nielsen: The minister says I must come down here more often, Mr. Speaker, but if he was plagued in his constituency with the administrative tribunals with which I am plagued in my constituency as a result of federal intervention in our affairs in the Yukon, then he would never be here. For the last three months I have at least been where the action is—where Mr. Lysyk has been holding his inquiry—and I have not seen any other members of parliament appearing around that inquiry in the Yukon.

Mr. Gillespie: I never saw you there either.

Mr. Nielsen: The reason the minister did not see me there is that he was busy speaking to the Chamber of Commerce.

Mr. Gillespie: And to Mr. Lysyk.

Mr. Nielsen: However, Mr. Speaker, I reserve my kindest remarks for the leader of the NDP.

Mr. Broadbent: Thank you, Erik.

Mr. Nielsen: The hon. leader's remark may be a little premature. He spoke extremely patronizingly. He said some good things. Although it was one of the most coherent speeches I have heard him make in a long time, it was patronizing. He spoke about how "we" were going to treat the people of the north. He spoke about what "we" had to do in order to ensure the proper treatment of the people of the north. He spoke as though we in this parliament should be looking forward constantly to the future in how we should be treating the north, when for the last 20 years we have been fighting to do that treating and thinking ourselves.

Nowhere in the hon. member's amendment do I see any reference to self-government for the people of the Yukon territory. Nowhere in his amendment do I see any reference to full participation among our elected representatives. Indeed his amendment would create another top heavy bureaucracy which would staff this so-called single agency that is to be set up to regulate and control construction of a pipeline. He should read the brief of the government of the Yukon territory as presented primarily by its elected representatives. He should read it carefully. If he does he will find that Mr. Lysyk and his inquiry adopted substantially all of the recommendations in that brief, one of the foremost of which was that the people of the Yukon should make the paramount decisions in this connection.

Mr. Broadbent: Have you read my amendment?

Mr. Nielsen: I have studied it, but in his sanctimonious way the hon. member did not deal directly with that problem. Neither has he nor his party yet dealt with the problem of self-government in the Yukon.

• (2030)

At this stage I could do no better than to quote something to arouse the memories of some of the hon. members here who might remember their history. I am referring to Lord Durham's Report wherein he said:

> The colonists—

and we in the Yukon are still colonists—

> may not always know what laws are best for them or which of their countrymen are the fittest for conducting their affairs; but at least they have a greater interest in coming to a right judgment on these points and will take greater pains to do so than those whose welfare is very remotely and slightly affected by the good or bad legislation of these portions of the Empire.

That is what is being done here, and that is what the Leader of the New Democratic Party is attempting to do in his own self-effacing fashion when he stated that we know better here what decisions to impose on the people of the Yukon.

One of the conditions which is attached to building any pipeline through the Yukon is that all of these factors, which the President of the Privy Council (Mr. MacEachen) has referred to, the parliamentary secretary who has just resumed

his seat and the Leader of the New Democratic Party have also referred to, are essential, and should be decided by the people of the Yukon Territory through their duly elected legislative assembly.

The Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce (Mr. Chrétien) has always advanced two arguments. The hon. members from the province of Quebec should understand what I am speaking about when we call for maîtres chez-nous. He has said that you cannot have autonomy "until you have the people and the money to pay for it. As long as we in the federal treasury are paying, then we are going to call the tune." The Yukon produced some $221 million last year in mineral revenue. This pipeline construction will dismiss that argument entirely. The money argument goes by the board, if ever it was an argument. Thus you are left with the argument of people.

Since when has the establishment of democratic institutions depended upon a target level of people for its functions? The problems which confront the people of the Yukon in the construction of a pipeline can be best solved by themselves. I hear various well-intentioned criticisms by southerners. There are those who advocate no pipeline at all. There are those who advocate a delay in the pipeline, which is simply asking for the delay of a future crisis in the supply of fuels to southern Canada. These are simply not in line.

There was an article by someone I have never quoted in the House of Commons. This person has some knowledge of the north and used to be with the Department of Northern Affairs. The article was written in 1966 by R. A. J. Phillips, who is now with Heritage Canada. The article was entitled "The Story of the Yukon and Northwest Territories" and reads in part as follows:

> The Yukon will not look like parts of southern Canada where towns and cities are joined by farms, and highways are dotted with villages. Between the northern towns, the Yukon will remain unchanged, its plains, its rivers, its mountains as majestic as when the land was born. And its rocks and gravels will, as in the past, quicken the hearts and hopes of men.

That is going to be true when the pipeline is built, as it is now. Anyone who has travelled the old dredging grounds of the Klondike goldfields will realize how quickly things will revegetate, contrary to what the parliamentary secretary just said.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): I regret to interrupt the hon. member, but his allotted time has expired.

Mr. S. Victor Railton (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Veterans Affairs): Mr. Speaker, we have two questions to decide tonight and tomorrow: first, do we need a gas pipeline now; and second, what route should we adopt?

Reviews of our production, consumption and demand for all kinds of energy show our Canadian oil demand to be 2,670 million barrels yearly. Our daily production is 1,780,000 barrels and our imports are 890,000 barrels. We export 918,000 barrels. We produce 2,520 million cubic feet of gas annually. We use 1,000,348,000 ourselves and we export 946 million cubic feet. We also produce 273 billion kilowatts of electricity in total annually, which is 26.6 per cent of our total energy production. So far only 1.4 per cent is nuclear. Coal, coke and natural gas in turn supply 26.1 per cent of our energy supply.

The export of oil to the United States has been reduced by one half since 1975. The natural gas export to the United States has also been reduced markedly. Both of these are on contracts which we must respect, and we are able to exchange other forms of energy in return for our exports. This mainly consists of coal for our Ontario Hydro. We are now importing oil for energy use, particularly for the Canadian regions east of the Ottawa valley line, from the OPEC countries. It used to be one million barrels daily and is now approximately 300,000 to 400,000 barrels a day.

Canada is doing research and demonstration projects on renewable resources such as on winds, sun, tides, and the biomass. It is conceded that these are most unlikely to become practical total substitutes for our fossil fuels but certainly are adjunctive. When petroleum, gas and coal run out, our energy will have to come in the main from hydro, nuclear installations, and the biomass.

Nuclear power will need fast development, particularly in Ontario, because in this province we are losing the self-sufficiency we once enjoyed in energy. Dr. Rasmussen of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology stated that nuclear power is the safest, cheapest and cleanest form of energy production. Even now breeder reactors for atomic fusion are being built in the United States, the United Kingdom, France, Germany, and Russia. The most recent is the super Phoenix in France. It was the scene of an incited anti-nuclear mob recently, which I deplore. None of these will be able to rival Canada's CANDU reactor because of their complexity and the need to find new metallic transducers or mediators to replace the light water. Our CANDU heavy water reactor can be adapted to the new Canadian concept of a breeder reactor. It will adopt the thorium cycle. This will make our present uranium resources stretch out 50 times further. It will also permit the use of the very poor grades of uranium, which are so plentiful in the earth's crust. This will make civilization many hundreds of years down the energy road.

From all accounts of economists, geologists, as well as oil and gas companies and government information sources, we will run into an acute energy scarcity around the year 1980. This will continue until the year 1986, at least. That is why we are striving so hard to become self-sufficient in Canadian-produced energy. As the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Gillespie) has frequently stated, there is no guarantee that Middle East oil will be available until we become self-sufficient. A sudden political upset there could mean that Canada might run into worse shortages than the U.S.A. experienced last winter. For this reason alone we cannot vacillate any longer on the pipeline question.

● (2040)

In fact, as stated in the "Energy Strategy for Canada" our future depends on the synchronization of all our energy modalities. Development of all our gas fields with vigorous

exploration for new deposits are imperative. Then Delta and Arctic gas and oil will be set to flow after Alberta oil and gas are exhausted. The tarsands, though expensive, will also be brought into great production. It behooves us to invest heavily in these future energy industries, both privately and publicly.

We may eventually, not only need new pipelines from the Delta and Arctic islands but we may, of necessity, look forward to ice-breaking cargo ships for transportation to carry liquefied Arctic island gas to the St. Lawrence Gulf.

New technologies for lowering the costs of tarsands oil, as well as for Alberta and Saskatchewan coal, are being produced even now. This, we hope, taken all together, will avert any catastrophe which any sudden Middle East boycott could produce. Along with all this necessarily simultaneous development, new oil and gas policies are to be phased in as they become economic or desirable. All that is in the "Energy Strategy for Canada". I wish hon. members would read it.

The government has laid on a very impressive conservation policy for energy. This includes home insulation stimulation throughout the country, the eventual mandatory conversion of private automobiles to low consumption types, and the possible strict rationing of gasoline in the future. There will have to be a planned diversion of fossil fuel energy for public use on railroads and highways, as well as airways and for the manufacture of plastics.

Part of our overview of the construction of pipelines will necessarily include the needs of the U.S. Her oil and gas fields in the lower 48 states are pretty depleted, although she is getting new supplies from the Gulf of Mexico and to some extent from her offshore Atlantic areas. Prudhoe Bay in Alaska has added 10 per cent to her inventory with both its gas and oil. One of her big hopes is that she can get supplies for her carry-over period from Mexico, which country may soon enter an enlarged exporting phase.

Prudhoe Bay oil has already begun to flow to Valdez and transportation to the upper western U.S. refineries will soon begin. This carries some danger to our Canadian coastal waters from pollution. It also presents the U.S. with the need to build more pipelines across its wide range of mountains to the mid-western states. It became obvious to them that a gas pipeline which requires gas-liquefaction after arriving at Valdez from the north slope and special new ships to transport it to the U.S. mainland, followed by more pipelines to the midwest, was anything but economical.

Both Canada and the U.S. know that Prudhoe Bay is a much cheaper and more efficient route by going down to Fairbanks, diverting to Dawson and Whitehorse in the Yukon, and finally running across upper B.C. and Alberta. The originally well researched plan of the Canadian Arctic Gas consortium along the Alaska-Yukon corridor to the Mackenzie Delta and then down the Mackenzie River would have been slightly easier but has certain ecological and socio-economic disadvantages.

We can argue for the CAGPL that it was a consortium made up of U.S. and Canadian companies, that it had considerable experience from its background companies, and that it seemed to have a good prospect of raising plenty of money. However, against the CAGPL submission, as seen by the NEB and by the report of Justice Berger, there are several black marks.

The consortium was fairly strong in their insistence for a government guarantee. We Canadians feel that a trans-Canada pipeline of this sort should be built privately by Canadians and, as it were, rented to the U.S. Justice Berger was very vocal in castigating the CAGPL plan. He ruled out the pipeline from Prudhoe Bay to the Tuktoyaktuk Peninsula along the Alaska-Yukon corridor because of the possibility of extinguishing the caribou herds, the migratory birds, the fur-bearing animals, and even the whales in the Beaufort Sea which calve on this nearby Arctic shore. He felt very strongly that the opinions of the Inuit, Indian and Métis peoples could not be circumvented. He stated that there would be a socio-economic black-out perpetrated and, just as important, he asked for a ten year moratorium and for the land claims to be settled.

I cannot agree that we should have a moratorium on any northern line for ten years because we will need the gas from that area in not more than five or ten years. So if that is the case, we will have to build some pipeline with this in view and start very shortly as the construction time is five to six years from planning. I was not convinced after an Arctic tour that the corridor plan would be very harmful ecologically.

A few separate points should be examined. Can we take on the $5 billion to $10 billion dollar investment in a pipeline and still find enough capital to allow further industrial development in Canada such as mining, nuclear reactor building, tidal power, transportation improvement, and the heavy cost of our system of social security?

Looking at it one way, there is no doubt the injection of this amount of money into Canada would be a stimulant to recovery in our economy. It would provide employment for many tradesmen, as well as labourers, and enhance the development of technology in many lines. There would be an impressive spin-off in many other lines of manufacturing and industry generally. It would bring temporary prosperity to the native population, with some hope for local industry in the future.

Dr. Peters, vice-president of the Toronto Dominion Bank, has given a good overview of this economic situation and shows that with ordinary growth in the next 13 years, we will double or triple our GNP and have plenty of capital left over for the other uses even after completing the pipeline. This does not preclude offshore borrowing, privately and publicly. In fact he is reassuring when he says that the amount of offshore borrowing would not appreciate in the next 13 years and we would generate enough capital from our own savings to promote all these expenditures in that period.

Furthermore, there are the completion dates to think of. The CAGPL, if started late this year, could be finished in 1981, that is, before we actually think our production scarcity will begin. The new ALCAN route could be completed by 1983-1984. This also gives Canada the option to begin the Dempster

highway addition, bringing gas from the Mackenzie Delta down from the Yukon to join the ALCAN line. This could be set to finish between 1984-1988. If it seemed necessary at that time, and if further deposits were found in the Mackenzie Delta, the Beaufort Sea and the Arctic islands, either a Mackenzie Valley pipeline or an Arctic island transmission system, or both, could be implemented. We must not be tied in into a state of no manoeuvrability. I think that should be noted.

● (2050)

An hon. Member: Allan MacEachen must have written the speech.

Mr. Railton: I wrote it myself, old boy.

The recent delay of four years for the ALCAN route, as suggested in the Lysyk report, takes no notice of our precarious dependence on the Middle East. Neither does it give us credit for the ingenuity and the responsibility we possess in our desire to look after our native peoples.

The alternatives might consist of a pipeline from the Arctic islands to the south, on the east or west coast of Hudson Bay—or even the previously mentioned plan of cargo ships. From the standpoint of the Canadian people, the vast majority of whom live below the Arctic Circle, it is important to demonstrate that we do have an energy strategy for Canada. This plan not only provides us with energy for the foreseeable future but also takes care of our northern citizens in a sensitive and generous manner.

Part of our public relations should be to educate people to know that severe scarcity in energy will occur in the next five years. It could suddenly become an emergency if an oil embargo by the OPEC countries is applied. Canadian people should have full information on the need for conservation, as mentioned previously, and they must be given full information on the advantages of the ALCAN route over that of the CAGPL for all the reasons presented in this debate.

In my opinion the selection of this latter route has been forced on us by necessity. Although we are not in full agreement with the Berger report, we believe it was an extremely important exercise because it pointed out our responsibilities as regards the environment and all our northern citizens.

With care, good planning and decisive action we can obtain our much needed pipeline and still live up to our contractual obligations to our neighbours in the U.S.A., and to our own northern Canadians. We have many great issues facing us in this country at the present time. They all need a solution. The building of a pipeline is just as necessary in keeping Canada together as is our handling of the Quebec problem. In fact it is rather like a re-enactment of the early Canadian dream, the trans-continental railway of Sir. John A. Macdonald, which gave us "Dominion from Sea to Sea".

Mr. John C. Crosbie (St. John's West): Mr. Speaker—

An hon. Member: Batten down the hatches, fellows.

[Mr. Railton.]

Mr. Crosbie: It is with some regret that I have to say that the speech of the President of the Privy Council (Mr. MacEachen) with which he opened this debate today was not made by the minister as he was known in his heyday. It had all the force and strength of the roar of a ruptured duck.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Crosbie: Now we all know that the President of the Privy Council was shot on the wing last fall, shot right out of external affairs into presiding over this House. We all sympathize with him in his predicament, because none of us here would want to preside over this House if we could avoid it. But he has been plucked like a partridge and plunked into this parliament, and we can only extend to him our condolences. Certainly he did not tell the House, he did not even intimate, what was in the thoughts of the government after all these years of studying the pipeline question. We certainly could not get a clue from the inscrutable minister today.

The Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) had an even better solution—he did not stay in the House.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Crosbie: I have never seen the Prime Minister or anyone else suffer as much as he did as he sat under the elbow of the President of the Privy Council and listened to him today. As soon as the President of the Privy Council finished speaking, he got up from this seat as if he were rushing to the outhouse and left the Chamber.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Crosbie: We are having this debate so the government can listen to our opinions and be guided and choose from among them, but the Prime Minister is certainly not bothering with our opinions. Nevertheless, we will put them on the record.

There is some talk about Prudhoe Bay. I say we will never get Trudeau at bay in the House of Commons.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Crosbie: The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Clark) was a delight, as always.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Crosbie: The leader of the rump party, the NDP, of whom I always think as flash Broadbent because of his quick decisions—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Crosbie: —was at it again.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Order, please. I suggest that the hon. member refer to the hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby (Mr. Broadbent) by his title, not by his name.

Mr. Crosbie: I accept your stricture, Mr. Speaker, and I will call him the flash member from Oshawa. Is it a bird, is it a plane? No, it is the member from Oshawa making a quick decision based on hot air. This inspired me to verse, if you do not mind verse, Mr. Speaker. This is a verse I dedicate to the CBC:

The leader of the rump of the NDP
Is also the hero of the CBC.
They admire his dash and his quick decisions
Though the NDP, like God, haven't got the divisions.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Crosbie: One thing we can say about the CBC is that they are always fair, they are for the underdog, and that is why they are for the leader of the rump party. It may be that if you are the leader of the rump you do not have to consult the rump because when you look at a rump, you just say, "hi, rump". You do not have much discussion or debate with a rump. But in the Progressive Conservative party we have a caucus of 95 members, and since it is a democratic party our leader does not make decisions without consulting us. There are 94 of us—the other chap got booed in Edmonton yesterday.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Crosbie: We have been travelling over here, with the thought of all the seats the Liberals will get in Alberta in the next election.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Order, please. I suggest the hon. member get back to the subject under discussion.

Mr. Crosbie: After all these years of Liberal governments, the only gas ever transported out of our frontier areas is the gas that came out of the stomachs of the ministers who flew over the Yukon, and that is certainly a very unsatisfactory situation.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Crosbie: I want to say, before launching into the serious part of my speech—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Crosbie: These remarks have not been prepared by a member of the civil service but rather prepared by a man whom I admire tremendously, namely, myself.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Crosbie: I do not ask anyone else to prepare my speeches.

The present very unsatisfactory situation with reference to the pipeline question is the responsibility of the gentlemen opposite, the scattered handful listening to me tonight. The others should be here, they might learn something. Since 1968-69 the hon. gentlemen opposite failed to take the necessary steps to establish the best route for a pipeline from the frontier areas, with the result that what would be the main objective for Canada, that is, the most economic method of bringing frontier gas to Canadian consumers when needed, is now only a secondary objective which might or might not be accomplished by the route which we have come to support because it is the only alternative left to us. That is the fault of the hon. gentlemen opposite because they should never have left it to private enterprise, to commissions, to studies, to environmental panels and the rest of it, to try to puzzle out the best route. They should never have allowed Arctic Gas to spend $130 million to do that work for them. They should have done some work themselves, or should have had the civil servants do some work on this question long before Canadian Arctic Gas and the others were drawn into this effort by themselves. It illustrates a lack of government policy.

● (2100)

The government says it has a strategy, but that is all it has. The government has nothing which will achieve anything for this country. The reports of the last few months make it clear that the proposal of Arctic Gas for a pipeline from Alaska down through the Mackenzie Delta and the Mackenzie Valley is not possible, even though that might be the most economic way to bring Canadian frontier gas down to Canadian consumers. It is not now or seems barely possible, unless hon. gentlemen opposite have some facts or knowledge we do not have. However, on the knowledge we have, that option is now foreclosed because of the reports of the NEB, Mr. Justice Berger and the rest. What might have been the most economic route for Canadian consumers appears to be foreclosed for the reasons given by Mr. Justice Berger and by the NEB.

The NEB and those who are experts in the field seem to assure us that we are really not going to need frontier gas for our Canadian consumers until the mid 1980's. From all we have been told and from all the assumptions the NEB has made this seems to be a reasonable risk. One assumption the NEB could not put into its report is the assumption that there might be a change of government and that there might be a successful implementation of a policy. That would give us even more assurance.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Crosbie: We have about a four year period to decide what is the best way of getting gas from the Mackenzie Delta, from the Beaufort Sea, from the Arctic islands and from the high Arctic to the south of Canada before we have to make a final decision on a Canadian route. However, we have to make a decision now about a route for transporting American gas from Alaska to the United States. Since the Arctic Gas proposal is not now acceptable, we are left with the Alcan proposal. That is the proposal of Mr. Blair and his associates, who certainly are to be admired for their persistence and hard work for three or four years. These are certainly Canadians of whom we can be proud. They are great Canadian nationalists.

There is one route left, if we are to be a good neighbour to the United States. On the assumption that we want to take

advantage of what we might offer them, there is one route left, and that is the Alcan route, the Alaska Highway route through the Yukon Territory, British Columbia and Alberta to the U.S. We should not even go for that route if it is clearly detrimental to Canada, but all the evidence we have seen shows that it is not.

The benefits for Canada seem to outweigh the costs. Some of the benefits are employment, economic activity and the opening of the Yukon. This might be the boost the Canadian economy needs because of the state it is left in by the policies of hon. gentlemen opposite for the last four or five years. This pipeline will require the manufacture of pipe and other activities. It will help the foreign exchange situation. There may be tax revenue, and there is a possibility that this route may provide a chance for us to bring Delta gas through the Dempster Highway link. In our opinion all these things would make it worth while for the government to go ahead with a decision to proceed with the Alcan route as approved by the NEB.

This would be taking two gambles, but they seem to be safe on the face of it. The Dempster Highway link from the Delta will be feasible in an economic sense as well as feasible in an environmental sense. The Dempster Highway would be a great benefit as a result of this project. The rest of the benefits would only be benefits for the next four or five years. Second, our need for frontier gas from the Delta or the Beaufort Sea will not come until the last half of the 1980's. We can get by without frontier gas until then.

Our position—certainly my feeling—is that the government should advise the United States that it is ready to go ahead under the conditions our leader outlined today. I do not see why these conditions should have to be negotiated. We should offer the Americans this route subject to these reasonable conditions, and the Americans can either accept them or use their alternative, which is to liquefy natural gas from Alaska and bring it by ship to California or wherever.

I do not like what I see and hear. I have in my hand an article from today's newspaper. The headline is "Ottawa Appears to be Jittery on Yukon Pipeline Commitment". The article refers to an attack of last minute jitters in the Canadian government. We saw that here this afternoon at the end of the question period. The ministry was pretty jittery. The government is jittery also because of the frosty reception it encountered last week in Washington when Mr. Basil Robinson and his team of negotiators went down there. The Americans did not fall over them and say, "Thank God you will be giving us the Alcan route". The Americans said they would not accept a number of things. They said they would not accept the $200 million socio-economic surcharge that the National Energy Board has recommended and that Mr. Lysyk has recommended.

It it recommended that that surcharge be added to the cost of the pipeline. The American Secretary of State, Mr. Vance, wrote a letter to the congressional committee advising that committee that a new pipeline treaty would prevent Canada from adding such an amount for socio-economic costs to the cost of the pipeline, which would have to be paid by the consumers of the gas. The United States has already said it would not accept any condition like that. The United States Senate has said that. The Americans are objecting, and apparently they are not going to pay the extra cost for any route deviation to Dawson City in the Yukon. They say they may not agree to an all-events tariff which would be necessary unless there are going to be government guarantees in connection with this pipeline. So our government is getting jitters. I say our government should forget the jitters.

If, because of our good neighbourliness, we are prepared to give to the United States a route across Canada for a gas pipeline subject to conditions which are reasonable to Canadians, Yukoners and people who would live along the route, and if the United States is not prepared to accept those reasonable conditions, then let us forget it. We are not suppliants to the United States; they are the suppliants, so let us not forget that. If the government goes for the route we are suggesting, I do not think it should act as if Canada has to surrender these reasonable conditions mentioned by our leader and others in this debate.

As our leader said, there should be no financial guarantees from the Government of Canada in connection with this pipeline. If it comes to building our own pipeline—the Dempster Highway pipeline or another pipeline to bring gas to Canadian consumers—it might be necessary for the Canadian government to have some financial involvement. If it does, it should have the equity of that project, or the project should be carried out through a Crown corporation. No guarantees should be given to private corporations or non-government corporations to build pipelines. Never should we agree to that, and we should give no financial assistance to bring American gas to American consumers. I am sure that the present government would not be so foolish as to do that.

Mr. Fraser: Don't be too sure, John.

Miss MacDonald: We gave it to Argentina.

Mr. Crosbie: I do not have time to go into the details of other conditions there might be, but if there are any swaps arranged, let us remember the price of those swaps. If we sell Canadian gas now or next year to the United States on a swap basis to get theirs back in eight or ten years' time, the gas we get back should be at the same price. We should pay the same price they pay when they buy our gas. Let us not forget that as a very important point to be remembered in any swap deals.

The government would be well advised to change its federal-provincial tactics and to get a little cosier with the government of Alberta once it makes its decision. If this project goes ahead, it cannot go ahead successfully without the co-operation of the government of Alberta, which has been treated in a pretty shabby manner by the government opposite, and it is not being treated any better now. To date there has been no change. Alberta has to be consulted on the financing of Alberta's gas contracts. There should be co-operative arrangements.

The people of the Yukon have to be consulted, and British Columbia has to be consulted. But the government is not used to consulting anyone. It is used to telling people what they are going to do and what they should do. Time and again we have seen the Minister of Finance (Mr. Macdonald) and the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Gillespie) carry on their Kung-Fu federalist tactics. They say, "Accept our programs, or we will give you our foot right in the mouth". That is what the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources said when it came to his home insultation program, but he is going to get a foot somewhere else before the year is out.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Crosbie: The Lysyk Report suggests a four-year delay, but that is not any grave impediment. It is only a year longer than might be necessary in any event. We say that if native claims and the rest of these matters are cleared up earlier than that, which any efficient government ought to be able to do, it would not take four years as Mr. Lysyk suggests. Of course he was dealing with the present government, knew its record, and based his four years on that.

• (2110)

All standing committees of this House, including the committee on national resources, should be treated as though they are meaningful. None I have been on to date has been meaningful. It would be nice if the government, when it makes its decision, does as the Leader of the Opposition suggests, sits down with the natural resources committee, to outline why it made the decision. It should meet with it every three or four months, to bring it and the House up to date on what is happening, how the negotiations with the U.S.A. are going, and what conditions they are or are not agreeing to. It would be no good passing orders in council of the sort mentioned in the House earlier this afternoon. They are not going to stop us looking at documents; we will get our mitts on them, anyway. Take us into your confidence, we say to the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources, knowing that there is not a chance in the world he ever will. But we say it anyway. If the record of the last nine months is any guide, we do not have a hope in Hades of having our pleas in this House answered.

Once you get the television cameras into the House we shall see the Prime Minister sitting in his seat, smiling through these debates. He will be all smiles when his seat mate, the President of the Privy Council, speaks. When the people see our leader speaking so well that the Prime Minister has to skulk and flee from this House in shame, they will draw the right conclusion.

We want additional exploration in the Delta and the Beaufort Sea, and it is up to the government to see that it happens. It is up to the government to provide the incentive. If all else fails, let the government use its great paragon of petroleum virtue, Petro-Canada, to make sure that explanation continues.

It is as well for me to sit down before you jump up, Mr. Speaker, and interrupt my train of thought. Let me end by saying we have told the government the course it should follow. If the government has any sense it will follow our advice. If it has not much sense, the government will be even more doomed to defeat than it is today.

Mr. Gillespie: Mr. Speaker, would the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. Paproski: Why don't you speak, instead of asking questions?

Mr. Fraser: When are you going to speak?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Order, please. The hon. member for St. John's West (Mr. Crosbie) has one minute left. Will he accept a question from the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources?

Mr. Crosbie: Mr. Speaker, I will give the minister as full and informed an answer as he gives me.

Mr. Gillespie: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member who is the energy critic of the Conservative party made an important contribution. I wonder if he can elaborate on something he said. I took him to say—if I am wrong perhaps he can correct me—that his party would gamble to the late 1980's before it is necessary to connect up any northern gas to the south. If he did not say that I ask him to clarify that position.

Mr. Crosbie: Mr. Speaker, I should like the Prime Minister to gamble on an election this fall. Answering the minister's question, I said that we must recognize that two gambles are involved in implementing the recommendations of the National Energy Board, of Mr. Lysyk or of my party. One is that gas supplies will be adequate until the mid-1980's. The second is if building the Dempster line will be possible. When I speak of gambles I mean that we have to take two chances any such decision involves, and it would be fair to take them on the evidence now available.

Mr. Alan Martin (Scarborough West): Mr. Speaker, the two day debate in which members of this House are now engaged concerns issues relating to a multi-billion dollar project, the largest single project to be undertaken in North American history by the private sector.

The question before us is in two parts. First and foremost there is the question of whether or not Canada wants a substantial piece of the action. Second, what are the minimum conditions under which we are prepared to throw in our lot with the project, if it is our determined objective to participate? I say minimum conditions advisedly, because we must bear in mind that this entire project has really come about as a result of substantial natural gas discoveries in the Prudhoe Bay area of the state of Alaska, and the desperate need in the heart of the United States to find a means to transport this newfound resource to the mainland. Without this crucial factor, the substantial proven reserves estimated at some 28 trillion cubic feet in Alaska, coupled with the urgent need for this gas to fuel the energy starved economy of mainland United States, we should not be here debating the Canadian position on this matter today.

It is my view, Mr. Speaker, that Canada should capitalize on the opportunity before the country and participate in as full and meaningful a way in this gigantic energy project as can be negotiated with our American partners.

The first argument I should like to make in support of my stand relates purely and simply to the obviously positive effect that such a major project will have on the Canadian economy at this time and in the immediate years ahead. Economists in Canada are few and far between today who are not prepared to state almost categorically that this country is running substantially below its potential, economically speaking. In this connection I refer to an article carried in the Toronto *Star*, dealing with the participation of the director of policy analysis for the C.D. Howe Institute, at the Couchiching conference. Mr. Speaker, a project of this nature will do more, both directly and indirectly, to stimulate new economic activity in Canada than any number of individual stimulants that might be provided by governments at federal, provincial and perhaps municipal levels, of various types and sorts with the same over-all objective. To me this is developing as perhaps the key issue in this debate over whether or not Canada should participate in discussions over the appropriate route for the line in Canada, questions of financial commitments to be made and other negotiations relating to native right problems, etc.

In my view, Mr. Speaker, a decision to participate in this important venture based in the first instance on its potential as a dramatic stimulus to the Canadian economy should help in perhaps defogging some of the other technical yet extremely important aspects that obviously must be resolved before the nature of our participation may be developed. In fact, Mr. Speaker, I see this project as such an important stimulant that one of the key considerations must, in my view, be the determination of appropriate controlling measures to ensure a minimum effect, from the vast spending involved, on the ever present and lingering inflationary concerns. These do not appear to be leaving us, and indeed may receive some stimulation in the wrong direction when the current control program is ended. I say, let matters relating to our sluggish economy be paramount as we hopefully make one decision to proceed and as we enter the complex phase of negotiations with Washington that will ensue, assuming the Americans continue to opt for an overland route, an assumption which I believe will prevail.

The second argument I wish to put forward relates to the opportunity which our willingness to participate in this project would create in terms of our relations with our great and respected neighbour to the south. Canadians are charged at this time with a desire to identify and promote our national spirit wherever and whenever possible. But this particular point in our developing state of maturity requires that from time to time we take a realistic and sensible attitude in our relations with countries which may be substantially more heavily populated and economically powerful than our own. We must never obviously be subservient—

● (2120)

Mr. Fraser: Not obviously!

[Mr. Martin.]

Mr. Martin: We must, however, endeavour to be helpful and understanding whenever possible, particularly in those instances where co-operation may be shown to be in our national interest. I would point out that a large part of Canada's energy development and delivery systems have been put in place over the years with American assistance. Through co-operation by the U.S.A. we are today delivering a major part of central Canada's oil and gas needs through pipeline systems which embody substantial mileage across several U.S. states and which are owned by Canadians, either completely or jointly with U.S. interests.

I believe our negotiating teams should be tough and should be expected to hammer out the best deal possible for Canadians in the course of the detailed arrangements which may ultimately be developed with regard to Canadian participation in this project. However, we must not forget that Washington will possess two clear options in the event the Canadian government chooses to participate. The U.S. authorities can accept such participation or else decide to go it alone by selecting the all-Alaska, all-American route. In the event we wish to join in—and I believe we shall—we must be careful to avoid falling prey unwittingly to the increasingly influential proponents of the all-American proposal by attaching terms and conditions to our participation which might be perceived as making such participation unattractive to American eyes by comparison with a project which does not involve Canada and Canadians.

Mr. Fraser: Would the hon. member for Scarborough West (Mr. Martin) permit a question?

Mr. Martin: I would be delighted to do so but I should like to finish what I have to say first, and see whether my time allotment permits.

An hon. Member: It is all so dull.

Mr. Martin: I hope that comment refers to some of the remarks I have heard from the other side.

An hon. Member: The House is falling asleep.

Mr. Martin: That would not be much of a change for some members over there.

The other point I should like to make relates to incentives to future exploration in the north, something which I believe is an important aspect of our considerations.

Mr. Woolliams: Incentives like the 25 per cent tax.

Mr. Martin: Frankly, I would be most concerned if Canada either opted out or was effectively shut out by virtue of a Washington decision to "go it alone". I hold this view for what, to my mind, is a most important reason—the need for Canada to do everything in its power to ensure far more active exploration and development in the Delta region and in the north in general than has occurred to date. This country needs the untapped or unproven resources of the north, both oil and gas, if we are to ensure a continuation of our economy in the

manner to which we have become accustomed. There is much argument as to how soon we shall need further gas. There is no similar argument about the need for frontier oil. Mr. Speaker, there is only one way in which this exploration and development can proceed and that is by heavy investment in the frontier areas, involving massive co-operation on the part of both the private sector and the government.

Mr. Woolliams: Like the 25 per cent tax.

Mr. Martin: If we fail in our efforts to become part of this current American frontier project which is so close to our own Delta region I am concerned about the discouraging effect of that situation upon efforts to bring vast amounts of capital to play in this crucial area of exploration and development.

I have so far, in these brief remarks, avoided two issues—I shall comment briefly on my reasons for giving them a somewhat lesser priority. The first is the question of the Canadian gas supply situation in the immediate future, say within the next several years. I might say that I am aware of the arguments which have been put forward to show how and why a near term shortage may develop; it is not lack of knowledge which prompts me to give this aspect a lesser priority. Rather, it is that I, as an ordinary member of parliament, am confused.

Mr. Fraser: That is apparent.

Mr. Martin: I am confused, and, unfortunately, not completely convinced. We are told again and again of the ever-increasing gas bubble developing in Alberta and the ever-increasing difficulty of getting new contracts signed. We are told about new reserves being proven in the traditional areas and of the failure to date to convince eastern oil customers to switch to natural gas. Then there is the vast potential offered by conservation measures. I feel there may be time on our side in this area at present and that the need for a new and concentrated focus on Delta and Arctic potential gas reserves may be less.

In the second place, I have not spoken about the actual route to be taken. I would find it difficult, bearing in mind the substantive recommendations and evidence presented to us recently, to accept that the Arctic Gas proposal is a viable one at this date. Therefore, we are looking at Alcan. Whether or not the Alcan route, if it is approved, should take in the Dawson spur is a consideration which I believe could be left for negotiation with the people concerned south of the border in terms of the ultimate project.

Mr. Fraser: Are you serious?

Mr. Martin: If I am correct in believing concrete evidence is lacking of an imminent gas shortge in the years immediately ahead, it seems to me conceivable that there may be time in which to prove up more Delta reserves in sufficient quantity to justify a pipeline which could come down either through what is referred to as the Dawson spur, longer or shorter than we have talked about so far, or through a new Mackenzie Valley line. The point I am making is that participation in the project serves a key need, and if ultimately it means that participation has to mean participation in a project which, for now, will only be moving U.S. gas from U.S. sources to a U.S. destination, it is still something in which we should be involved.

● (2130)

If I have time I would now be quite happy to entertain the question directed to me earlier.

Mr. Fraser: Mr. Speaker, I want to say that I appreciate my hon. friend's acceptance of my question. I want to refer to something he said a few minutes ago when he warned this House and presumably his colleagues in the government about being too intransigent with the terms, because there is a possibility that the United States may not accept either of the overland routes.

I want to read to my hon. friend from Scarborough West part of a letter sent several days ago to Senator Stevens of Alaska by the administration. This matter is of very grave importance in that I am referring to the $200 million fund recommended by the National Energy Board in the event that the Alcan project goes ahead, the money to be used to help soften the socio-economic impact in the Yukon. This is an excerpt from the letter sent to Senator Stevens of Alaska by a Mr. Bennet.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Question.

Mr. Fraser: Just a minute. We have come a long way at great public expense to debate this matter and, with respect, Mr. Speaker, I think I should ask my colleagues to allow me to put the question in proper form. I am sure my hon. friend would appreciate that. The letter is sent by the office of Secretary Vance and commences:

> Secretary Vance has asked me to respond to your letter of July 22 concerning the United States-Canada transit pipeline agreement and the transportation of Alaskan natural gas across Canada.

He goes on:

> With regard to the relationship between Article III of the agreement—

That is the Canada-U.S. agreement.

> —and the proposed two hundred million charge to Alcan for indirect socio-economic costs, we have taken the position with the Canadians that Article III of the agreement would preclude the imposition on the pipeline of the charge unless such a charge is applicable to similar pipelines in Canada.

My question to my hon. friend who speaks for the government is in the context of the remarks that the hon. member made a few minutes ago to the effect that we must be very flexible and not become intransigent in regard to the terms. In view of the fact that my leader and other speakers, most recently the critic in our caucus on energy matters from the province of Newfoundland, have so eloquently stated that these—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member should not open the debate but ask a question.

Mr. Fraser: It is an important question, Mr. Speaker. Can I ask the hon. member whether he is prepared to say on behalf either of himself or on behalf of the government, when he was

referring to being flexible, that he is prepared to give up one dollar of the $200 million recommendation from the government's own regulatory agency, the National Energy Board, in any negotiations with the United States of America?

Mr. Martin: Mr. Speaker, first of all I think it should be quite obvious to the hon. member, who has been around here a lot longer than I have, that as a backbencher on this side of the House I do not indeed speak for the government. I am a member of parliament and I am participating as a member of parliament in this debate. With regard to his point, I would simply say that in my view the point he has made is one of those technical matters—and I realize technical matters can amount to a great deal of money at times—which I think will have to be resolved at some point in the negotiations in Washington. I certainly had that in mind when I lumped the groups together earlier in my speech.

Mr. Fraser: Mr. Speaker, may I put a supplementary question?

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The hon. member's time has expired and unanimous consent would be required.

Mr. J. R. Holmes (Lambton-Kent): Mr. Speaker, during this debate I want to make a few observations about the north and its people. Perhaps this will be a diversion from what we have heard earlier. I should say at the outset that I do not recall an issue on which there has been more information over a prolonged period of time than that surrounding the present debate. The divergent views expressed on a multitude of interrelated issues is one manifestation of the complexity and importance of the subject.

In assessing the information, it has been my impression that the participants involved collect information from their own perspective, and the strategy to disseminate that information varies from that of retaining a narrow point of view to retaining a narrow point of view while giving the appearance of a broader perspective of the issues. I do not say this in a critical manner; indeed it is my belief we have been exposed to a new decision making process in dealing with an important and sensitive political issue.

The question must be asked: is there a common denominator, is there a starting point from which we can reconcile the divergent opinions that surround the present debate? I suspect the simple answer to that question is no, and yet it seems to me there are convincing arguments to suggest all northerners—and I emphasize all northerners—are telling us they are concerned about individual freedom and equality of opportunity.

The irony of this debate is that the Liberal government would have the House of Commons and the Canadian public believe that by permitting members of parliament to speak for a period of two days the words of wisdom flowing from all concerns of the House will lead to more enlightened decisions. However, what is obvious and what the government has failed to tell the Canadian people is that many of the issues involved in the debate have been ignored by the Liberal government for years and have been permitted to fester like an untreated chronic ulcer. The illusion created by the government that we are simply debating a pipeline is spurious, and has had the serious and unfortunate effect of diverting attention away from many of the critical political issues which affect the north.

What are some of the issues that have a direct impact on the north, its people and their future, that have been ignored or inadequately handled by the government? The absence of a national energy policy has been discussed earlier today, in particular the long term need for Canada, in concert not only with the western world but with the global community, to rationalize our future energy needs. Despite widely conflicting reports with respect to existing and potential petroleum resources in Canada, it is generally accepted that there is a need for a transition strategy toward a different kind of energy economy. The importance of such a strategy on decisions affecting northern development and Canadian sovereignty over a disproportionate share of the world's territory and resources is obvious.

The absence of a comprehensive policy for the north, the absence of an industrial development strategy and a national policy regarding resource development, has a direct impact on the future of the north and its people. What will be the role of Petro-Canada? The conflicts between the federal and provincial governments, between provincial governments, and the conflicting objectives between various federal ministries and indeed within specific ministries, including the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, have created uncertainty, stagnation, and inaction. The political development of the north and the role of native northerners in that development process is crucial, and I shall make reference to this point later.

Any rational discussion about the future of the north and its people must be predicated on our past and present knowledge of the area and its people. Following several visits to the north and innumerable discussions with a broad cross section of northerners, one is left with definite impressions. Indeed for many reasons which I do not have time to discuss there is a growing awareness of the north in southern Canada, which in itself is healthy, and as one Canadian interested in the future of the north and its people I would like to make a few observations.

I believe it is fair to say that the north during its three centuries of contact with the white man has been viewed by those in southern Canada as a sparsely populated, hostile environment, with vast natural resources that should serve as a resource base for the rest of Canada and the world.

Although the nature of the resources has changed through the centuries, the basic principle of exploitation of natural resources in the north independent of the economic, social and political development of the area has been and continues to be the policy of this government. Indeed in recent years the state has been involved in numerous projects to the extent that there

is no apparent difference in the activities in the public as distinguished from the private sector. The question is not whether these resources should be developed now or in the future, but rather how they should be developed, over what period of time, with what safeguards and for whose benefit?

● (2140)

I am convinced this policy of exploitation is regressive. It is essential that the Canadian north be respected on its own terms, and future policy must be adopted to acknowledge the special characteristics of the north and the culture of its people.

The second point I wish to make is the lack of understanding that prevails regarding the impact our society has had on the economic, social and political development of the Indian, Inuit and Metis in the north. In assessing the impact there is a risk of either accepting de facto the interpretation of the events as perceived by a particular group, or a risk of becoming paralyzed by a number of widely divergent interpretations from several groups based on their perception of events. It is essential to make a distinction between the opinions of the various parties and the necessity to have an understanding of the events which have occurred.

To draw an analogy, it could be compared to three patients visiting a doctor with similar symptoms, where the first patient was convinced he had leukemia, the second cancer, and the third meningitis. The doctor has the choice of treating each patient as they have interpreted the symptoms, or attempt to elicit the facts and draw his own conclusions.

What are the facts? During the past 30 years there has been a remarkable shift in the Canadian economy from a goods producing system to a services producing system. During this period we have seen a growing portion of our economic resources allocated to health care, communications, transportation, education, and social services. This growth in the service sector has been accompanied by changes in financing, in which many of the services formerly financed in the private sector are now the responsibility of the public sector.

There is no question these changes have had a dramatic impact on the traditional way of life in the north. With the continued high birth rate, improved health standards and decreasing mortality rates, we are witnessing the highest population increase on record. Added to this is a marked reduction of previous nomadic activity. The results of these events have been an explosion in the population and the establishment of more permanent settlements.

Not unexpectedly this sequence of events has been accompanied with problems in housing, lack of infrastructure, unemployment, and the numerous social problems one would anticipate in such an environmental setting. In recent years there have been an increasing number of children attending schools in the north, and one cannot escape the inevitable question of asking about their future. Will we be able to provide them with a life style of their choice? Having provided them with the educational equipment to work in a wage economy, will we be able to provide them with the economic opportunities in their communities? Will conditions be such that their future opportunities are limited, causing a further breakdown in families as children are forced to leave home to seek opportunities elsewhere, most likely in the provinces?

I do not underestimate the difficulties in achieving the proper balance in reconciling the divergent views which exist regarding the future economic, social, and political evolution of the north. However, I am confident if we understand the past, and if there is a commitment to the future, we can achieve the proper balance which will preserve individual freedom and equality of opportunity.

In the brief time remaining I should like to make a few comments regarding the first volume of Mr. Justice Berger's Report and native land claims in the north. Few doubt the eloquent report of Justice Berger has had a significant impact on those preoccupied with the problems of native land claims, economic development and political evolution in the north. Although it is too early to assess the effect the Berger inquiry will have on the future political climate in Canada, it is important to understand the significance of the Mackenzie Valley pipeline inquiry.

It seems clear from the proceedings of the Berger inquiry and a review of the testimony collected, either from informal gatherings in small settlements in the north or larger centres with exposure to the news media in the south, that the future of people was the dominant theme. Although I am not in agreement with all of the conclusions of Justice Berger, I am persuaded to conclude he has added an important dimension to the decision-making process of assessing development projects. In contrast to the James Bay hydro power project in northern Quebec, when the people were forgotten prior to the injunction to stop the development, the Berger inquiry recognized the need to establish the effect development would have on the people in the north. Historically economic concerns dominate the decision-making process in assessing development. Justice Berger has provided a source of information expressing other concerns, and this fundamental principle should be recognized as an important component in any technology assessment program applied to future development.

During the debate on second reading of the James Bay legislation I attempted to define some of the difficulties encountered in resolving the important issue of comprehensive land claims in the north. I emphasized the need for flexibility since no one, in my opinion, in our democratically constituted society has the wisdom or foresight to predict how an individual or a people will evolve. On the basis of the existing proposals or stated objectives of the Northwest Territory Indian Brotherhood, the Inuit Tapirisat of Canada, the Committee for Original Peoples Entitlement, the Metis principally around Great Slaves Lake and the Delta, and the Council for Yukon Indians, the need for flexibility continues to exist.

The flexibility does not imply inaction. Indeed the major components of comprehensive land claims are well known, and yet the government had failed to acknowledge the reality of northern native aboriginal claims and has refused to come to grips with this fundamental issue.

Unfortunately the time constraints imposed by the House prevent me from outlining the details of the various proposals. However, at the risk of generalizing, it should be noted there is a remarkable similarity in the major components of the proposals that have been presented to the government, which I believe the majority of Canadians would accept in principle. I want to conclude my remarks by referring to what I consider to be the major issue in Mr. Justice Berger's report, and perhaps in the entire debate, namely his reasoning for imposing a ten year moratorium on the building of a pipeline. Let me attempt to place the problem in perspective by initially quoting from the first volume where he states at page 174 the following:

> Local, regional or territorial political entities may evolve that have a predominantly native electorate, an electorate in which a native majority might be entrenched by a suitable residency clause. Or political instruments may be developed by which the native people can, under an ethnic franchise and within a larger political entity, control matters that are, by tradition and right, theirs to determine. One approach would be geographical, the other functional.

Again, at page 176, he states:

> The settlement of native claims must be the point of departure for any political reorganization in the Northwest Territories. That is why the decision on the pipeline is really a decision about the political future of the Northwest Territories.

In a recent submission to the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development (Mr. Allmand) the Indian Brotherhood of the Northwest Territories proposed the division of the Northwest Territories into three sections on ethnic grounds. Indeed in an earlier proposal to the federal government they stated:

> There will therefore be within Confederation, a Dene government with jurisdiction over a geographical area and over subject matters now within the jurisdiction of the Government of Canada or the government of the Northwest Territories.

The issue is quite clear. If one supports the moratorium for the reasons outlined by Justice Berger, one is in effect supporting the principle of separate national development on ethnic grounds, in other words a homeland policy as proposed in South Africa, and perhaps it is not coincidental the title of the first volume is in part referred to as "Northern Homeland".

● (2150)

What are the implications of accepting the Dene proposal for political independence on the basis of race and culture, which appears to be supported in Judge Berger's recommendations?

First is the assumption that the federal government has not, cannot, and will not be trusted to administer an obligation under the B.N.A. Act to protect the interests and rights of the Indian people. This point of view has its proponents in both the north and south, among Indians and non-Indians, for a variety of reasons. Some are prisoners of the past, others are romanticists, and others espouse personal ideologies with questionable credentials regarding their genuine interest in resolving Indian problems.

If a federal government accedes to the request for independence, we are admitting as a nation and more important, as a people, that we do not have the capacity and flexibility to adapt to existing circumstances, and we are admitting independence is an acceptable alternative to the development and respect which can serve to unite us for the mutual benefit of all Canadians.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Holmes: Although the constitution does not define in a precise manner how the federal government should discharge its responsibilities, it is quite clear action can and should be taken. We need to assist the Indian people to preserve their identity and permit them to choose a way of life in keeping with their cultural heritage. We need to provide the Indian people with the opportunity to build an economic base to ensure the survival of their culture. With respect to political development, we must recognize the importance of Indian involvement in the decision making process, and it seems to me a broad spectrum of possibilities exists other than independence.

Finally, it is impossible to divorce the issue of independence on racial and cultural grounds in the north from the issue of national unity and the future of Canada.

Special status for the Indian people is an integral part of our constitution which must be preserved and continually altered to allow the Indian people the opportunity to preserve their identity and break the shackles of dependency. I believe this is just and attainable.

However, I have not been persuaded that Justice Berger's reasoning will stand the test of time, and to add tacit approval to the Dene proposal for independence supports a fundamental problem that exists in Canada, namely, the notion that a people must be the absolute masters of all matters affecting them.

An important feature of our federal system is that if there is the will it can respond to changing circumstances. As I indicated earlier, to accept independence as a viable option is to admit as Canadians we do not have the capacity and flexibility to adapt to existing circumstances.

It is my belief that federalism and national unity are a viable option over independence, and to take any course of action which accepts in principle the establishment of political independence based on race and culture is to indicate our loss of faith in federalism and our future as an united country. I am a Canadian and stand for a united Canada.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Clark: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order because I see the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development (Mr. Allmand) rising, presumably to put a question. It is important that we on this side make it clear to ministers that while we are prepared to receive some reasonable questions, there are certain ministers from whom we believe we and the people of Canada have a right to hear on this matter.

One of the reasons we were prepared to accept questions from the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr.

Gillespie) was that he indicated he would be speaking in this debate. If the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development is going to speak in this debate, we will be prepared to answer questions. However, we are not going to let him get away with this debate simply playing the role of a questioner.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Paproski: Are you going to speak or are you not?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Clark) will agree that it is the decision of the member who has the floor as to whether to accept a question.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Deputy Speaker: In this particular case the hon. member's time expired over a minute ago. The question can only be asked with unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent to allow the minister to ask a question?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: There is not unanimous consent. I will have to recognize the next speaker.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Maurice Dupras (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, you will agree that it is difficult for an orator to launch out into as important a debate as that on the construction of a pipeline when there is barely one minute left.

Mr. Speaker, may I call it ten o'clock?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It being ten o'clock, in accordance with Standing Order 40 a motion to adjourn the House is deemed to have been made and seconded at this time. Therefore the question is: That this House do now adjourn.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[*English*]

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 40 deemed to have been moved.

VETERANS AFFAIRS—NUMBER OF WIDOWS NOT RECEIVING PENSIONS AND LOW LEVEL OF DISABILITY PENSION—GOVERNMENT ACTION

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, June 29, as reported in *Hansard* at page 7183, I put to the Minister of Veterans Affairs (Mr. MacDonald) a question concerning two matters about which I have questioned him a great many times. My question on June 29 put it this way:

> In view of the increasing concern of veterans and their organizations over the number of widows who do not receive pensions, and in view of the increasing concern over the widening gap between the rate of the disability pension and the base to which it was attached a few years ago, as well as the minister's sympathetic statements made several times to the effect that this matter is being reviewed, will he do his best to get the members of the cabinet to agree to bringing in this year the necessary legislation to correct these two situations?

The reply of the minister was in these words:

> Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member has indicated, this is a concern of mine and many people in the House. As far as trying to get it implemented this year, I will do my best.

It could well be that this is the last night in this session in which there will be late shows. I know of no subject to which I would rather devote my last effort in an adjournment debate than this one.

I appeal as strongly as I can to the Minister of Veterans Affairs to do what I asked him to do on June 29, as well as on other occasions, to try and get the cabinet to agree to include in the Speech from the Throne that may well be read by Her Majesty in October at least these two matters respecting Canadian veterans.

● (2200)

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Not just for study.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): The hon. member is right. We do not want just study, we want action. I realize that every time we discuss the question of pensions for widows of veterans, the minister makes the point that if a veteran's disability pension was only 5 per cent, say, for flat feet, that amount of money would hardly be the main element in the income of that veteran and his wife and that therefore a case for a widow's pension in that situation is not as strong as it might be. I point out to the minister—and he knows it as well as the rest of us do—that the pensions of veterans' widows are not on a graduated basis. Either the widow gets the full widow's pension or she gets nothing at all. The crucial point is that 48 per cent level in the case of the veteran's pension.

The minister knows that several responsible bodies such as the Woods commission, the Hermann commission and the Standing Committee on Veterans Affairs on at least two or if not more occasions, have recommended that there be a graduated scale so that in the case of widows of veterans where the veteran's pension was less than 48 per cent, there could be a pro rata pension. This is one of the matters that is concerning veterans greatly, and as the years roll on, especially now for World War II veterans as they rolled on some time ago for World War I veterans, the numbers of veterans' widows who do not qualify for pension as a matter of right is increasing, and this is an issue of great concern to veterans. It is being expressed by the veterans in literally every veterans' organization.

I do not think I have to argue with the minister the strength of the case. I think he agrees with it just as strongly as the rest of us do. The problem is to get it approved by the cabinet, to

get it into the Speech from the Throne, and to get it on the list of legislation for the next session. I plead with him as strongly as I can to see to it that it is on that list when we come back into session in October of this year.

The other point covered in my question is another of the major issues that are still of concern to veterans. A few years ago we corrected a wrong that had persisted for nearly 50 years, namely, that the war disability pension lost its relationship to the base to which it was established back in the early 1920's. A few years ago we attached it to a base, namely, the average income after taxes of five categories in the public service. But in the four or five years since that base was established, a gap has developed which is now nearly $45 a month or nearly $540 a year. I have the exact figures in front of me. They are a few cents less, but those are roughly the figures. I submit that it is grossly unfair to the veterans, unfair to the government which brought in this proposal, and unfair to the standing committee which recommended it, and I earnestly plead with the minister and express as strongly as I can to him the hope that this too will be in the Speech from the Throne which will open the next session of parliament.

The minister knows, as do all members, that veterans have a particular feeling of attachment to the Crown, and I suspect that the Sovereign, being herself a woman, has a particular interest in women and in widows, and I can think of nothing better to put in the mouth of the Queen when she opens parliament next October than these two matters respecting veterans.

I know the minister agrees that it should be done. I plead with him tonight to give us the assurance that he will do his best to get the agreement of his colleagues in the cabinet on these two important measures affecting the veterans of this country.

Hon. Daniel J. MacDonald (Minister of Veterans Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I take great pleasure in answering the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) on this matter, as I have done in the past. In 1972 it was recognized that some better method of determining the basic amount of disability pension had to be found, and a joint study group on the basic rate of pension was established. This study group had representation from veterans' organizations as well as from the Canadian Pension Commission and the Department of Veterans Affairs.

The joint study group recommended that the salary, after tax, of a composite group composed of five classes of unskilled public servants be accepted as the basis on which the disability pension should be based. This was done, and in June, 1973, Bill C-202 was enacted. That bill established the basic rate of pension in relation to five named classes of unskilled public servants. This resulted in an over-all increase of pension at that time of some 24 per cent.

In 1974, 1975 and 1976, because the pension rate was tied to the consumer price index, it was slightly more than it would have been if it had been tied only to the five categories of unskilled public servants.

[Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre).]

This year, however, after deduction of income tax the spread between the income of the unskilled public servant and the pensioner has reached the point where the pension rate is $44.72 a month behind that of the composite group of unskilled public servants, approximately $536 a year.

I am aware of the spread between the pension paid to the single 100 per cent pensioner and the control group of five named classes of unskilled public servants. The question of an upward adjustment of pension rates is under serious consideration.

Insofar as payment of pro rata pensions to widows of pensioned veterans is concerned, I have very little to add since a statement was last made on this subject. The suggestion has been made that a widow should receive a pro rata pension if her husband had been in receipt of a disability pension assessed at the rate of 47 per cent or less. This is because if his pension had been assessed at the rate of 48 per cent or more, the surviving dependants would be pensionable. What is sometimes forgotten is that in addition a widow will be pensioned if her husband's death was attributable to service or occurred during wartime regardless of the degree of the assessment of the disability.

The hon. member predicted that if people are in receipt of as little as 1 per cent pension I would make this statement, so I might as well make it. There is an opportunity to receive war veterans allowance if a person's income enables him to do so. The entire matter of veterans benefits—and that includes the basic rate of pension and pro rata benefits for widows—is under constant review by the Department of Veterans Affairs, the Canadian Pension Commission and the other agencies of my ministry to see what changes can be made to improve the lot of veterans and their dependants. Both subjects are of great importance, and when I have something specific to report to the House, I will be more than pleased to do so.

ROYAL CANADIAN MOUNTED POLICE—MINISTERIAL RESPONSIBILITY FOR OPERATION OF SECURITY SERVICES—KNOWLEDGE OF MINISTER OF ALLEGEDLY ILLEGAL ACTIVITIES

Mr. Elmer M. MacKay (Central Nova): Mr. Speaker, on May 24 I asked the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) whether he took the position that the Solicitor General (Mr. Fox) or the government should be responsible for the activities of the security services of the RCMP. The Prime Minister said that the principle of ministerial responsibility did apply, but he was less direct in indicating what sort of briefings the Solicitor General got from the force.

Since then interesting things have happened. On June 17 the Solicitor General said there would be no inquiry into the RCMP because the Montreal news agency break-in was, to use the Solicitor General's terminology, exceptional and isolated. Then, early in July, a complete reversal occurred. An inquiry was announced. Obviously, to put it in the most charitable way, between the minister and the RCMP there was an obvious failure to communicate. Who is responsible for this information gap or need "not to know"? I cannot believe it is totally the fault of the force.

A series of solicitors general have obviously been either too lazy, imperceptive or incompetent to become informed and to live up to their parliamentary obligations and traditions. Perhaps, as Shakespeare said, "When ignorance is bliss, 'tis folly to be wise". However, under the terms of reference of this inquiry announced last month there is no thrust, even in part, toward exploring the errors—if not of commission, then of omission—of the government or a series of solicitors general.

No, the RCMP is left literally alone to be checked, and nothing is said to any extent about any responsibility of its political masters. I would have expected this minister to have done better in living up to his responsibilities for the force than this. He has focused the inquiry on the RCMP, leaving the responsibility on the force, rather than assessing the degree of blame which ought to be attached to the Solicitor General and his predecessors.

● (2210)

If I may refer briefly to the British North America Act with reference to the responsibility for security services, there is an interesting, possible conflict between federal and provincial jurisdictions as far as the duties of the RCMP are concerned. As everyone knows, the force at one time was a territorial force known as the North West Mounted Police, with headquarters in Regina, which was then in a territory. Once a province was established, it had to enact its own police act, since every province had and has exclusive jurisdiction under section 92(14) of the BNA Act for its administration of justice. The provinces then enforced not only their own laws but those passed by parliament, for example, the Criminal Code and the War Measures Act.

An examination of section 91 of the act reveals significantly that while subsection (7) provides parliament with control over our militia, military and naval services and defence, there is no provision for the national police force, which is understandable in a way, since the administration of justice by parliament is confined by definition to the territories. Yet, when we turn to the RCMP Act we note an interesting conflict. That act passed by parliament, appoints every member of the force a peace officer in all Canada, and its officers ex officio justices of the peace.

The question which comes to mind is, how is it possible for parliament to pass this legislation, when the appointment of peace officers and justices of the peace is in the exclusive jurisdiction of the provinces. I shall develop this theme when time permits. For the present suffice it to say that the Royal Commission on Security in 1969 stated then that there is no exclusive statutory authority for the security role of the RCMP. In other words the RCMP, lacking parliamentary direction but realizing what was required, had to make its own terms of reference, which the royal commission pointed out as well. That is another indication of lack of backing for our national police force by a series of governments and ministers.

As a step in the right direction I suggest we should consider amending the BNA Act and inserting in section 91(7), in addition to the provisions concerning the militia, military and naval services and defence, a provision concerning national police and security services. Parliament should then regularize the Royal Canadian Mounted Police Act, after consulting with the provinces, and consider a better legislative foundation for our security services as well.

The minister, using his ministerial responsibility in the full meaning of the term, as I suggested earlier, owes it to the force to make certain that when the RCMP is contracted to a province, its work there shall be in no way unduly restricted. When I see a letter like the one I gave the minister today, a letter from an official of the Nova Scotia attorney general's department to a superintendent of the RCMP, instructing that officer to have deleted certain items from a file, items which would appear to be embarrassing to the Crown prosecutor, the same prosecutor whom the official informed the superintendent would be prosecuting the case, I suggest the Solicitor General owes a duty to the force in that respect, as well, to make certain its work is not being hindered. I think Superintendent Christian, the officer involved, is obviously unhappy with that situation, since he wrote three letters in 11 days. I think the minister has some responsibility for checking such a situation which also comes under the broad mantle of ministerial responsibility.

While the force must in the final analysis be responsible to the civil authority and conform as well to certain policies of the provinces to which it is under contract, the force must never be discouraged or brushed aside from certain areas of criminal investigation for reasons that those areas may touch on matters close to government, any government.

The RCMP is a proud, national force, with national standards of law enforcement to maintain. I trust that the Solicitor General, using his ministerial responsibility, will make sure that its mandate to enforce law and order is never impinged upon. I also hope that the government, in particular the Solicitor General, will do as it promised, implement some of the recommendations of Judge René Marin. In this way the minister would have better rapport with the force. I should like to see him improve its work conditions and see a more satisfactory and businesslike relationship between this important law enforcement agency and the Parliament of Canada. Until this is done we shall continue to have these unfortunate situations which have precipitated the present RCMP inquiry and which, as I said at the outset, do little credit to the concept of ministerial responsibility, since the force in effect is left holding the bag. All attention is focused on it and none of the responsibility is focused on those ministers who are responsible by definition and law for the force. I trust this matter will be remedied soon.

Mr. S. Victor Railton (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Veterans Affairs): Mr. Speaker, the principle of accountability is not one which the Solicitor General (Mr. Fox) or the government simply acknowledges or endorses. It is a concept which is understood as fundamental to the system of parliamentary democracy in Canada. As practised in our system and by the government, it means acceptance of responsibility for the conduct of government and, of course, for the

administrative machinery of the Government in Canada, in the sense it involves an obligation not simply to give direction but also to ensure that those directives given are carried out. But as with any other system of responsibility and obligation, it would be too simplistic to believe that the principle of accountability involves exactly the same thing in each of every aspect of its application. There is, at once, a general understanding of the principle and of its reality in practice.

Thus, in some areas of government endeavour one might anticipate, indeed expect, a rigorous form of this principle. In other, different areas of government operations, one equally expects a less controlled exercise of the principle. For example, the over-all system of government in Canada includes the operations of various Crown corporations. The nature of their activities ranges from that of support to Canadian industry active in the international area to the activity of those Crown corporations involved in domestic operations, such as the Canadian National Railways. These corporations have many features similar to private enterprise organizations, and in some cases they compete evenly in and with the private sector. In order to do so, they must be relatively free of direct ministerial involvement. Yet, at the same time, support given them from taxes collected at large demands ministerial control.

At the other end of the scale of government operations are those areas of endeavour which are of such importance to the national well-being that important ministerial involvement is essential. In the areas of regional disparity, employment, health and welfare, responsible ministers must ensure that the direction they request is indeed met and carried out. In such areas the nature of ministerial responsibility for appropriate public service organizational and individual response is critical. No minister of this government would deny his responsibility and that of departmental employees in such circumstances. There is then no question of the government's sense of and support for this principle. It is a principle which I believe has been met by government action.

THE CANADIAN ECONOMY—MEASURES TO STOP EXODUS OF CAPITAL TO UNITED STATES—REASON REAL ESTATE DEVELOPERS WILL NOT INVEST IN CANADA

Mr. Dan McKenzie (Winnipeg South Centre): Mr. Speaker, the heading of my adjournment speech tonight is "The Trudeau Government—Architects of the near destruction of Canada".

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. McKenzie: At the rate we have been going and on the basis of the information which has come forward in the last couple of weeks we shall soon be able to remove the word "near".

On July 25 I addressed a question to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Macdonald) with regard to measures he might take to stop the exodus of capital to the United States and inquiring as to the reason for which real estate developers will not invest in Canada. I got a typical Liberal answer. The minister said, in part, that changes costing something over $700 million had been made in favour of the corporate business sector in the budget of March 31 and the government believed that this, combined with a change in the dividend tax credit for business investment in Canada made for a favourable climate.

[Mr. Railton.]

That is a meaningless answer and it does absolutely nothing to help the economy. If the present trend of business going to the United States continues, within the next five years Canada will have from two million to 2.5 million unemployed and the government's make-work projects will not be able to match the dollars leaving this country. Over 400,000 students are leaving our schools and universities annually, but only 200,000 new jobs are being created annually. Members can see the direction in which we are headed. It is not a question of whether the government could be returned in the next general election. It is a question of whether we can afford to have it continue in office until this parliament comes to an end.

● (2220)

So that I will not be accused of making strictly a partisan speech tonight I want to quote a financial institution and other financial experts throughout Canada and the United States. Economists for the Royal Bank of Canada and the Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce have said that, based on their economic indicators, the current slump may continue into next year. So that absolutely nothing will be done for the one million unemployed in this country or about the mass exodus of investment money. A Royal Bank trader blamed it on lack of concern by the federal government. He said that people are waiting for the government to do something. Well, Mr. Speaker, we will be Rip Van Winkles with beards before this government does anything.

The type of answers that we have been receiving from the Prime Minister to the effect that investors will send their money where they will get the best return is an indication of the concern that he has. He tells people that if they cannot get a job in Canada they should go to the United States. The Royal Bank trader also said that the decline could fuel inflation by raising the price of imported goods. A Bank of Commerce economist said that the weakening in their indicator underscores the fragile state of Canada's economic recovery. These are damaging statements, Mr. Speaker.

According to an article in a recent *Wall Street Journal* issue, the weaker Canadian dollar is a sign that the money markets are telling the Prime Minister that they have even less confidence in his economic management—that should be mismanagement—than in that of the current U.S. administration. The article points out that the Prime Minister's complacency is not shared by many of his fellow Canadians. Canada is not doing so well. Its economy has been tangled up by a government effort to apply compulsory wage and price controls for nearly two years, when we should have had short-term controls as we in the Conservative party proposed. The article goes on to say:

While the nation's troubles are frequently attributed to the rise of the Quebec separatists, it would be more accurate to say that the rise of the Quebec separatists is closely related to the country's economic mismanagement.

Individual U.S. states are also opening up offices in the Montreal and Toronto areas and are being funded by the United States economic development administration. For example, the state of Vermont has opened up an office in Montreal to encourage Canadian businesses to move to the United States. The state wanted to be in a position to attract businesses wishing to move from the province of Quebec. They see that there is a lush open market here, and they know that no smart investor or any Canadian business is going to continue to operate in this country.

A number of United States bankers have combined to provide a $500,000 pool so that low interest loans can be offered to firms contemplating relocation to the United States. Furthermore, American towns and cities along the St. Lawrence plan to blitz Ontario with promotional campaigns aimed at luring Canadian industries across the border. Jefferson county and Watertown recently joined forces to open a new $800,000 industrial park which local officials hope to fill with Canadian satellite plants. They already have two, and leads on three others. That is another example of Canadian business and Canadian investors having no faith in Canada or in the present government.

Last year was a banner year for movements to the United States; 44 companies either moved to New York or expanded existing facilities. Twenty-five came from Ontario and 18 from Quebec. They brought in $28.6 million in investment money and created 1,330 new jobs. Canadians are also buying United States realty. For example, there are 17 major complexes being developed with Canadian money throughout the United States.

I would also draw the attention of the House to a most devastating article which I read recently entitled "Drifting along like ship without rudder", which has reference to this government. I want to point out, in closing, that the reason for all these business investors moving out of Canada is the overtaxation and the over-regulation which are confining these businesses to debt, and they can no longer operate in this country.

Mr. Maurice Dupras (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has raised a number of concerns about reports of business investment and, in particular, investment in real property flowing out of Canada and into the United States.

It is always difficult to obtain a clear and up to date perspective on investment flows in any particular business sector. However, it is important to note that investors continue to express confidence in the Canadian economy and the ability to obtain a return on investment in Canada. Thus, for example, total capital movements, unadjusted for seasonal variations, produced a net capital inflow of $810 million during the first quarter of 1977, while new issues of Canadian securities raised $1.4 billion.

Of course it is the case that within the total flow of capital there are movements in both directions, which represent the response of investors to market conditions and opportunities. In certain areas such as real estate development, two or three major projects can represent in themselves very large dollar transactions. However, it is important not to draw premature or unwarranted conclusions based on a limited number of cases.

It is true that we have faced in the last two years an uphill battle to restore the competitiveness of the Canadian economy, which is the prerequisite for sustained investment. That battle has been difficult, but with widespread public support and co-operation the inflation of our costs has been brought to more acceptable levels. Wage settlements have, for example, shown a steady deceleration in the first six months of this year. Negotiated settlements are now showing increases in the first year of the contract in the order of 8 per cent. In the manufacturing sector, first year increases in Canada were down to 7 per cent in the first quarter, falling below the United States increase of 7.8 per cent.

As the Minister of Finance (Mr. Macdonald) indicated in his response on July 25, the budget of March 31 provided additional assistance to equity investment and business finance in Canada, particularly through the increased dividend tax credit, the enriched investment tax credit, and additional measures to assist small business. With the rather cautious case of the current expansion, the full impact of those measures has yet to be felt; but there are encouraging signs of strengthening export markets, particularly in the United States. However, what is important is that we persist in the effort to hold the line on our costs if we wish to ensure the attractiveness of the Canadian economy to investors. That is why the government attaches importance to obtaining agreement with business and labour on wage and price restraint for the period after controls are lifted.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The motion to adjourn the House is now deemed to have been adopted. Accordingly, this House stands adjourned until tomorrow at 11 a.m.

Motion agreed to and the House adjourned at 10:30 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Friday, August 5, 1977

The House met at 11 a.m.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

COMBINES

ALLEGED URANIUM CARTEL—BASIS FOR DISTINGUISHING BETWEEN COMPANIES—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Sinclair Stevens (York-Simcoe): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a matter of urgent and pressing necessity under Standing Order 43. My motion concerns the extremely puzzling ability of the Prime Minister to separate certain foreign multinationals, such as Gulf Oil, the Rothschild financial empire and RTZ, whom he feels are good guys, from the other multinationals such as Westinghouse. I move, seconded by the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra (Mr. Clarke):

That the Prime Minister explain to this House, the Canadian people and the director of combines investigation how he decides which of the various multinationals is a good guy and which is a bad guy.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: Presentation of such a motion for debate can be done only with the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

* * *

CRIMINAL CODE

PROPOSAL TO MAKE SEXUALLY RELATED MURDERS PUNISHABLE BY DEATH—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Otto Jelinek (High Park-Humber Valley): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the provisions of Standing Order 43, I rise on a matter of urgent and pressing necessity dealing with yet another sex related murder. I refer this time to the horrendous episode in Toronto involving an innocent 12 year old boy who became a victim of a sexual orgy. Although the city of Toronto, as well as provincial officials, are taking steps to close down sex oriented establishments, much broader action is necessary from parliament in order to stem any similar future episodes. Therefore, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams):

That this House instruct the Minister of Justice to introduce legislation which would make sexually related murders punishable by death.

Mr. Speaker: Pursuant to the provisions of Standing Order 43, presentation of such a motion for debate requires the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

* * *

ENERGY

REQUEST FOR PUBLICATION OF AGREEMENT WITH DENISON MINES FOR PURCHASE OR SALE OF URANIUM—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. John Rodriguez (Nickel Belt): Mr. Speaker, I rise under the provisions of Standing Order 43 to ask the unanimous consent of the House to deal with a matter of urgent and pressing necessity. In view of reports that the federal government is now selling uranium to Denison Mines which it had recently purchased from the company as part of a federal government stockpile; in view of the suggestion that the government is selling this uranium back to the company at the same price at which they purchased it, in spite of the fact that the world price of uranium has risen $30 a pound since the initial purchase; and in view of the fact that if this is the case the government is passing on an enormous windfall profit to the company at the expense of Canadian taxpayers and at a time when wages for company employees were frozen, I move, seconded by the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Leggatt):

That this House instruct the government to clear up this issue by releasing any agreements it has with Denison Mines for the purchase or sale of uranium.

Mr. Speaker: Presentation of such a motion for debate requires the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

* * *

[*Translation*]

FINANCE

REQUEST BANK OF CANADA MAKE LOANS TO MUNICIPALITIES WITHOUT INTEREST FOR SEWAGE TREATMENT PLANTS—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Eudore Allard (Rimouski): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the terms of Standing Order 43, I request the unanimous

consent of the House to discuss an urgent and important matter.

As most municipal administrations have many problems with their sewage treatment and discharge systems;

As most of our streams, lakes and rivers are in the process of becoming highly polluted;

I move, seconded by the hon. member for Abitibi (Mr. Laprise):

That this House order the central government, through the Bank of Canada, to allow loans at cost to the municipalities with a view to enabling them to finance the construction or expansion of sewage treatment and discharge facilities, which would at the same time create employment at a time when unemployment is extremely high in Canada.

Mr. Speaker: Order. Pursuant to Standing Order 43, such a motion cannot be put without the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

* * *

● (1110)

[*English*]

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

NEGOTIATIONS WITH UNITED STATES ON TAX PROVISIONS FOR ADVERTISING IN PERIODICALS—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Benno Friesen (Surrey-White Rock): I rise under the provisions of Standing Order 43 on a matter of urgent and pressing necessity.

When the government promoted the advantages of Bill C-58 in the first session of this parliament, it promised that the provisions of that legislation would not only restrict unfair foreign competition but would also thereby help to establish an indigenous periodical industry in Canada. To date the government has collected about $5 million in taxes, lost about $200 million in convention business, and the periodical industry has not given birth to a major new publication.

In view of the fact the U.S. Senate foreign relations committee has approved a resolution criticizing Canada's posture and in view of the fact that at least one prominent U.S. Senator believes the Canadian provisions might end in disaster for bilateral trade relations, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Provencher (Mr. Epp):

That this House instruct the Secretary of State for External Affairs and the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce to adopt a position of enlightened self-interest and conciliation when negotiating with their American counterparts on this subject.

Mr. Speaker: The presentation of such a motion pursuant to Standing Order 43 can be done only with unanimous consent. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

[Mr. Allard.]

INDUSTRY

SUGGESTED PLACEMENT OF ORDERS FOR RAILWAY CARS WITH SYDNEY STEEL PLANT—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Elmer M. MacKay (Central Nova): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a matter of urgent and pressing necessity pursuant to Standing Order 43. In view of continuing high unemployment in the Pictou County area of Nova Scotia, and in view of the need for additional railway rolling stock, including refrigerator cars, and in view of the pressing need for such cars by CN rail, particularly in Prince Edward Island, as outlined recently by both Premier Campbell and the hon. member for Egmont (Mr. MacDonald), I move, seconded by the hon. member for St. John's West (Mr. Crosbie):

That this House direct the Minister of Transport to forthwith arrange orders for the construction of a substantial number of suitable types of railway cars at the Hawker-Siddeley plant in Trenton, Nova Scotia.

Mr. Speaker: The presentation of such a motion pursuant to Standing Order 43 can be done only with unanimous consent. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

* * *

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

EFFORTS TO SECURE RELEASE OF DANYLO SHUMUK FROM SOVIET UNION—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Stuart Leggatt (New Westminster): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a matter of pressing and urgent necessity pursuant to Standing Order 43. It concerns the plight of Danylo Shumuk, a Soviet citizen who has been imprisoned in the U.S.S.R. for over 27 years for activities that would constitute no crime in a free society. Given that Mr. Shumuk is living in great physical and mental deprivation, and that he is nearly 64 years of age, and that he has many relatives in Canada who are willing to sponsor his entry to Canada, and given that he has been adopted as a prisoner of conscience by Amnesty International since 1972, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles):

That the minister instruct the Canadian delegation to this fall's Belgrade Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe to publicly raise the plight of Danylo Shumuk, and take all steps to secure his release from the Soviet Union.

Mr. Speaker: The presentation of such a motion pursuant to Standing Order 43 requires the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

AIR TRANSPORT

MEASURES TO ENSURE CONTINUANCE OF SERVICE IN VIEW OF THREAT OF STRIKE BY AIR TRAFFIC CONTROLLERS—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. John C. Crosbie (St. John's West): Mr. Speaker, I rise under the provisions of Standing Order 43 and ask for the unanimous consent of the House on a matter of urgent and pressing necessity. In view of the breakdown of negotiations between the air traffic controllers and the Government of Canada, the rotating strikes threatened to commence August 8 and the need, if this situation occurs, for the government to be rotated, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Central Nova (Mr. MacKay):

That the government of Canada take immediate steps to ensure the continuance of air transportation services across Canada during the period from at least August 7, 1977, to August 19, 1977, during the period of the Canada summer games held in St. John's, the capital of Newfoundland, and the oldest civilized city on this side of the Atlantic.

Mr. Speaker: The presentation of such a motion pursuant to Standing Order 43 requires the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

* * *

HANSARD

REASON FOR LATE PUBLICATION

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Before beginning the question period perhaps I could advise members that there has been some difficulty with *Hansard,* partly due to some computer difficulty and partly due to the fact that a number of tables which were filed as part of answers to questions yesterday cannot be printed in the usual way by the computerized equipment. We are trying to finalize the printing of *Hansard* to get it into the hands of members as quickly as possible.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[*English*]

COMBINES

ALLEGED URANIUM CARTEL—REMOVAL OR AMENDMENT OF ORDER IN COUNCIL PROHIBITING POSSESSION OF DOCUMENTS

Mr. Joe Clark (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister. He will recall that yesterday he said he would be prepared to review order in council No. PC-1976/2368, this offensive document limiting the access of members of parliament and Canadian citizens to information relevant to our understanding of the legal or illegal activities of the Government of Canada. Can the Prime

Minister tell the House whether he has considered changes or amendments with respect to this regulation and whether a changed regulation will be put into effect or the regulation removed today?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, certainly not today. I have asked that the regulation be considered with a view to doing what I suggested yesterday. We want the Canadian public, and the opposition in particular, to be well informed about the reasons for our policy, why it was taken and what the effects of it would be. If it is necessary in order to obtain that and to permit the opposition to debate this fairly, we will see what we can do to amend the order in council. The intention, once again, is to permit the policy to be judged on its merits, and we will attempt to do that.

Mr. Clark: Mr. Speaker, I am not sure how long it is going to take the government of Canada and the Prime Minister particularly to recognize the obvious, which is that we have here in this order in council a very serious restraint upon the capacity of the House of Commons to do its work. In light of the Prime Minister's recommendation to us yesterday in answer to a question by the hon. member for Calgary North—

Mr. Guay (St. Boniface): Oh!

Mr. Clark: I just heard from the Minister of State (Multiculturalism). The last time we heard from him was when he voted against multiculturalism.

Some hon. Members: Shame.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Clark: The Prime Minister is reported in *Hansard* to have said yesterday, and I quote: "If any person in this country, including a member of the opposition, thinks that we have acted illegally, redress is available in the courts". On the basis of the evidence we have seen, we in this party want to instruct our lawyers to investigate and advise on whether charges under the Combines Investigation Act are warranted and on what processes are open either to us or to other members of the Canadian public to act and to take advantage of the law. We have, however, been informed by very respected and responsible legal counsel that given this regulation it is impossible for them to advise or to give any opinion to us or to any member of the public in any way with respect to legal proceedings. This regulation makes it impossible for Canadian citizens to obtain advice with respect to the operations of the cartel and with respect to the legal or illegal activities of the Government of Canada.

Can the Prime Minister give us a commitment that whether by removal of this regulation or by amendment of this regulation we will have a situation where members of parliament or members of the public will not be barred from taking legal action or from seeing whether charges are warranted under the Combines Investigation Act? Can we have the commitment now that the impediment which responsible lawyers in Canada

believe is created by this order in council will be removed so that the regular law of the land can apply, even though the people who suffer from that application might be the government of Canada?

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, the order in council itself has already been challenged in the courts, as the Leader of the Opposition may know, and it has been found by the courts to be a valid order in council.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): That is not the question; that is the problem.

Mr. Fraser: That just proves what he said.

Mr. Baldwin: We are talking about natural justice, not legality.

Mr. Trudeau: If we are talking about natural justice it seems to me—

Mr. Baldwin: You don't understand what natural justice is.

Mr. Trudeau: —the first precept would be to hear the other side of the question, which the opposition does not seem to want to do.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Fraser: You passed a law which says nobody can hear the other side of the question.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Shut up, big mouth.

Mr. Paproski: Listen to the red neck.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): The animal is back. Welcome back, animal.

Mr. Trudeau: I have given the understanding that I would do everything possible to permit the opposition and the Canadian public to debate this fairly, to know the reasons for the policy and so forth. I have said if that entails a change in the order in council, I will direct such a change to be brought in. But the essence of the question, as I explained yesterday, was to protect the Canadian people, producers and consumers. I repeat, the opposition may not agree with that. They are entitled to know the facts, so that they can debate this question properly. But if that policy is justified and if it means not letting competitors of the Canadian industry know certain data relating to that industry, then, obviously, there will have to be some embargo on the spreading of that particular knowledge. I repeat, this will depend on whether the opposition has the data at hand and whether or not it can debate the justification of this policy.

● (1120)

Mr. Clark: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. This regulation, in effect, will stop the Parliament of Canada and the people of Canada from having and pursuing data which might relate to illegal activities by the Government of Canada. I asked the Prime Minister a simple question: Will he give us a firm commitment, now, to remove the obstacle which now prevents Canadian citizens, including members of parliament, from taking the kind of legal action which would be open to us in normal cases but is closed to us in this case, because the Government of Canada has passed an order in council to give itself special protection against inquiry into illegal acts in which it may have been involved.

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, since the question is phrased in that way, I must say I disagree with the advice the hon. gentleman received from his lawyers. I would say that if the Government of Canada has acted illegally or if there is cause to believe this, there is no impediment in the courts to proceeding—

Mr. Stevens: What about the regulation.

Mr. Trudeau: And the regulation itself, I suggest, would not stand in the way of that.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): I am the law, says the Prime Minister.

ALLEGED URANIUM CARTEL—REASON FOR NOT PASSING LEGISLATION TO PROHIBIT EXTRATERRITORIAL APPLICATION OF LAW

Mr. Joe Clark (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, we can get a better legal opinion than that offered by the Prime Minister, and we have it. That legal opinion is that this order in council, passed by the government to protect itself from scrutiny, bars this party, any Canadian citizen or any member of parliament from proceeding in the courts or having an inquiry started under the Combines Investigation Act. I asked the Prime Minister to have that stopped. I have asked him three times to give us a simple, clear, unequivocal commitment that he will remove this obstacle directly.

I ask, why did the Prime Minister, as head of the government, choose not to follow the example set by the government of Australia which, when faced with a problem similar to that cited by the Prime Minister, simply passed legislation to prevent extra-territorial demands for information? This order in council, in contrast to what is happening in Australia where they respect the rights of their legislators and of the citizens, stops domestic inquiry into domestic matters. If the Prime Minister of Canada wanted to prevent extraterritorial demands for information, he could have done as Australia did and passed legislation. Why did he not do that? Why did he, instead, bring in this odious order in council which seriously restricts the rights and capacities to inquire of this parliament and of the people of Canada?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, in the second part of his question the Leader of the Opposition was arguing policy, arguing that another policy would have been more appropriate. This is what we are prepared to debate.

Miss MacDonald: We are concerned about the legal issue.

Mr. Grafftey: The Prime Minister's approach is Nixonian.

Mr. Stanfield: Yes, it reminds you of Richard Nixon.

Mr. Trudeau: On the first part of the question, I repeat what I said a moment ago. If the government of Canada or any person in this country has acted illegally, there is no impediment that would stand in front of the courts for attacking that illegality.

Mr. Clark: There is this impediment.

Mr. Trudeau: The Leader of the Opposition is showing an order in council—

Mr. Fraser: You wouldn't get through first year law school—

Mr. Trudeau: —and I hear from the hon. member for Vancouver South who is talking about law school. I do not think the remark is very appropriate in this context.

Mr. Fraser: I said you wouldn't get through first year law school with the argument you are advancing.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): You wouldn't even get passed *Cité Libre*.

Mr. Hees: You wouldn't get into law school.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: They might even take your degree back.

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, I am not sure it is appropriate for me to give legal advice to members opposite. Apparently they would not even listen to it, let alone understand it. If they had any courage, or if their lawyers had any courage and they believed what they are saying—

An hon. Member: Lay a charge.

Mr. Hees: It's the old broken record, Pierre.

Mr. Trudeau: If they had any courage—

Mr. Hees: Wind up that old gramophone.

Mr. Trudeau: —they would look at a piece of legislation that the right hon. member for Prince Albert brought in some years ago.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Trudeau: They don't even know about it.

Miss MacDonald: Just remember the War Measures Act.

Mr. Hees: Pierre, you need some new writers. You are running down.

Mr. Trudeau: Here.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): What are you going to do about that, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Hees: Throw him out.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. This line of questions and answers which began a while ago has degenerated into an argument over legal opinions which is really not appropriate to the question period. Because it consisted of questions being put in a serious vein by the Leader of the Opposition to the Prime Minister, I naturally extended considerable leniency in the scope of the questions. However, for some time now participants have been arguing over legal interpretations. It is really not germane to the question period in which strictly information is sought and not opinions, particularly not arguments over opinions sought outside the House. I think the hon. member for York-Simcoe wants to continue the line of questioning. Perhaps that might be permitted, but they will have to be factual rather than along the lines of legal opinion or advice.

ALLEGED URANIUM CARTEL—IDENTIFICATION OF LEGAL OPINION TO WHICH PRIME MINISTER REFERRED

Mr. Sinclair Stevens (York-Simcoe): Mr. Speaker, my question is also to the Prime Minister. It arises out of a statement by the Prime Minister and recorded in *Hansard* to the effect that he had a legal opinion from the Department of Justice of Canada to the effect that they were not infringing the Combines Act. In the hope that we can identify which legal opinion the Prime Minister is referring to, as there are several legal opinions referred to in various documents that we now have in our possession, will the Prime Minister indicate if the legal opinion to which he made reference yesterday was the one to which Mr. Jack Austin made reference during a meeting recorded in a memo between Mr. O. J. C. Runnalls to Mr. Austin dated June 15, 1972 in which Mr. Austin stated that it had been necessary to measure the risk of falling within the confines of the Combines Investigation Act. It had seemed to be a reasonable business risk to accept the arrangement up to 1977 but beyond that, however, the risk of infraction of the act was substantial. Is that the legal opinion that subsequently was forthcoming to which he referred yesterday? Mr. Austin, in the memo to which I have referred, ended up by stating that a regulation would be passed—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The question seems to be clear without further reference to the matter.

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of the memo that the hon. gentlemen is putting before the House. I am aware that when this policy was put together, it was done with the participation of the Department of Justice and the Deputy Attorney General. We envisaged, as we always do, what the proper way of implementing a policy is, that it is within the law. I have this assurance and this was done at the time by the deputy attorney general. In what form he expressed his opinion I have not yet ascertained, and I could

not say if it was done at the time of, or in relation to, the particular document quoted by the hon. gentleman.

● (1130)

Mr. Stevens: Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question is for the Prime Minister. Is the Prime Minister aware that the justice opinion that he is apparently referring to, on the basis of which he justifies the government's participation in this questionable affair, is actually part of a four point program of government accommodation conceived and drafted by the producers and fully orchestrated by them to give them, if I may quote from a memo, "some insulation"? Also Chief Justice Estey of Ontario is reported in a memo to have stated that "an opinion will be rendered by the Minister of Justice which will prevent any action under Canada law . . . at least as long as the present government is in power", to which a Gulf official is reported to have replied: "The political implications of"—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman is obviously entering into a debate. I indicated yesterday that we would welcome this debate. We will put every fact we have before parliament so it can debate this matter properly. Obviously, this game of putting statements on the record of which I have no knowledge may be profitable for the hon. gentleman, but I do not think it advances the question whether the government at that time either acted legally or illegally. Nor does it answer the question whether we did so in the interests of the Canadian people or not. We are anxious to have this debated—

Mr. Gillies: Can you act illegally in the interests of the Canadian people?

Mr. Trudeau: Well, Mr. Speaker, I understand another hon. gentleman has a question; perhaps you could recognize him.

ALLEGED URANIUM CARTEL—OBJECTIVE OF REGULATIONS

Mr. Sinclair Stevens (York-Simcoe): Mr. Speaker, my final supplementary question is also directed to the Prime Minister and I hope that he will have a view on this. Gulf officials, in a memo originating from Bermuda, indicated that the primary objective of the Canadian uranium export regulations is basically to implement the over-all cartel arrangement. A secondary objective is to implement the over-all cartel in the safest possible manner, with a view to the hazards of the combines act. Would the Prime Minister indicate if in fact they were the primary and secondary reasons for the regulation passed in 1972?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I repeat that I do not know the context of these documents. The hon. gentleman could ask any of his lawyer friends. It seems to me that that is the kind of thing a lawyer would say. He would want to advise you to do some things which would keep you out of the reach of the law. That is the way lawyers give advice. They want to make sure that their clients are not doing anything which is illegal. It seems to me that that is what this particular phrase is saying.

* * *

THE CANADIAN ECONOMY

REQUEST FOR ADOPTION OF DIRECT JOB-CREATING MEASURES

Mr. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Finance. Considering that the most recent report on Canadian profits which was published in today's press shows that corporate profit increases in Canada for the second quarter of this year averaged some 12 per cent, with more than half the groups surveyed increasing their profits from 13 to 31 per cent, and considering that the Minister of Finance has admitted that the budget's $1.2 billion tax incentives to business which will come on top of these profits are being unproductive in terms of job creation, I would ask the Minister of Finance whether he would now reconsider this $1.2 billion package as being both unproductive and unfair and reallocate the equivalent sum of money to direct job creation?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I would have to contest the assertion of the hon. gentleman that I at any stage admitted that the proposals in the budget will not be effective for the purpose of strengthening the Canadian economy and contributing particularly to employment. I would point out to him that one of the most significant ways in which to create additional employment, in particular in Canada, is through additional investment in the public sector—

Mr. Broadbent: The private sector.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): —the private sector, thank you very much. The best way of attracting that kind of investment is to make sure that it is going to gain a return. I think even the hon. member would be able to understand that an investment which is going to get a return is in the interests of all Canadians, and in that sense the hon. member should favour the proposal.

Mr. Broadbent: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Considering that a manufacturing sector operating only at 80 per cent capacity because of a fall in domestic demand and other reasons is most unlikely to use these kinds of incentives to expand unused facilities any further, a fact which the President of the Treasury Board alluded to when he said that the budget has failed and which the Prime Minister alluded to when he said that the budget has failed in terms of job creation, I would ask him to follow up on his Freudian slip when he said that the way to create jobs now is through public investment and assure the House that before we come back in the fall the government will take some initiative to create jobs for the one million Canadians who need them.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Speaker, I would just like to point out to the hon. gentleman, as he knows, that when he

says that the President of the Treasury Board says the budget has failed it is a falsehood, and he knows that it is false. We are keeping the economy under careful examination. At the same time we must be concerned about a recurrence of inflation and the impact of unemployment. It is to maintain a balance between the two that we have been following this policy. If indeed as time moves on there has to be a change in that policy we will make it. It seems clear to us at the moment that we should not depart from the basic policy, which is directed at trying to restore private investment in this country and at the same time not increase inflation.

Mr. Broadbent: A final supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. The Minister of Finance said that I had said something which is false. I repeat what I have just said, that he himself, the President of the Treasury Board and the Prime Minister in recent weeks have said that the private sector is not doing what they believe ought to have been done in terms of job creation, and that the budget measures presumably related to that have not been successful. I repeat that.

In view of these concessions made publicly in recent weeks, and in view of the Minister of Finance's own commitment made a few weeks ago that during the first week of August the government would make a decision on some new job creation efforts, I would ask the Minister of Finance whether we are now going to get those new job creation efforts, or is the Minister of Finance saying to the people of Canada that they can freeze in the dark in the coming winter in terms of new job efforts by the government?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Speaker, I would just repeat to the hon. gentleman that it is quite false to say that the Prime Minister, the President of the Treasury Board or I have made this statement which the hon. gentleman alleges. He would know if he examined the record that there is absolutely no foundation for those allegations.

Mr. Broadbent: Read the papers.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): I have read the papers. I know what the hon. gentleman says and it is pure invention on his part. With regard to the question of further measures for this winter, as I have said there is an additional quarter of a billion dollars going into direct employment measures this coming winter. I indicated that we would be conducting an examination, as indeed we have, of the current state of the economy to determine whether we should decide on further public investment at this time. We have decided not to change the fiscal framework at this time for this purpose. Obviously, we will have to watch the economy carefully during the balance of the summer and in the fall to see if further changes in fiscal or financial policy will have to be made.

[*Translation*]

INDUSTRY

SHOES—FINDINGS OF ANTI-DUMPING TRIBUNAL—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Léonel Beaudoin (Richmond): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce.

Can the minister tell the House whether he can live up to the commitment he made on July 19 concerning the position he or the government will take about the obvious conclusions of the interim report of the Anti-dumping Tribunal which is investigating the footwear situation in Canada?

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, we are now consulting with manufacturers, importers and consumer associations to determine what would be the best policy; we had meetings last week and this week and we hope to be able to announce a policy on this subject in the near future.

REQUEST FOR CONTROL OF LEATHER GOODS IMPORTS

Mr. Léonel Beaudoin (Richmond): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary. Can the minister tell us whether the manufacturers will be able to have better cooperation from the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce in the future as far as the import of footwear and of related products such as leather, etc, is concerned?

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): I do not know what the hon. member is alluding to; my department is always prepared to co-operate with all industrial sectors in Canada.

* * *

● (1140)

[*English*]

COMBINES

ALLEGED URANIUM CARTEL—KNOWLEDGE OF LEGAL ADVISER OF EFFECT OF ARRANGEMENT ON DOMESTIC PRICES

Mr. James Gillies (Don Valley): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the right hon. Prime Minister, which refers to the cartel arrangement the government entered into. Any documentation we have seen concerning this cartel, or any legal opinion, seems to suggest it was either illegal, or if not that, it would not effect a restriction of a reduction of prices to Canadian consumers. I should like to ask the Prime Minister if the legal opinion he has indicating that this cartel was legal is based upon knowledge that it would in fact fix prices and raise prices to Canadian consumers?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I repeat what I said earlier. The arrangement was put together with the participation of the deputy attorney general of

Canada. Obviously he knew what the arrangement was. I suppose it was evident that this would be the effect—that prices would be set. Our opinion was that this was a legal arrangement and we proceeded with it.

* * *

ENERGY

ALLEGED URANIUM CARTEL—GOVERNMENT'S KNOWLEDGE OF EFFECT OF ARRANGEMENT ON DOMESTIC PRICES

Mr. James Gillies (Don Valley): Mr. Speaker, an examination of the documents seems to indicate that the Canadian representatives were of the opinion that it would not be applied in Canada and would not affect prices to Canadian consumers.

Perhaps I could direct my question to the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources and ask him, as the principal agent of this conspiracy, whether he knew it would have the effect of raising prices to Canadian utilities such as Ontario Hydro, or if he believed, as the early discussions seemed to indicate, that it would not have that effect on domestic Canadian prices? Who conned whom? Did the government know that by entering into this agreement it would be raising prices to Canadian public utilities to the extent that the prices went up? They went up almost 300 per cent. Did the government know this was the penalty they were imposing upon Canadian consumers, when it entered into that arrangement?

Mr. Clark: Did its lawyers know?

Mr. Gillies: And, did its lawyers know?

Hon. Alastair Gillespie (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, it has been made very clear many times that this arrangement was aimed at export sales and it was aimed at stabilizing the remaining markets of the world, which at that time represented only 30 per cent of the market. It was being competed for by the producers of at least five major countries. As the hon. member may know, at that time the price of uranium was lower in many instances than the cost of uranium. For those reasons, if there had not been such a cartel arrangement, to use the hon. member's words, then in all probability there would not have been a viable uranium industry today.

Mr. Stevens: Baloney!

Mr. Hees: Why don't you answer the question?

Mr. Gillespie: The second aspect of the hon. member's question seems to imply that as a result of this producers' arrangement the price, which was then somewhere in the order of $5, went up to $40 a pound. If the hon. member has looked at the circumstances, he must know that the main increase in price occurred after the oil price increase. Second, he must know that the price of the arrangement in all respects, except for one month, was lower than the United States domestic price.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

COMBINES

ALLEGED URANIUM CARTEL—POSSIBILITY OF CHARGES BEING LAID

Mr. James Gillies (Don Valley): Mr. Speaker, obviously the minister did not answer the question. If he is trying to say to the people of Canada that this cartel was put together to keep prices down, that is just absolutely inconceivable.

I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. If it can be demonstrated that the action of this cartel was to fix prices and limit production in Canada, which is clearly in contravention of the competition act, will the minister lay charges, as it is his duty and responsibility to do? Will he lay charges under the law? This arrangement has been expensive to Canadian people. Will he lay those charges, if we give him the documentation?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The minister may want to make some response; but I cannot overlook the fact that the question in its basic terms is hypothetical. The hon. member may wish to rephrase his question and the minister may want to make some response. I am not restricting the minister; but surely there could not be a more basically hypothetical question than the one put by the hon. member for Don Valley.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

An hon. Member: Let him comment.

Hon. A. C. Abbott (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I completely endorse Your Honour's view that the question is hypothetical.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Abbott: The fact is that the government—

Mr. Clark: It makes one wonder about its source.

Mr. Abbott: —in carrying out this measure did so in consultation with the bureau of competition policy. The government received the advice of its law officers. The project was proceeded with as a legally proper action by the government.

The hon. member is asserting that it is an illegal action. I would reiterate that the Prime Minister's point is simply this: if such a belief exists, then action should be taken by those who say so to prove so.

An hon. Member: We can't!

* * *

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

ALLEGED URANIUM CARTEL—REQUEST FOR IMMUNITY FROM PROSECUTION FOR POSSESSION OF DOCUMENTS

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the right hon. Prime Minister. His anxiety to debate in this House the legality of the proceedings, which the government took in conjunction with the companies, is evident

and also the propriety of the regulation passed to prevent information from being given. We have some problems in getting the proper information or documentation upon which we can debate intelligently. I note a hint from what Your Honour said yesterday that until there has been clear danger to a member of the House we may not be able to find there is a breach of privilege. I would find it difficult to debate this issue from the cell which might be occupied more properly by other people.

I should like to ask the Prime Minister if he would be prepared to give the same absolution to members of this House and their counsel as the Minister of Justice gave those involved in the 1972 cartel, in order that we will be free to obtain the necessary documentation and papers to prepare our case in this House, and if necessary, for the purpose of laying charges outside the House under the act? Will the Prime Minister give us the same privilege as his government extended to the companies involved in the cartel?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, that seems to be a rather circumlocutive way to ask if the hon. member can attack the government on its alleged illegal behaviour. My answer earlier was that he certainly could. If he feels the government has acted illegally, if he feels that due process is not possible in this, and if he feels that the order in council does not permit him to have due process in this country, then I think they should attack the order in council under the Bill of Rights. The right hon. member for Prince Albert might be able to advise them on that. When I was trying to explain earlier I was just talking to a howling mob, and I do not think that is conducive to finding out the truth.

An hon. Member: Swing it again.

Mr. Baldwin: Mr. Speaker, now that we have descended into a quiet, judicial atmosphere where we can have an intelligent examination and cross-examination, will the Prime Minister answer the last part of my question? Is he prepared to consult with his Minister of Justice so that we can have assurance on this side of the House that we will be able to properly and legally obtain the documentation required to make our case in the House, and if necessary, on the advice of counsel outside the House, for prosecution under the Combines Investigation Act? Will he give us that assurance?

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, I am sure the hon. gentleman knows that neither the Minister of Justice, nor anyone else, can absolve in advance anyone from committing an illegality. If the government of Canada has committed an illegality, this will be proved in the courts.

• (1150)

Some hon. Members: How?

Mr. Trudeau: It will not be proved by any defence or legal opinion of the Department of Justice. It will be proved in the courts.

The next question is: How does one prove it in the courts. To this, I have two answers—I feel I am giving very valuable legal advice to members who probably do not appreciate it. But there are two ways. The first is to go to the minister of energy under the regulations, under the regulation in the second paragraph, and ask him for any information which is felt to be needed in order to test the government on the legality of its position. And if he refuses, I tell the opposition that they should find lawyers who are prepared to consult with the right hon. gentleman from Prince Albert—

An hon. Member: And take a chance.

Mr. Trudeau: And take a chance, Mr. Speaker. When you go before the courts and you believe in your legal case, when you are not simply involved in political histrionics such as we have seen in the past couple of days, you don't fool around; you go to a lawyer, you take the government to the courts and you prove your case and you have the courage to do it.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

* * *

HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN

POSSIBILITY OF ATTENDANCE AT OPENING OF PARLIAMENT

Mr. Speaker: The right hon. member for Prince Albert.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Prince Albert): Mr. Speaker, I do not rise for the purpose of accepting the accolade the Prime Minister has just given me. But I do appreciate the welcome I have received from the House of Commons today and if I had the athletic capacity of the Prime Minister I would do either a pirouette or, if I might use the proper expression, the kick which he performed this morning in the House.

Again, I wish to ask the Prime Minister the question I asked him earlier concerning the possibility of Her Majesty the Queen opening parliament. I am wondering whether he is in a position to tell us what the situation is.

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): We on this side are very glad to welcome the right hon. gentleman back to the House of Commons. This is not only because of our great affection for him, which is well known and which was established, I believe, in the month of June of this year, but because he is an expert in due process and I am sure he would be an addition to his caucus at this time.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Trudeau: I am not sure whether the right hon. gentleman was away when I answered this question a short time ago. I said I had invited Her Majesty in a hypothetical form—in other words, if we were able to open parliament at the time of her visit, would she be prepared to read the Speech from the

Throne. She graciously accepted, as I believe I reported to the House, at which time I indicated that the date of the opening of parliament would only be known with certainty when parliament opens.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Trudeau: We are not certain, now, when parliament will close. The various parties are consulting on the possibility of sitting beyond today and it may be that our plans for having parliament open on October 18 will not materialize. However, for the time being we are still planning on that assumption and it is on that basis I invited Her Majesty and she accepted.

* * *

GRAIN

WHEAT—POSSIBILITY OF INCREASE IN DOMESTIC PRICE

Mr. Lorne Nystrom (Yorkton-Melville): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the minister in charge of the Wheat Board. The hon. gentleman told the House recently that the two-price wheat policy was under review. I should like to ask him whether he has completed this review and if so whether there will be an upward adjustment in the price along the lines recommended by the wheat pool, namely, from $3.25 for domestic wheat sold in this country to $4 a bushel. If he has completed the review will he announce his policy today and make any increase retroactive?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, a final decision has not yet been taken, but is imminent.

FEED GRAIN—POSSIBILITY OF CHANGE IN POLICY

Mr. Lorne Nystrom (Yorkton-Melville): I wish to ask a supplementary question which also has to do with the price of grain. In the last two years, the price of feed grain sold outside the Wheat Board has been less than the price received for feed grain sold within the Wheat Board. When he brought down his new policy, the minister made a commitment that this would not happen. Since the policy has obviously failed, is the hon. gentleman now considering placing feed grains under the Wheat Board or, at least, conducting a plebiscite which would enable the farmers to decide how they wish to sell feed grain.

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): The hon. member is completely falsifying the record in relation to anything I said about prices of grain. There were expressions of protection in relation to the guarantee and initial prices, but in the ordinary course of events when there are quotas on Wheat Board grains and an open quota on non-Wheat Board grain it is to be expected that the non-Board price would fall somewhat below the Board price. That was always the broad expectation although, of course, market forces work in different ways.

[Mr. Trudeau.]

TRANSPORT

CROWSNEST PASS RATE—MINISTERS' VIEW ON RETENTION

Mr. Lorne Nystrom (Yorkton-Melville): Since this may be the last day upon which we shall sit until October, can the minister clarify certain statements he has made about the Crow rate? Can he tell us once and for all that he agrees with what the Hall Commission is saying and that the Crow rate must stay.

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I have emphasized in the House that I fully support the Hall Commission's statement. The Hall Commission said emphatically that the Crow rate should remain statutory and made permanent protection, and I endorse that position completely. But the Hall Commission did go on to say a number of other things which need reconciliation in terms of the rate and products carried, and this raises some difficult questions.

* * *

CRIMINAL CODE

REQUEST FOR AMENDMENT TO DEAL WITH SEX RELATED MURDER

Mr. Otto Jelinek (High Park-Humber Valley): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Justice and it is further to my motion dealing with the brutal sex murder of 12-year old Manuel Jaques of Toronto. Could the minister tell us what action the government is taking or intends to take in order to minimize such dastardly incidents, bearing in mind that officials of both the city of Toronto and of the province of Ontario are taking action within their own jurisdictions? Such action may be a step in the right direction but I believe much broader federal action is necessary in order to discourage any such further incidents. What is this action to be?

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Justice): I share the concern of the hon. member and of the people of Toronto about this matter. All the alleged activities involved would appear to be criminal offences already and therefore subject to the enforcement of the Criminal Code provisions. I am continuing discussions with my provincial counterparts in connection with certain aspects of pornography, and as a result of our most recent discussions in June my officials are examining, in consultation with provincial officials, possible amendments to the Criminal Code in relation to pornography. However, I emphasize that the activities alleged to have been committed in Toronto are clearly contrary to the law and a matter for law enforcement.

● (1200)

SUGGESTED AMENDMENT PROVIDING CAPITAL PUNISHMENT FOR CERTAIN TYPES OF MURDER

Mr. Otto Jelinek (High Park-Humber Valley): Mr. Speaker, I have one supplementary question. In view of the minister's answer and because sex related murders as well as the murder of police officers, as has occurred in the incident here

in Ottawa recently, continue to take place even after the House passed the Capital Punishment bill against the wishes of the great majority of Canadians, would the minister consider introducing legislation which would make sexually related murders as well as murders of prison guards and police officers punishable by death? If not, would the minister consider approaching cabinet about including the question of capital punishment by way of a referendum in the next federal election?

Mr. Speaker: That is clearly a recommendation.

* * *

CUSTOMS

PROPOSAL TO PROHIBIT PORNOGRAPHY FROM ENTERING CANADA

Mrs. Simma Holt (Vancouver-Kingsway): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of National Revenue. In view of the fact that Criminal Code section 159(8) clearly defines obscenity, and that pornography is obscenity in its most gross and extreme form, and given that all pornography brought into Canada is the product of organized crime in the United States, and given the fact that the main Canadian distributor is well known in Canada as being Maclean-Hunter publishing Company—

Some hon. Members: Right.

Mrs. Holt: —and given the fact that these products not only require illegal use of children, animals and adults for illustration but also counsel law breaking in their texts, will the Minister of National Revenue move to halt all pornography entering Canada?

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. This seems to be clearly a representation, as was the case of the question put by the hon. member for High Park-Humber Valley.

* * *

Mr. Walter Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order dealing with the matter that was raised by the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) a few moments ago. I say with some regret that a number of questioners on the matter of the uranium cartel, because of the shortness of time could not put their questions. I want to make that clear. I rise because I think the Prime Minister may have inadvertently misled the House. He indicated that some discussions were going on now regarding the extension of the period of sittings of the House while we are here. I must say to him that that is not so. There have been no discussions at all amongst the representatives of the parties about extending the sittings of the House for any purpose whatsoever. That is the first point.

The Prime Minister alluded, in the course of his remarks, to the fact that he would be interested in having a debate at some time to be agreed upon. I presume he would have no objection to a debate on Monday, Tuesday or Wednesday of next week—and I am not limiting myself to time when I say that—so this matter can be completely dealt with. I want to make it quite clear to the Prime Minister and to the government House leader that there is no objection on this side of the House to having a debate on this issue, but there is and would be great objection to having such a debate if it were conducted without the documents which have been referred to being tabled in the House of Commons so that all all members of the House have access to them.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): It would seem absolutely fruitless, on one hand, for a debate on such a matter as this to be carried on under the shroud of this odious order in council, as it has been described rather benevolently and, on the other hand, for a debate to be carried on in the face of the failure of the government to produce the documents upon which this debate would take place. Moreover, I think that regardless of whether the debate and further action will take place in the House or in the courts, it would be difficult, if not impossible—and the government knows this—to prosecute the case, whether or not there is courage to do so, and there would be little point and no advantage gained in prosecuting the case outside or inside the House without the production of the documents.

These are the conditions upon which any debate should take place in the House, and I presume that either the Prime Minister or the Minister of Justice (Mr. Basford) or perhaps the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Gillespie), would be prepared to rise in their place in the House now and indicate that they and their officials have authority to release to Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition and to any other member of parliament who wishes to have them the documents which were intended to be enveloped, enshrouded and hidden away in the order in council entitled "Security of Information".

In the course of this point of order I invite the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources to authorize any person, organization or corporation who has these documents to release them for the purpose of a debate in the House and in the interests of justice and full disclosure of truth with respect to this matter. I now invite him to say that all organizations which have these documents, including his own department and any other agency, can now disclose them and that, in aiding this process, he will do the courageous and honourable thing and table these documents in the House.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Alastair Gillespie (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, I am not in the position, as the hon. member clearly must know, to give that kind of "carte blanche" order with respect to a very large number of documents of a confidential nature, documents which involve not just the Canadian government but arrangements between the Canadian government and other foreign governments. Clearly, the hon. member could not expect this. If he thought for one

moment that I could give him that undertaking, then I can only consider his question to be a very frivolous question.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

* * *

PRIVILEGE

MR. BALDWIN—MEMBERS' RIGHTS RESPECTING ORDERS IN COUNCIL—RULING BY MR. SPEAKER

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Before allowing the hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby (Mr. Broadbent) to state his question of privilege, I should like to deal with the question of privilege raised yesterday by the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin). The hon. member interpreted correctly the preliminary opinion I gave yesterday, which I now confirm.

I should like to make reference to a ruling I made on March 17 of this year which was with reference to a very similar question of privilege raised by the hon. member for Peace River. I think it is important to understand that the Chair should not attempt to decipher legal opinions and decide between one and another legal opinion. Furthermore, the Chair should not attempt to decide whether or not government action is technically or legally justified.

The Chair has to decide on questions of procedure and whether they extend into the area of privilege. Privilege, while it goes beyond procedure into substance, does in fact, for obvious reasons, have a strict definition. That strict definition has been repeated many times in the past, and it relates to actual interference with a member of parliament in the discharge of his or her duties. In fact, the hon. member for Peace River referred to this order in council as being a potential interference in that regard. Were it an actual interference, it would be a different situation so far as the argument is concerned. At the moment, I think all hon. members will agree that if there is the interference described in the terms put forward yesterday by the hon. member for Peace River, it is potential in nature and not actual. Therefore, I reiterate the ruling I gave on March 17 in respect of some regulations that were passed at that time which had a similar potential effect.

While members are expressing fear that the effect of this order in council might be to restrict them in the transportation, use or release of documents in their possession, unless the restriction has taken place I believe it would be an unwarranted extension of the definition of privilege for the Chair to indicate that the danger of that taking place, rather than the actuality of it, constituted a question of privilege. Therefore, I set aside the question of privilege raised by the hon. member for Peace River yesterday.

● (1210)

MR. BROADBENT—ANSWER OF MINISTER OF FINANCE DURING ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

Mr. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege. It pertains to a very serious

[Mr. Gillespie.]

accusation made by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Macdonald). He has totally mismanaged the Canadian economy, and rather than acknowledging that, he makes accusations about hon. members when they try to put the record straight. The minister said earlier in the question period that what I said was false and that I knew it was false. That is a serious accusation for one member to make about another member of the House, and I do not take it lightly.

I want to document for the minister what other ministers have said on the subject of the failure of the budget, including the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau), and then I will let the Minister of Finance repeat his accusation, if he wants to. The point I made during the question period is that a variety of ministers of the Crown have acknowledged the failure of the budget to create jobs by stimulating the private sector. It was that which the Minister of Finance said was a false description of what had been said. I see he is nodding his head.

I have reference here to three ministers who support the question I put to the Minister of Finance. The judgment of these three ministers is that the budget has failed. The first judgment was made by the President of Treasury Board (Mr. Andras) in a speech, appropriately enough, to the Canadian Manufacturers Association in Toronto on July 12. He was talking about the failure of the Canadian economy to create jobs and, related to that and entirely appropriately, to growing feelings of disunity in the country. At that time the President of Treasury Board said, and I quote from his text:

—pressure is building to substitute public spending on direct public sector job creation . . . and there will be very heavy pressure indeed if significant private sector employment increase, through expanded or new activity, is not forthcoming soon.

The whole thrust of that part of the speech of the President of Treasury Board was that the private sector was not producing the jobs that the government expected it would in its earlier budget. In addition to the President of the Treasury Board, I would like to quote the Minister of Finance himself. In a newspaper article which appeared in the Toronto *Star* on July 22 we find the following:

The federal government may be forced to spend more on emergency job creation if business investment doesn't pick up soon, says finance minister Donald Macdonald.

"We will have to make a decision by the end of this month," he told the *Star* yesterday. If government projections indicate investment is not going to improve in the next few months, "perhaps we'll have to step in."

Later in the same article it says:

In his March budget, Macdonald provided $1.2 billion in tax cuts for companies in the hope they would expand and create more jobs.

Yesterday, he admitted the strategy wasn't working.

The story continues in the same vein. Finally, I would like to refer to the Prime Minister. In the same article pertaining to the failure of the budget to create jobs, in the judgment of the Minister of Finance, the Prime Minister is quoted as having said earlier in the week—

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Where?

Mr. Broadbent: The source I have is a Toronto *Star* article, and it put the words of the Prime Minister in quotation marks.

I will try to track it down for the minister, but in the last 40 minutes it has been hard for me to find anything more specific than words attributed directly to the Prime Minister. The Prime Minister is reported to have said that the private sector "has not taken up the slack which was provided for it in the budget".

The President of the Treasury Board, the Minister of Finance, and the Prime Minister all passed judgment, explicitly or implicitly, on the failure of the budget to create jobs—and if that does not support the questions I asked, I do not know what does. If the Minister of Finance has any respect for truth—even if he has no concern about job creation—I suggest he withdraw the accusation he made when he said that what I said was false.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, right at the start I will withdraw the comment I made that the hon. gentleman was misleading the House. I recognize that under the rules of this House, whatever my personal belief, I am not entitled to say that any other hon. member is deliberately setting out to mislead. Therefore, I can say that the statements the hon. gentleman made were false, and I think he has shown on the record that they are false. However, I am not accusing, and I withdraw any accusation that he is trying to mislead.

What I am saying is that he just does not know any better. The remarks made by the hon. member do not at all reinforce the arguments he made. He said that ministers had acknowledged—and I have not seen the blues yet—and admitted that the budget had failed. I have spoken to my colleagues, the President of the Treasury Board (Mr. Andras) and the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau), in this regard and they both affirm that they have never at any time said that. In addition, the quotations read by the hon. gentleman do not support that whatsoever. The quotations he read are, "We may be forced to spend more if business does not pick up soon," and, "Perhaps we will have to step in". Both quotations refer to possible future measures. In other words, that is what I said to the hon. gentlemen—indeed, also in response to the hon. gentleman's colleague in this House—and I think it is significant that the Leader of the NDP chose to refer to press reports rather than statements actually made by me in response to his colleague right here in the House.

I would like to refer the hon. gentleman to the response I gave on July 21 to his colleague, the hon. member for Waterloo-Cambridge (Mr. Saltsman). In that response he will find the position I took at that time and the position I have been taking consistently. As recorded at page 7860 of *Hansard*, I said the following:

> Mr. Speaker, I am not considering a fall budget. However, at the end of this month I will be having an analysis of the first quarter returns, and as much as is available on the second quarter returns, made to determine whether in the absence of private expenditure some additional public expenditure—additional to that announced by my colleague the other day—will be desirable for this coming winter.

In response to questions today, I said that we have made that analysis and decided that with the present balance between inflation and unemployment in the economy we should not make further public expenditure at this time. I think it is fair to say, in reply to the hon. gentleman, that that statement is clearly on the record. I will examine very closely the quotations he has made, but on the face of them I suggest that they bear absolutely no support for the proposition which the hon. gentleman put forward, that ministers have acknowledged that the budget has failed. There is nothing in the record, either in *Hansard* or in the statements he has quoted, which supports in one whit the allegations he has made. I cannot say he was trying to mislead the House, and I withdraw that, but I say the statement was false.

Mr. John Rodriguez (Nickel Belt): Mr. Speaker, I rise on the same question of privilege. The House has just heard the Minister of Finance (Mr. Macdonald) say that there is nothing in *Hansard* and nothing on the record indicating that government ministers or the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) have indicated that the measures to stimulate the private sector have failed, in terms of producing jobs. I refer the minister to page 7829 of *Hansard* for July 20, 1977. On that day I asked the Prime Minister the following question:

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

The Prime Minister answered as follows:

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

The clear indication and implication from that response is that the budget measures have not served the purpose for which they were designed. The minister is deliberately trying to obfuscate the issue by accusing my leader and by saying that he is misleading the House. The Prime Minister himself has clearly indicated that the measures in the budget are not solving the problem.

● (1220)

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Any vestige of a question of privilege vanished when the Minister of Finance (Mr. Macdonald) rose in his place to withdraw allegations concerning any deliberate misleading of the House. However, he said during the question period that there had been some misleading, or that something said by the hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby (Mr. Broadbent) was false. The hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby was given time to raise the matter as a question of privilege. The Minister of Finance responded and withdrew his allegations suggesting the hon. member had been

deliberately misleading the House. Any other arguments seem to me to relate to the interpretation of answers given or statements made. That becomes a matter of debate and discussion, and not a question of privilege.

MR. STEVENS—RULING BY MR. SPEAKER ON QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE OF MR. BALDWIN

Mr. Sinclair Stevens (York-Simcoe): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege which arises from the ruling Your Honour made on the question of privilege raised by the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin). As I understood the thrust of your ruling, you came down against the motion my colleague proposed to move, on the basis that there was no infringement, other than an apprehended infringement, of the rights of members of parliament with respect to the regulation concerning the security of information regulation with respect to the uranium question.

My question of privilege is this. In my case there has already been an infringement, in my view, of my right to perform as a member of parliament in this House. I requested a large Toronto law firm to review the documentation I had at my disposal, to determine to what extent they felt an offence had been committed and, second, to what extent they felt that offence had been committed not only by officials of companies in the private sector but by certain members of the government as well. They considered the question. Upon my drawing their attention to the regulation to which I have referred, they said they felt they could no longer continue to even review the documentation, or to advise me on the subject, as they themselves might be charged under the provisions of the Atomic Energy Control Act.

The chap with whom I was dealing said he would discuss it with two of his partners. He telephoned me again in two hours and said they both felt unanimously that there was no way they could participate in the formation of an opinion with respect to this matter. Within one hour, the documents in their entirety were returned to my Toronto office.

An hon. Member: Obviously, you did not have a case.

Mr. Stevens: Mr. Speaker, the second infringement occurred in this manner. I planned to go to the United States in order to review certain documents which had been made available to us in the United States. Members of a Toronto law firm agreed to go down to attend and review the documents with me. Subsequently, within 12 hours of our leaving for the United States, they told me they could not go on the trip. They felt they could not review the documents because of the impact of the regulations to which we have been referring.

In short, in two instances legal counsel of two large law firms in Toronto said that they felt the regulation was so all-embracing and so wide that they would risk being charged even if they simply reviewed the documentation with a view to giving me an opinion as to what the legal consequences might be of actions taken by certain individuals as revealed in those documents. That, in essence, is my question of privilege. If you find a prima facie case, I propose to move the following motion:

That the question of my inability as a member of this House to consult with counsel on the question of a uranium cartel and seek legal opinion as to action being taken with reference thereto be referred to the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I feel that the point raised by the hon. member for York-Simcoe (Mr. Stevens), a point raised in discussion yesterday, was met in the ruling I gave today. Perhaps, in fairness, I should have expanded on the point because it is significant. The hon. member's argument put forward today is essentially the same argument as he put forward in support of the question yesterday.

I say I think the point has been met for this reason. Surely the Chair ought not to be called upon to comment on the correctness or adequacy of a legal opinion. The hon. member did not say to me that he, as a member of parliament, could not have the documents in his possession. In fact, he said today that he had the documents in his possession and turned them over to his counsel. Counsel returned the documents saying that under the impact of the law counsel ought not to proceed to look at the documents or give an opinion. Surely I cannot say if that is a correct or incorrect legal opinion. Surely it is beyond the scope of the chairman of this assembly to determine if that is right or wrong. If the hon. member had indicated to me that he could not get the documents with which to go to the lawyers as a member of parliament, then I would say the point had been met. Similarly, the point arises in connection with the hon. member's going out of the country to have access—

An hon. Member: Shame.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. To go on in the same vein, the hon. member intended to go elsewhere to examine documents and indicated that he requested counsel to accompany him. Counsel said, "Under the impact of that order in council, as I read it, I would not go with you because I am afraid of breaking the law." But that does not prevent the hon. member himself from going to examine the documents. After all, privilege is confined to the ability of a member to fulfil his obligations as a member of the House of Commons. Surely it does not call on the Chair to pass an opinion upon the competence of a legal opinion.

On the question of whether the lawyers gave a correct opinion or an incorrect opinion, that is a decision I do not want to make, and in any circumstances do not think the Chair should make. If the hon. member had indicated that he had not been able to get the documents to seek a legal opinion, I would think that would be a much different matter. But asking the Chair to pass on the validity of an opinion seems to me to go far beyond that which is required of the Chair in assessing privilege.

MR. BAKER (GRENVILLE-CARLETON)—ANSWER OF MINISTER OF ENERGY, MINES AND RESOURCES

Mr. Walter Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a personal question of privilege which relates to this matter and which arose during the course of the question of privilege and point of order I raised earlier to which the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Gillespie) responded. I do so on the basis of the dictum which Your Honour just pronounced. Your Honour said this, and I think I took most of the words down: First, privilege is confined to the ability of the member of parliament to perform his function or carry out his duty; second, if the point relates to whether or not the member of parliament was able to obtain the documents in order to obtain a legal opinion, it might be a completely different question.

Sir, during the course of my point of order I put a specific question to the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources which he did not have to answer but chose to answer. He said my question was frivolous, that I ought to know better than ask such a question, and he made certain other disparaging remarks I am prepared to let pass. The important point is this: he refused to table those documents and thereby make them available to me, at my request as a member of parliament, to do with them what I will in my capacity as a member of parliament, which could include the seeking of a legal opinion. I do not want Your Honour to be "hung up" on legal opinions. As a member of parliament, I have duties other than the obtaining of legal opinions. One of my duties is to know what is happening in any given situation.

The situation in which I now find myself may be different from that of the hon. member for York-Simcoe (Mr. Stevens), but fits exactly the conditions set out in your last decision. I should like to have those documents tabled, naturally. I now believe I am raising the valid question of privilege which the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin) sought to raise but did not put forward, according to Your Honour's judgment. Your Honour also ruled that the hon. member for York-Simcoe had not raised a valid question of privilege. Therefore, sir—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Before the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton (Mr. Baker) continues, I want to be clear as to what he is saying. Is he suggesting to me that the Chair ought to find that there is a case of privilege in every application by a member of the House of Commons for documents which is not met with the tabling of documents? Obviously, I cannot extend the area of privilege to that point.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): I did not argue that.

Mr. Speaker: Applications for documents have followed a well known procedure in the House, namely, the request for the tabling of documents. Surely the hon. member is not asking me to find that if a request for documents is met with a refusal, until the request is specific, is met with an argument or transferred for debate under motions for the production of documents, that that constitutes privilege. I need to have clear ground if a member indicates to me that in attempting to fulfil the special obligations upon a member of this House of Commons the member has been prevented from carrying out those obligations. The definitions are well known. There is a regular process for the tabling of documents. Applications by members for tabling of government documents is well known. It is available to all members.

● (1230)

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, the question is much broader than that. It is not merely a procedural point. It should be apparent to everyone in this House that it is not a mere question of procedure. The order in council that has been dealt with in the past few days reads as follows:

> No person who has in his possession or under his control any note, document, or other written or printed material in any way related to conversations, discussions or meetings that took place between January 1, 1972, and December 31, 1975, involving that person or any other person or any government, Crown corporation, agency or other organization in respect of the production, import, export, transportation, refining, possession, ownership, use or sale of uranium or its derivatives or compounds, shall
>
> (a) release any such note, document or material, or disclose or communicate the contents thereof to any person, government, Crown corporation, agency or other organization unless
>
> (1) he is required to do so by or under a law of Canada, or
>
> (ii) he does so with the consent—

It is not just a mere question of procedure. This is not a mere tabling of documents. What has happened to the public of Canada and to this House over which Your Honour presides is that by your ruling, a member of parliament, before he would have a question of privilege, would have to commit an offence and be in jail—that is, before he would have a question of privilege with respect to this matter.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Before the hon. member interprets my language for me—and I want to give him full amplitude to develop his argument—I want to make it clear that he must establish something that comes within the four corners of privilege as we have known them within the classic definition of privilege, the interference with a member in the performance of his duties.

The hon. member for York-Simcoe (Mr. Stevens) indicated that he had documentation, sent it to his lawyers and his lawyers said they could not give him an opinion on it. That is their opinion. Surely the Chair is not called upon to say whether that is right or wrong. The member was not in a position to say he attempted to get documentation which was refused to him on the basis of this order in council, or that it was documentation that had been refused on grounds of confidentiality or relationship with other government, or one of several other standards. Bear in mind that in applications for documents by members of the House of Commons there are several grounds upon which the government has, and does, regularly refuse production of documents to members of this House.

If an application is made for documentation with respect to a certain negotiation, the application is made in this House

and the minister rises in his place and says they will not produce that document because it relates to confidential negotiations, does the member rise in his place and say that he is asking for a document, he cannot get it and that is a question of privilege? Surely not. There must be something more than the inability of members to be able to get the tabling of that document.

The hon. member for Grenville-Carleton (Mr. Baker) stood in his place today—by way of a point of order, by the way—and said to the minister the honourable thing to do would be to stand up and agree to table all of these documents. The minister said, "Of course I cannot agree to table all documents until I know what documents they are and what restrictions they might be under." Does that constitute a question of privilege? How can I bring that within the definition of privilege? I am not in any way saying that the member has to go and steal the documents from the minister. Surely that is not an accurate interpretation of the language I have used. Surely there must be more than some sort of refusal to produce documents on the classic grounds that have been known in the past.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): I apologize to you, Mr. Speaker, but I cannot comprehend the corner in which the House now finds itself. We have not suggested that before I or any other member would have a question of privilege there has to be a theft of the documents.

Mr. Nielsen: Those were not your words.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Those were not my words. That was not my interpretation of Your Honour's words. Moreover, the question is not whether the Chair must decide whether the lawyer, in expressing the opinion that he could not give an opinion, is right or wrong. That is not Your Honour's function; I admit that. The point is the lawyer, the solicitor or counsel who made the statement that the hon. member for York-Simcoe (Mr. Stevens) has indicated made the statement regardless of where he stands on the question of right or wrong.

The facts are now that the hon. member for York-Simcoe, by Your Honour's ruling and, indeed, any other member of this House of Commons, even when faced with a legal opinion that is wrong, that that particular lawyer could not give an opinion, is now in the position where his privileges as a member of parliament to investigate, as a member of parliament, as a citizen to involve himself in the court process, however you want to cut it, is denied access to documents and to opinion on those documents by this order in council which the Leader of the Opposition has rightfully described as an odious order in council. That is the situation in which we find ourselves.

This is not an ordinary production of documents. I asked this question specifically, admittedly not in the question period but as a point of order. It would have been grand if it had been in the question period, but it was not. It was outside the question period. The question was answered. The question was not answered on the grounds Your Honour suggests. It was answered on the basis that the question was frivolous and I knew it. There was an absolute refusal to produce those documents.

Mr. Clark: Check the record.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): It is on the record that it was frivolous. The disparaging remarks followed. On the basis of this order in council, we are now being denied the documents. That is out of the mouth of the minister. In these unusual circumstances, I do not know how anyone including, with respect, Your Honour, could call this an ordinary matter of production of documents, in view of what has happened. What has clearly happened is that I, as a member of parliament, in the circumstances of the last few days in the face of order in council by the government, have been denied access here in the House of Commons to documents, according to one legal opinion, right or wrong, upon which you do not have to decide. The solicitor could not give an opinion to a member of parliament to permit him to carry out his duties.

I want those documents as a matter of my right as a member of parliament. It is not an ordinary production. In view of what has happened, I do not think it can be handled in any other way. Therefore, in view of the refusal and in view of what I have said, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin):

> That this House declare that the order in council No. SOR 76-644 is not binding on members of the House with regard to proceedings in the House or any committee thereof or their counsel and that for the purpose of such proceedings, despite the provisions of such order in council, all documents or copies may be obtained, produced and used in connection with any inquiry into questions of privilege or into the legality and propriety of the actions of the government and minister and others in the establishment of a uranium cartel.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

● (1240)

Hon. Alastair Gillespie (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, I was going to rise on a point of order. Perhaps that is the best context in which to make my remarks. As the House leader of the opposition mentioned a few moments ago, he raised during the question period a question, on a point of order, which he put to me dealing with the matter of the documents. Quite clearly, if he will reread his question as it will undoubtedly appear in *Hansard*, he will realize, as his motion is now cast, that this is a carte blanche request to the government to table and make public all of the documents that might have been associated with the producers' agreement, all of the confidential government documents and all of the intergovernmental agreements, the sort of agreements that Your Honour referred to a moment ago when addressing the Leader of the Opposition.

I want to make it quite clear to him that when his request was put on that basis I considered it to be frivolous, and I still do. But I would make this point to him, that if he is prepared to put forward requests respecting specific documents, I am quite prepared to consider those requests—

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): To "consider".

Mr. Gillespie: Yes, to consider those requests—on an expeditious basis. Quite clearly, I cannot give a carte blanche answer that I will table every confidential document that he may want to list, but I am quite prepared to give consideration on an expeditious basis to the particular documents that he might like to receive.

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): Mr. Speaker, may I make one very brief comment before a final ruling is made or is reserved, though there is little time left for reservation today. Your Honour will take note, as a member of the profession to which I have the honour to belong as well, of the punitive nature of this order in council. It is not just a civil matter; this is an order in council passed under the Atomic Energy Control Act. Any offence against that act or any of the regulations under the act carries with it a very heavy penalty. I do not have the act here, but I examined it the other day. There are very heavy penalties attached to any infraction or breach of that act or regulation.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the minute that I—or, indeed, my friend for Grenville-Carleton (Mr. Baker), the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Clark) or the hon. member for York-Simcoe (Mr. Stevens)—go to anyone to secure possession of these documents and I have them in my possession, I commit an offence against this order in council. This goes back to the case that Your Honour will remember we discussed in committee, of Strauss, the father of the House in the United Kingdom. I remember that in that case the original decision was against Strauss; but ten years later, in a report of the committee proceedings in 1966 and 1967, my recollection is that the procedure committee in the House in England at that time made it quite plain that any attempt which was made in that case, by threats against a member of the House, to inhibit him in the carrying out of his functions and duties constituted, in their opinion, a breach of privilege.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what could be a greater threat to us than the contents of this order in council? It constitutes a threat to every member of this House that if they dare to secure, without the permission—the very selective permission, probably—of the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Gillespie), possession of a document for the purpose of proceeding in the House or out of the House, it would immediately render them liable to a criminal proceeding and to the imposition of a very heavy penalty.

I suggest to Your Honour that there could be nothing more conducive to inhibiting members of this House in the discharge of their duty than the fact that they know—and I intend to pursue this matter when I leave the House today—that if I come into possession of some of these documents, not second or third rate copies out of the proceedings in Washington, but the original documents themselves, that if I go to a member of this cartel, ask for a document and they show it to me and for some reason are prepared to give it to me, then I have committed an offence. How can I prepare a case for proceeding in this House?

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Baldwin: In support of my hon. friend from Grenville-Carleton, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that this order in council constitutes a clear, present and continuing threat to every member of this House.

Mr. Speaker: Although again eloquently argued, I return to the basic point which I think has not been altered by the discussion during the last hour. The hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin) has very accurately and coolly described the circumstances under which this order in council, in his view, constitutes a threat to his ability to function as a member of the House of Commons. I can understand that interpretation.

Again I say that if the hon. member was standing in his place and saying to me that he has done what he says he might do, and that he had met with that kind of response, I would be dealing with a much different question from the one I am dealing with at the present time. I maintain that so long as the matter remains in the potential, as opposed to being in the actual, the Chair would be making an unwarranted extension of privilege to accept the matter as a question of privilege.

With respect to the application by the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton (Mr. Baker) which we are specifically dealing with here, the basis of his question of privilege is the statement made by the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Gillespie) today that he could not give the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton a blanket assurance that he would table all of the documents which relate to these transactions. I surely cannot find that that constitutes a question of privilege.

Mr. Joe Clark (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I rise on the same question. Let me preface my remarks by saying that since the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Gillespie) has now amended his original position and has at least asked to consider requests for specific documents, we will take him up on that offer. I can advise the minister that it will be a very long list, and we would like to have a very expeditious reply.

We would also expect to have the kind of consent which would allow the parliament and people of Canada to get to the bottom of this question. I repeat what my colleague for Grenville-Carleton (Mr. Baker) has said, that access to information which will make a debate in this House useful and effective will, of course, be a condition precedent to our agreeing to a debate, because we do not intend to have a debate in which the information is hidden away in the back pocket of the minister.

If I might briefly repeat what others of my colleagues have said in argument on the question of privilege, we are not asking at all that Your Honour come to some decision on the competence of a legal opinion that two senior, respected firms in the city of Toronto felt constrained from participating in any way in any activity which had to do with these documents. Your Honour is not being asked to judge whether or not they were right. The point at issue here, with the greatest respect, is that the existence of this order in council prohibits, and has

prohibited, the hon. member for York-Simcoe (Mr. Stevens)—it is not a theoretical matter; it is not potential or a threat; it is something that has happened—from seeking the kind of external advice regarding a complicated matter which he requires to have in order to carry out his responsibilities as an effective member of the House of Commons of Canada.

Again I emphasize that this is not a threat; it is not something which is potential. This is something which has happened to the hon. member for York-Simcoe on two occasions with respect to two separate, respected, substantial law firms in the city of Toronto. Their interpretation—which is an interpretation by very reputable counsel—of this order in council is such that it prevents them from giving a member the information that he requires to carry out his functions as effectively as he would want to in the House of Commons. Consequently, it interferes with his capacity to perform his functions in the House of Commons.

● (1250)

I want to emphasize that while most of us are prepared to rely on our own instincts and advice, there are many specialized questions of particular complexity where it is essential for members of parliament, in order to do their job, to seek outside, specialized advice. As the hon. member for York-Simcoe has indicated, this is clearly one of those cases. This is even more the case in an atmosphere which has been developed deliberately by members of the government when in answer to any request for an inquiry into any kind of question they ask the members on this side to make a charge before they will divulge any information.

The hon. member for York-Simcoe, in anticipation that this latest attempt at a cover-up would bring forth the same response as earlier attempts at cover-up, went to legal counsel to seek advice in order to be in a position to function in the House of Commons within the ground rules the government is trying to impose upon this House. The fact that a member of parliament is precluded by this order in council from seeking the kind of expert advice he needs to carry out his duties is a clear interference with his rights. I should like to make two other brief points.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Clark: This is a question that is different from the normal request to table documents. We are dealing here with documents that would be available to the public in the normal course. They are not available to the public because of this particular order in council. Therefore, that takes the case we are discussing out of the context of the ordinary and makes it a very extraordinary case.

Members of the Official Opposition have been faced not simply with a threat but with a real interference, flowing from this document, to our capacity to do our duty. I should report to the House that the hon. member for Ottawa-Carleton (Mrs. Pigott), in pursuing her responsibilities as a member of this House, was in touch with representatives of a Canadian company affected by this order in council to discuss the debate which proceeded in this House yesterday. The situation occurred where a representative of that company would not even mention the word "uranium" because of the apparent concern that official had as to the consequences of engaging in any discussion with anybody, in light of the existence of this very serious limitation upon the right to inquire and the interference with the duties of members of parliament.

Those factors should be taken into account. We are not dealing with a threat. This is something that has happened to limit the effectiveness of members of parliament to do their job in the House of Commons.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I have made a ruling on the question of privilege. There is no fresh question of privilege before us. I will not restrict the serious intervention of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Clark) on a question of this nature. The danger of actual interference I attempted to stress in respect to the carrying out of duties special to members of this House are ones that it is my obligation to protect. I attempted to illustrate that as clearly as I could with respect to actual difficulties as opposed to potential ones. The matter has now received rather extensive discussion and has been adjudicated upon by me on three separate occasions, and perhaps we ought to move on to other matters.

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Halifax): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask you, and I do it in no impertinent way, how many members of parliament would have to make an effort to get a legal opinion of the sort sought by the hon. member for York-Simcoe (Mr. Stevens) before Your Honour considers that our privileges have been interfered with by this order in council?

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Surely the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Stanfield) is asking me to conclude that the refusal to give an opinion to the hon. member for York-Simcoe (Mr. Stevens) is in itself a legal opinion. Surely that is clearly understood. It is an interpretation of a document which indicates that the effect of the document in front of me now is such that I ought not to deal with—

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): How do you get off the treadmill?

Mr. Speaker: Surely we can lay this point to rest. Supposing that legal opinion is not correct. On the basis of that presentation, is the Chair required to decide that that is a correct assessment by the lawyers of their obligations?

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): No, not at all.

Mr. Speaker: Then, that is the nub of the disagreement. I have examined this document, and on another day some other counsel can examine this document and indicate that if the hon. member brings documents before him, he is in no way restricted from giving advice to him in his capacity as a

member of parliament. Now, which counsel is correct? Surely the Chair must decide, in order to answer the question put forth by the hon. member for Halifax. The Chair has to decide on the correctness of the opinion. If the hon. member for York-Simcoe had indicated that he wanted to take documents to counsel for an opinion, but he could not get his hands on the documents, and the reason for that was this order in council, and no other reason, then the argument would be considerably different from the one that has been put forward.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

FINANCE, TRADE AND ECONOMIC AFFAIRS

Fourteenth report of Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs—Mr. Cafik.

[*Editor's Note: For text of above report, see today's Votes and Proceedings.*]

* * *

TRANSPORT

TABLING OF POSITION PAPER ON COASTING TRADE ACT

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I wish to table, under Standing Order 41(2), a position paper dealing with the proposed coasting trade act.

* * *

PENITENTIARIES

TABLING OF RESPONSE TO SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT

Hon. Francis Fox (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, I wish to table, under Standing Order 41(2), the document entitled "Response of the Solicitor General to the Parliamentary Subcommittee Report on the Penitentiary System in Canada".

* * *

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, the following questions will be answered today: 67, 68, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 118, 119, 120, 121, 495, 497, 584, 721, 734, 798, 805, 806, 807, 808, 1,229, 1,254, 1,255, 1,526, 1,528, 1,618, 1,619, 1,624, 1,625, 1,626, 1,628, 1,629, 1,630, 1,917, 1,918, 1,989,

2,180, 2,225, 2,267, 2,292, 2,384, 2,388, 2,391 2,448, 2,479, 2,540, 2,747, 2,774, 2,860, 2,893, and 2,912.

[*Text*]

RADIO CANADA INTERNATIONAL

Question No. 67—**Mr. Cossitt:**

1. In or about August 1975, did two men visit the offices of Radio Canada International in Montreal to discuss the content of programming to the Soviet Union by the CBC (a) did they represent a Soviet news service or any other Soviet organization and, if so, which one (b) did they introduce themselves as representing APN (c) who are the individuals and their job designations with whom these men met (d) what are the names of the visitors (e) was an attempt made by these visitors to persuade members of the Russian section of Radio Canada International to eliminate any political events or comments from coverage of the Canadian scene in Russian language broadcasts?

2. Was the Department of External Affairs aware of this visit prior to its taking place and (a) if so, on what date (b) if not, on what date did it become aware of the visit (c) did the Department take any action on the matter (i) if so, what(ii) if not, for what reason?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): I am informed by the Department of External Affairs and the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation as follows: 1. A visit took place, to the Russian section, by two Soviet journalists, at their initiative. Visits by journalists from countries to which RCI broadcasts are a common occurrence. Discussion of RCI programs took place during the visit, as is usual in such cases. (a) Yes. (b) Yes. (c) Mr. L. Chipman, Supervisor, Eastern European Section; Mr. A. Lieven, Announcer/Producer, Russian Section; Mr. D. Lebedeff, Announcer/Producer, Russian Section; Mrs. H. Liberowsky, Announcer/Producer, Russian Section; (d) Mr. Valery Yuryev, Mr. Serguei Chandrov. (e) No.

2. No. (a) Nil. (b) On June 29, 1976, when the matter was raised in the House. (c) No. (i) Not applicable. (ii) The department was not aware of the visit until the matter was raised in the House and no action seemed called for.

Question No. 68—**Mr. Cossitt:**

Did Mr. M. Mogiljansky, Head of the Russian section of Radio Canada International write a letter dated May 19, 1976, to Dr. Yaroshevsky and Mrs. E. Bobro-Zuchert of the Russian section of Radio Canada International in Toronto (a) did the memo state in part "This is to inform you in writing that according to the new rules, introduced by the RCI Director, Mr. Alan Brown, you are just reporters, not commentators" and, if so (i) what are these new rules (ii) for what reason were they introduced (iii) who compiled them (b) did the memo further state in part "You must also stay away from any reporting from the Toronto scene of a political nature" and, if so, what are the reasons that foreign listeners to the CBC should not be permitted to hear news of our democratic political processes as reported from Toronto?

Hon. John Roberts (Secretary of State): I am informed by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation as follows: yes. Mr. Mogiljansky, head of the Russian section of Radio-Canada International wrote a letter on May 19, 1976, to Mrs. E. Bobrov-Zuckert and Dr. Yaroshevsky. These two persons are, however, not members of the Russian section nor employees of Radio Canada International, but are freelance contributors in Russian to the section's program. (a) Yes. (i) It is a normal part of a broadcaster's function to brief freelance contributors as to their role, and inform them of any policy changes that bring corresponding changes in that role. The "new rules"

referred to in the question were contained in a memo dated May 12, 1976, from the director of Radio Canada International to program managers of RCI, and gave the task of selecting political commentaries temporarily to the assistant program director, Shortwave, assisted by the heads of the English and French Sections. (ii) This was a temporary measure, pending a reorganization. It was introduced to clarify overall CBC program policies. The "new rules", were not related to the performance of Dr. Yaroshevsky and Mrs. Bobrov-Zuckert. (iii) If the director's memorandum of May 12, 1976 is here referred to, that memorandum was prepared by the director himself. (b) Mr. Mogiljansky's letter quotes an interpretation by his immediate supervisor of the director's policy memo, as follows: "You must also 'stay away from any reporting from the Toronto scene of a political nature.'" The fact that political reporting would not be done in Russian from Toronto did not mean that no political material would be available from that area to the Russian section. Such political material would continue to be available for translation by the Russian section from any political commentaries ordered under the assistant program director's authority for use by all sections of RCI. In this way a similar balance and objectivity could be achieved in broadcasts to all areas served by Radio Canada International.

Question No. 70—**Mr. Cossitt:**

Did Mr. Axel Thogerson, Assistant Programme Director of Radio Canada International write to Mr. T. England, Chief Administrative Officer of Radio Canada International, on June 1, 1976 and, if so, did his letter contain in part these words (a) "So we can't speak about Christmas. Why? Because the regime of the USSR has banned X-mas or what? Well, X-mas was a feature of this country last time I looked around and we have official government-declared holidays in which to celebrate the feast." (b) "The Toronto Automobile Exhibition, was that O.K. and safe? Hope we didn't offend any sensitive USSR listeners by telling them about this capitalistic show"?

Hon. John Roberts (Secretary of State): I am informed by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation as follows: yes. (a) and (b). The quotations in question 70 are accurate but are out of context. Mr. Thogerson's letter is an internal memorandum that is part of a free and frank internal exchange on the contents of RCI broadcasts. Mr. England had not suggested any problem about mentioning Christmas or the Toronto Automobile Exhibition, nor was it within his power or responsibility to remark on program policy. On the contrary, he had simply passed on an evaluation of certain broadcasts in the Russian language which had been an evaluation commissioned from a person outside the organization—and was inviting comment, critical or favourable and was not enunciating policy. The quotes from Mr. Thogerson's memo are part of Mr. Thogerson's critical response to the evaluation. This memo, in its proper context as an internal exchange of programming criticisms, is part of a normal interchange of views within the service.

Question No. 71—**Mr. Cossitt:**

1. Did Radio Canada International censorship have removed from newscasts in the Russian language two items made by Dr. F. Yaroshevsky on May 19, 1976 and, if so, were the reports of (a) a demonstration by Jewish women in Canada protesting against treatment of Jews in the USSR (b) a report on the opportunities and the difficulties which doctors from the Soviet Union have encountered in settling in Canada?

2. Was an explanation of the censorship sent by a letter dated May 19, 1976, to Dr. Yaroshevsky by Mr. M. Mogiljansky, Head of the Russian section of Radio Canada International, stating that such a censorship order had been issued by Mr. L. C. Chipman, Supervisor of East European Programming and, if so (a) who instructed Mr. Chipman to impose such censorship (b) what part did the Department of External Affairs play in the action, if any?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): I am informed by the Department of External Affairs and the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation as follows: 1. There is no Radio Canada International censorship. RCI editors attempt to reflect major developments in Canada in proportion to their importance to the average Canadian, comparable to what might be found on the front page of a major Canadian newspaper. Deletions as described in (a) and (b) were and are made in the context of the reply to question 68.

2. No. An explanation of the deletion of two items from the Russian program on Mr. Chipman's instructions was sent to Dr. Yaroshevsky by Mr. M. Mogiljansky, head of the Russian section of Radio Canada International, on May 19, 1976. (a) No one instructed Mr. Chipman to impose censorship or to delete particular items from RCI's programming or to forbid particular subjects being treated. The deletion was Mr. Chipman's correct interpretation of the instructions regarding the ordering of commentaries, referred to in reply 68. (b) None.

Question No. 72—**Mr. Cossitt:**

1. Did Mr. Alan Brown, Director of Radio Canada International, circulate an internal memo dated May 12, 1976, under the heading: "Target Area Desks and Central Programming: Preliminary Steps"?

2. Did this memo contain in part these words "no more so-called news backgrounders are to be written by Radio Canada International employees" and, if so, what are the reasons (a) CBC personnel were abruptly ordered not to do such a thing (b) background information to the news was considered suddenly undesirable?

3. Did this memo also contain in part the words "Of course no commentaries will be written in-house on political or economic matters under whatever disguise" and, if so (a) what are the reasons justifying the forbidding of comments on political or economic matters on the CBC's international service (b) is it now CBC or government policy to censor from Canadian broadcasts to other countries items of a political or economic nature?

4. Did the memo also state in part "a press review will then be written by Mr. Côté (I suggest at least three times a week) referring to both the French language and English language press—but the selection will be made by Mr. Côté" and, if so (a) what is the full name and job designation of Mr. Côté (b) for what reason, has this one individual been given exclusive judgement and right to decide what excerpts from the English and French language press will be broadcast to foreign listeners (c) what is Mr. Côté's employment history with the CBC and what are his qualifications for such exclusive power?

Hon. John Roberts (Secretary of State): I am informed by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation as follows: 1. Yes.

2. Yes. (a) Radio Canada International seeks to reflect the spectrum of representative Canadian opinion on events, but should not, through its staff employees, have an editorial stance of its own. It was felt that a separate program element, referred to as a news backgrounder, had occasionally been susceptible to the inclusion of commentary by some staff employees and should, therefore, be replaced by a commentary

by freelancers. In addition, since CBC news policy precludes the inclusion of the staff news writer's own opinion in desk copy prepared for news bulletins proper, specific background facts only, (needed to explain a Canadian story to foreigners and to bring out its significance) would be incorporated by news-room staff as part of the news bulletin. News backgrounders, because of their length, are not a part of the news bulletin, but follow it in the slot where commentaries also normally appear. Where it would be difficult to deal with an event in the news without more extended explanation, either a backgrounder or commentary could continue, as had always been the case, to be dealt with in French or English by freelance commentators whose material would be available for translation by all foreign language sections. (b) Background information to the news is, of course, not considered undesirable. The policy is aimed at providing more background, using the most varied and knowledgeable sources.

3. Yes. (a) The fact that commentaries were no longer to be written by the one or two staff members who occasionally did so does not mean that no commentaries, including those on political or economic matters, were to be broadcast by freelance commentators. The purpose of the memo was, on the contrary, to specify the duties of staff members and to widen the variety of commentary available through freelancers, thus ensuring the use of the best specialist expertise. Not only would the various language sections continue to have available commentaries written by freelance commentators in the official languages of Canada, English and French, for subsequent translation to the appropriate language, but the diversity of opinion available in Canada would be increasingly reflected by expanding the list of available authoritative freelance commentators. (b) No.

4. Yes. Mr. Côté was given the editorial function of selection under the general direction of the assistant program director. (a) Lucien Côté, information resources officer. (b) It is normal for one person to compile a press review. Mr. Côté was given the responsibility because he is well informed on Canadian events and has a distinguished journalistic background. Since he is fluently bilingual, Mr. Côté has access to the contents of the English and French language press. (c) Mr. Côté is a highly experienced broadcaster and journalist. He has worked in the national service of the CBC, both in radio and in TV, and in the international service, or RCI.

Question No. 73—**Mr. Cossitt:**

1. Did Mr. Ted England, Chief Administration Officer of Radio Canada International, have an evaluation made of a number of broadcasts from Toronto by Dr. F. Yaroshevsky in the Russian language and did Mr. M. Mogiljansky, Head of the Russian section of Radio Canada International, in a letter to Dr. Yaroshevsky dated May 25, 1976, state in part, as follows "The evaluation was undertaken by an outsider, who is aware of our mandate" (a) what is the name and address of this anonymous evaluator (b) what were his or her qualifications for making such an evaluation (c) who selected this person to make the evaluation (d) what is the meaning of the phrase that this person "is aware of our mandate" and exactly what is this "mandate"?

2. Did this anonymous evaluation consist of eight pages of comments (a) did it state in part "Religious overtones, for example, have no place on any Radio Canada International broadcast" (b) did it also state in part "Why should a writer-announcer (Felix Yaroshevsky, in this case) be allowed to voice his own political feelings regarding the Canadian government on the air" and does this indicate an attempt by the government to forbid Russian listeners of Radio Canada International from knowing that in a democratic country such as Canada there are those who are permitted to disagree with the government (c) did it criticize Dr. F. Yaroshevsky from reading in Russian an article from the *Toronto Star* which stated that certain United Nations delegates from small countries were selling their votes in exchange for sums ranging between $600,000 and $800,000 and, if so, for what reason is there any objection to Russian listeners being made aware of articles or editorials appearing in the *Toronto Star* (d) did it criticize Dr. Yaroshevsky for pointing out that Russian immigrants to Canada had apartments, cars and supermarkets available in which to shop, electrical appliances, etc. and did it criticize him further for saying that "the material goods are not what is important, it is the newly-found freedom that counts" and, if so, what is wrong with Radio Canada International speaking about the subject of freedom in Canada (e) did it criticize Dr. Yaroshevsky for stating that the Ontario Liberal Party "fared poorly in the last provincial elections" and, if so, for what reason, when Dr. Yaroshevsky was actually stating a basic fact (f) did it criticize Dr. Yaroshevsky for stating that "the federal Liberals, under Trudeau, are becoming less and less popular in Canada" and, if so, for what reason, in view of the fact this statement is in accordance with all recent Gallup polls (g) did it criticize Dr. Yaroshevsky for pointing out that the Ontario Liberal Leader is a Jew of Russian origin and stating that therefore the Prime Minister of Ontario might one day be a Russian Jew and, if so, for what reason was fault found with such a statement and does the government not consider such a statement a credit to the opportunities offered to immigrants by Canada (h) did it criticize Dr. Yaroshevsky for describing in Russian "the Christmas scene in Toronto; the masses of shoppers, the after Christmas sales, etc. and remarks that Christ's teachings were not along the lines of materialism" and, if so, what was wrong with the stating of these basic facts (i) did the evaluation ridicule praise, given in Russian on one broadcast, of the work of the Salvation Army and, if so, for what reason is this something that should not be told to Russian listeners (j) did it criticize Dr. Yaroshevsky for pointing out as follows "Latin America, South Viet Nam, the Soviet Union, and other countries where the imperfections of the social system manifest themselves in the fact that the minority rules as a dictatorship in name of the majority and where all individual initiative is curtailed" and, if so, for what reason does the government and the CBC object to this statement of democratic principle?

3. Did the evaluator state that Dr. Yaroshevsky's broadcasts showed "incredibly poor judgment and a total lack of sensitivity to the listeners' point of view" and, if so, is it now the policy of the CBC's International Service to see that everything broadcast to the Soviet Union conforms with the point of view of the Soviet Union?

Hon. John Roberts (Secretary of State): I am informed by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation as follows: 1. A fairly elaborate program evaluation process was begun in September 1975 and between that time and February 1976 all language sections, including French and English sections, had undergone a preliminary evaluation. In the case of languages inaccessible to some members of the evaluating committees, an outside evaluation was commissioned to provide an additional element to the retranslations of program material available. The evaluations, internal and commissioned, are part of an ongoing process. As part of these evaluations, and on instructions from the director of Radio Canada International, Mr. England requested an evaluation of a number of Dr. Yaroshevsky's freelance contributions to the Russian section. Mr. Mogiljansky in his letter of May 25, 1976 quoted a memorandum from Mr. England as follows "The evaluation was undertaken by an outsider who is aware of our mandate". (a) The name and address of the evaluator cannot be revealed for obvious internal reasons. (b) The evaluator had experience in broadcasting, a distinguished academic career and knowledge of the Russian language. (c) The director of Radio Canada International in consultation with Mr. England and another member of his staff. (d) The phrase "is aware of our mandate"

means that the evaluator understood Radio Canada International's strategic objective as approved by the board of directors of the CBC in 1973. It reads "Radio Canada International is directed by the CBC to provide a program service designed to attract an international awareness of Canada and the Canadian identity by distributing, through shortwave and other means, programs which reflect the realities and quality of Canadian life and culture, Canada's national interests and policies and the spectrum of Canadian viewpoints on national and international affairs."

2. Yes. (a) to (j) Yes, it contained the remarks quoted. However, it must be understood that the evaluator's remarks, as quoted in part in 2(a) to (j), were one of several internal evaluations and had no status as CBC policy.

3. Yes: the question, in itself, is accurate. The evaluator's text, however, does not represent Radio Canada International policy. Broadcasts to the Soviet Union are not designed for the Soviet government, but for listeners in the USSR. Subjects which might be displeasing to their government can be treated at any time, but, in accordance with good journalistic practice, must not be treated in such a way as to constitute a propaganda campaign.

Question No. 74—**Mr. Cossitt:**

1. Did the Supervisor of East European Programming for Radio Canada International in a letter dated June 1, 1976, to Mr. A. Thogerson, Assistant Programme Director of Radio Canada International, state in part as follows "Do we allow information in English to the United States about anti-Vietnam rallies in Toronto knowing that the US government understands the nature of democratic journalism but censor news in Russian to the USSR about Jewish demonstrations against Soviet policy because the Soviet government does not? If we do, our credibility with our listeners is shot because our hypocrisy will be apparent; if we do, our sense of journalism is warped to some extent beyond the limits of the normal restraints of good sense and a feeling of responsibility. If we don't, there are suggestions that a political campaign is being waged." and, if so (a) is it the policy of Radio Canada International and the government to permit anti-American propaganda on foreign broadcasts but to censor any criticism of the Communist system on such broadcasts (b) is the government prepared to allow a Parliamentary Committee to summon and question officials of Radio Canada International concerning programming in general and whether or not and on how many occasions, pressure has been put on the CBC's international service by the Department of External Affairs to restrict what is said in broadcasts to the Soviet Union?

2. Did the letter also state in part "Our Soviet programmes are directed to an audience we know to be friendly and interested (and it includes Communists) living under a dictatorship that is not. As Robert Ford has pointed out often, the trouble is that the Soviet Union is a super power whose government re-acts with the sensitivity and lack of confidence of a banana republic. Even the wages of Toronto garbage collectors are an offence." and, if so, is the government prepared to censor the fact that workers in Canada such as garbage collectors in Toronto make wages higher than their counterparts in the Soviet Union and, if so, for what reason?

3. Did the letter also state that on the subject of detente the alternative is "acceptance of the Soviet definition that detente means that Western Countries shouldn't say mean things about the Soviet Union"?

Hon. John Roberts (Secretary of State): I am informed by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation as follows: 1. Yes, but in an internal memorandum, not a letter. (a) Radio Canada International's policy is to reflect in a balanced way the spectrum of Canadian opinion on any subject. (b) To be answered elsewhere.

[Mr. Roberts.]

2 and 3. The internal memorandum (not a letter) did make the statements quoted. There is no censorship in Radio Canada International by the government or otherwise. The memorandum refers to the outside evaluator's remarks, which have no policy status.

As far as the government is concerned: 1. (b) The Standing Committee on Broadcasting, Films and Assistance to the Arts has the opportunity to question officials of the CBC on subjects it deems appropriate during the review by the committee of the CBC main and supplementary estimates.

Question No. 75—**Mr. Cossitt:**

Is the government prepared forthwith to order an immediate inquiry into the programming of Radio Canada International in the Russian language and in languages to other Communist countries to determine whether or not political influence is being used by the Canadian government to bring about censorship and, if not, for what reason?

Hon. John Roberts (Secretary of State): No. In a news release dated August 5, 1976, the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation gave an unequivocal assurance that there is no censorship policy and never has been as it applies to broadcasts to foreign countries. As was further outlined, the CBC strives to achieve the same policy of balance in foreign broadcasts as is applied to domestic news and current affairs programs.

Question No. 118—**Mr. Cossitt:**

1. Did Mr. Carroll Chipman, Supervisor, Eastern European Programming of Radio Canada International, write a memo dated December 10, 1975 to Mr. Alan Brown, Director of Radio Canada International and, if so, did the memo state in part "You will find attached my note to Bill Hooper and Alex Chistoff of the Eastern European Division of the Department of External Affairs covering my submission of the Russian and Ukrainian Radio Canada International section reports as they requested. Mr. Hooper and Mr. Chistoff were concerned about the complaints made at a cocktail party by the Soviet Ambassador about our programmes. They were thought to be worse than those of the BBC and Radio Liberty, were offensive to the Soviet Union and said nothing about Canada"?

2. Were there discussions or communications between Messrs. Hooper and Chistoff or any others in the Department of External Affairs, with Mr. Chipman or any others in RCI and, if so (a) on what dates (b) for what reasons (c) in what locations and in what manner did they take place?

3. What was the date and place of the cocktail party referred to in Carroll Chipman's memo of December 10, 1975?

4. Is it the policy of the government to have the Department of External Affairs attempt to influence programming of RCI to Eastern Europe and particularly to the Soviet Union and (a) if so, for what reason (b) if not, what justifies the actions taken by Messrs. Hooper and Chistoff in this case?

5. Did the memo of December 10, 1975 from Carroll Chipman to Alan Brown also state in part "After a cursory look at our programme reports, Alex Chistoff raised a few questioning criticisms from, as it were, diplomatic point of view . . . ..a tendency to nag the USSR, that is to say, to seek out material which while certainly published in the Canadian press, reflected poorly on the Soviet Union, in a way that was out of proportion with other matters of greater general Canadian concern" and, if so, what are the reasons justifying such interference on the part of the Department with the material broadcast by RCI to the Soviet Union and does this indicate a policy of censorship by the Canadian Government being applied to programming to the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): I am informed by the Department of External Affairs and the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation as follows: 1. Yes, the memo did so state, in part.

2. Yes. (a), (b) and (c) November 18, 1975, the Soviet desk officer, Mr. Chistoff, asked Mr. J. Svedman by telephone for an indication of news subjects for the sample period of September 20 to November 7, 1975 that would be helpful in any future discussions the division might have with the Soviet embassy on the subject of RCI broadcasts which it had raised with the department informally. December 5, 1975 Mr. Chipman called on Eastern European Division on routine consultations and delivered a memorandum dated December 3, 1975 to Messors. Hooper and Chistoff together with the typed programme items. April 28, 1975 Mr. Alan Brown and Mr. E. T. England called on Eastern European Division during a call on the department on routine consultations.

3. The Department of External Affairs is unaware of the cocktail party mentioned in Mr. Chipman's note of December 10, 1975 and believes the reference intended may have been to informal conversations which took place with Soviet embassy officials at luncheons on October 31 and November 17, 1975.

4. No. (a) Not applicable. (b) Consultations between RCI and the Department of External Affairs are provided for in Order-in-Council PC 1968-525 dated March 19, 1968, which directs the CBC "to provide in consultation with the Department of External Affairs an international service . . .". Officials of RCI and the Department of External Affairs accordingly meet from time to time to discuss questions of mutual interest. The department does not, however, seek in these discussions to influence RCI's programs in any way whatsoever.

5. Yes, the memo did so state in part.

In so far as the Department of External Affairs is concerned, however, the incomplete extract quoted from Mr. Chipman's memorandum suggests that Mr. Chistoff was critical of RCI programmes when in fact this was not the case either after the first brief look at the programme reports or at any other time. He did not criticize RCI for any tendency of its programmes to nag the USSR as suggested in the quoted extract. In its entirety, the relevant paragraph of this memorandum reads as follows: "After a cursory look at our program report, Alex Chistoff raised a few questioning criticisms from as it were, a diplomatic point of view, which coincided rather neatly with my own occasional criticism of the Russian program from a journalistic standpoint. I attempted to define this thought—a tendency to nag the USSR, that is to say, to seek out material which while certainly published in the Canadian press—reflected poorly on the Soviet Union, in a way that was out of proportion to other matters of greater general Canadian concern". The memorandum did not represent an interference or a policy of censorship.

Question No. 119—**Mr. Cossitt:**

1. Did Carroll Chipman, Supervisor, Eastern European Division of Radio Canada International, in a memo dated December 10, 1975, to Alan Brown, Director of Radio Canada International, state in part "He (Chistoff) will go through all the papers I gave him, and probably come back at me with further thoughts. They will be thoughts that, quite naturally, reflect External's sense of its own interests. An example: They don't like us to report, even in the news, anti-Soviet demonstrations outside the Soviet Embassy because the Soviets think that these demonstrations are (in the Soviet fashion) government inspired and that the government wants RCI to report them out of bitchiness" and, if so, what are the reasons that the Department of External Affairs objects to RCI reporting anti-Soviet demonstrations outside the Soviet Embassy that have actually occurred and news of which has been published in the western press?

2. Does such objection constitute a direct attempt at censoring the reporting of news events by the Department and, if so, on what date did such a policy commence and (a) who authorized it (b) for what reason?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): I am informed by External Affairs and the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation as follows: 1. Yes, the memo did so state in part. The Department of External Affairs does not object in any way to Radio Canada International reporting the news. It is incorrect to infer that the department does not like RCI to report anti-Soviet demonstrations. Such a view point has never been held or expressed.

2. There was no objection and no censorship exists. (a) Not applicable. (b) Not applicable.

Question No. 120—**Mr. Cossitt:**

1. Did Carroll Chipman, Supervisor, Eastern European Programming of Radio Canada International, in a memo dated December 10, 1975 to Alan Brown, Director of Radio Canada International, state in part "I took the opportunity to complain that External doesn't properly and promptly allow us to report and explain Canadian foreign policy . . ." and, if so (a) by what authority does the Department allow or disallow RCI to report and explain Canadian foreign policy (b) what is a full explanation of the word "allow" and does this indicate a policy of control by the Department over the programming of RCI?

2. Did Carroll Chipman also state in the memo that RCI only gets "ministerial and ambassadorial pronouncements three weeks after delivery" and, if so, for what reasons was the Department not willing to make full information of events available to RCI for proper and legitimate news reports?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): I am informed by the Department of External Affairs and the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation as follows: 1. Yes, the memo did so state in part. (a) The department has no authority to allow or disallow Radio Canada International to report and explain Canadian foreign policy. (b) The word "allow" in this quotation was used in the sense of "enable". It does not indicate any policy of control by the department over the programs of RCI but rather a desire on Mr. Chipman's part to receive more current information from the department on Canadian foreign policy.

2. Yes, the memorandum did so state in part. The department is willing to and does make factual and policy information available to RCI and other journalists for news reports and commentaries. Moreover, the department is constantly exploring ways of facilitating and improving this process.

Question No. 121—**Mr. Cossitt:**

1. Did Carroll Chipman, Supervisor, Eastern European Programming of Radio Canada International, write a memo to Messrs. Hooper and Chistoff of the Department of External Affairs in which he stated in part "You will find attached itemized programme reports of the Russian and Ukrainian sections of RCI on the period you requested from Gromyko's visit to Ottawa to the October Revolution, September 20 to November 7" and, if so, for what reasons did Messrs. Hooper and Chistoff request such material?

2. Were Messrs. Hooper and Chistoff acting on complaints received from anyone in the government directly or indirectly as a result of complaints from any Soviet authority and, if so (a) who made such complaints and on what dates (b) what was the nature of such complaints?

Order Paper Questions

3. Is it the policy of the Department to scrutinize and censor programming of RCI to the Soviet Union or any other countries on the basis of complaints received from representatives of such other countries and, if so, on what date did such a policy begin and on whose authorization?

4. Did the memo also state in part "We will never have a programme that will satisfy pro-Soviet Soviets or anti-Soviet Soviets: we don't aim to. Our job is to fulfill our mandate, satisfy our journalistic conscience and interests, engage our listeners. Your Ambassador will never be happy, because he believes journalism should serve politics" and, if so (a) is the Department more concerned with keeping ambassadors and the governments of other countries happy than it is with the news being reported accurately and factually (b) is this an example of attempted censorship of RCI by the Department?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): I am informed by the Department of External Affairs and the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation as follows: 1. Yes, he did write a memo which so stated in part. The purpose in doing so was quite simply to obtain whatever background Radio Canada International could provide that would enable the department to discuss the matter knowledgeably if it were again raised by the Soviet embassy. The Soviet embassy did not raise it again.

2. (a) and (b) The request for background information was made following informal comments by members of the Soviet embassy at luncheons on October 31 and November 17, 1975 that the programs of RCI were inconsistent with the spirit of the Final Act of the CSCE in Helsinki.

3. No, it is the policy of the department to relay to RCI comments from foreign sources in the course of the consultations provided for in the Order In Council creating RCI.

4. Yes, the memo did so state, in part. (a) No. (b) No, nor does Mr. Chipman's memorandum imply this. It goes on to state: "But we are sometimes unhappy too when we lapse from our standards". The memorandum is clearly an attempt to anticipate the kind of detailed points that could conceivably be raised by the Soviet authorities and to provide the Department with points that could be made in reply.

Question No. 495—**Mr. Cossitt:**

Did Mr. A. W. Johnson, President of CBC issue a statement dated August 4, 1976, stating in part that CBC has not been subjected to pressure from the Soviet Union in regard to Radio Canada International Programming and, if so, was he aware of an internal R.C.I. memo dated September 10, 1975 and signed by L. C. Chipman, at the time, Eastern European Director for R.C.I., addressed to the Director of R.C.I. and stating in part that Messrs. Hooper and Chistoff of the Department of External Affairs had approached him concerning complaints by the Soviet Ambassador about R.C.I. broadcasts to the Soviet Union and, if so, for what reason did he issue such a statement and is he prepared to correct it in this regard?

Hon. John Roberts (Secretary of State): I am informed by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation as follows: Yes, the CBC president's statement of August 4, 1976 did so state, in part. It is presumed that the question refers to a memorandum dated December 10, 1975, and not September 10, 1975, between the parties mentioned and on the same subject. The president had not seen that memo on August 4. Since, however, the memo, in its entirety, reflected the frank review of criticism received from abroad which is part of the normal consultation process outlined and explained in the answer to part 2 of question 69 (formerly 5,.830), it in no way alters the purport of the statement of August 4, 1976.

[Mr. Cossitt.]

Question No. 497—**Mr. Cossitt:**

Did Mr. A. W. Johnson, President of CBC issue a statement dated August 4, 1976, stating in part: " . . . it has been charged that the CBC has been censoring its broadcasts to Eastern Europe. I can give an unequivocal assurance that there is no such censorship policy and never has been" and, if so, was he aware of various internal CBC memos written by M. Mogiljansky, at the time, Head of the Russian Section of Radio Canada International, L. C. Chipman, at the time, Head of the Eastern European Division of R.C.I. and Axel Thogerson, at the time, Assistant Program Director of R.C.I. which indicate otherwise and, if so, for what reason did he issue such a statement and is he prepared to correct it in this regard?

Hon. John Roberts (Secretary of State): I am informed by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation as follows: Yes. Yes, if these are the memos and letters referred to in questions 68, 69, 70, 71, 73 and 74 of October 12, 1976. For a discussion of this correspondence and its meaning and context and confirmation of the fact that there is no censorship in Radio Canada International by the government or otherwise, see the answers to the aforementioned questions together with the answer to question 72 of October 12, 1976. The statement was issued to answer and refute allegations which had been made and published concerning the broadcasts to Eastern Europe by CBC's Radio Canada International and to place the matters in question in their proper context.

UIC—MR. DANIEL COATES

Question No. 584—**Mr. Cossitt:**

1. What is the complete Public Service employment history of Mr. Daniel Coates, including positions held and dates, etc.?

2. Did Mr. Coates receive French language training and, if so (a) in what location (b) during what period of time (c) at what cost to the taxpayer?

3. On what dates was Mr. Coates on vacation during the years 1975 and 1976 and what exact work was he doing for the Unemployment Insurance Commission on the three days immediately preceding his holidays and on the three days immediately following his holidays?

4. Is Mr. Coates drawing full pay from UIC and, if so, what is the amount per year?

5. Is Mr. Coates presently engaged in taking university courses in the United States and, if so (a) in what location (b) at whose expense (c) by what authority (d) for what period of time?

Hon. Bud Cullen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): In so far as the Unemployment Insurance Commission is concerned: 1. Summer 1964—Department of Citizenship and Immigration—Research Assistant. Summer 1965—Department of Labour—Senior Research Assistant. September 24, 1973—SAPP appointment to UIC—To initiate an organization and human resources development program in UIC. January 10, 1974—Acting Comptroller, UIC. July 1, 1974—Executive Director, Administration UIC. April 19, 1975—Special Advisor to Chairman, UIC.

2. (a) Algonquin College, Ottawa. (b) July 7, 1975 to January 31, 1976. (c) $12,660—Instructors' fees.

3. 1975—June 2 to June 30 inclusive; 1976—no leave; Special Advisor to Chairman.

4. Yes—$31,500-$41,500 salary range.

5. Dr. Coates is pursuing the development of models of organizational change and effectiveness as a post-doctoral

fellow. (a) Queen's University, Kingston, Ontario. (b) Except for full salary, his own expense. (c) Treasury Board Minute 718445 1973-55. (d) February 1, 1976 to September 30, 1976 on educational leave. October 1, 1976 to December 6, 1976, by way of exhaustion of his annual leave credits.

NON-PUBLIC SERVICE POSITIONS

Question No. 721—**Mr. Coates:**

1. What are the names, positions and salaries of each of the individuals who hold non-public service positions in the offices of Parliamentary Secretaries and in each instance, what was the date the person was appointed to the staff in question?

2. In each case, how many have been candidates for office for the Liberal Party in either federal or provincial election campaigns?

3. In each case, are there any persons who work on a contractual basis and are not listed in the above categories and, if so (a) what are their names (b) how long does their contract run (c) what is the amount of the contract (d) what is the reason for the contract (e) were any of them actively involved in the Liberal Party, either federally or provincially, in any past election campaigns?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): 1, 2 and 3. See Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms, Fourth Edition, Citation 184.

RADIO CANADA INTERNATIONAL

Question No. 734—**Mr. Cossitt:**

Is November 7, 1976 the effective date of the reorganization of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation's Radio Canada International Russian Section and, if so (a) for what reason was the date selected and by whom (b) was the fact taken into account in making such selection that November 7, 1976 is the anniversary of the Bolshevik Revolution in the Soviet Union?

Hon. John Roberts (Secretary of State): I am informed by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation as follows: No. November 7 is, however, by international agreement the date on which RCI and other international shortwave broadcasters carry out frequency changes in transition from summer schedules to fall and winter schedules, under the auspices of the International Frequency Registration Board, a division of the International Telecommunications Union, which is a United Nations agency based in Geneva. (b) Not applicable.

UIC—NEW LOCATIONS

Question No. 798—**Mr. Cossitt:**

1. (a) What was the total square footage occupied at 1650 Carling Avenue by the Unemployment Insurance Commission (b) what was the rental cost per square foot (c) what was the total rent paid per year (d) how long does the lease to the government have to run (e) following the moving of the UIC from this location, what was the length of time that the premises remained unoccupied before being utilized for other government purposes and what was the total amount of rental paid for the unoccupied premises?

2. Have the facilities of the Ottawa Office of UIC, formerly located on Carling Avenue, been divided between L'Esplanade Laurier and 414 Cooper Street and, if so (a) in each case, how many square feet of space will be occupied (b) what is the total overall square footage (c) in each case, what is the rental cost per square foot (d) what is the total overall rental (e) from whom is each location rented (f) in each case, what is the (i) length of the lease (ii) name and address of the landlord?

3. What was the total cost of the move from 1650 Carling Avenue to the two new locations and what are the reasons justifying such expense in view of the government's declared restraint programme?

4. What is the (a) total cost of all furnishings at (i) L'Esplanade Laurier (ii) 414 Cooper Street (b) overall cost?

5. Was a new telephone system installed at 1650 Carling Avenue and, if so (a) at what cost (b) on what date?

6. Was a new telephone system installed at the two new locations and, if so (a) in each case, at what cost (b) what was the overall cost?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): I am informed by the Department of Public Works and the Unemployment Insurance Commission as follows: 1. (a) 23,036 square feet (plus 174 parking stalls); (b) $4.15 per square foot (lease payment to owner—not including parking); $5.27 per square foot (U.I.C. rental payment to DPW—including parking); (c) $95,599.40 (not including parking); $121,399.72 (U.I.C. rental payments to DPW—including parking); (d) To March 31, 1977 (plus 2 × 1 year options); (e) U.I.C. vacated July 30, 1976. New tenant occupied premises on October 22, 1976. Renovations commenced two days after U.I.C. vacated. Total amount of rent paid during renovation period—$21,739.04.

2. Yes. (a) L'Esplanade Laurier—office space—22,214 square feet; storage area—737 square feet; 414 Cooper Street—office space—5,407 square feet; (b) 28,358 square feet (plus 13 parking spaces); (c) L'Esplanade Laurier: $9.25 per square foot (lease purchase payment of office space); $3.00 per square foot (lease purchase payment for storage space); $41.25 each per month (for 12 parking spaces); U.I.C. rental payment to DPW —$9.71 per square foot for office space; $3.09 per square foot for storage space. 414 Cooper Street: $10.00 per square foot (lease payments); $40.00 per month (for 1 parking space); U.I.C. rental payment to DPW—$10.30 per square foot; (d) $268,180.50 (total annual payments including parking); $273,667.37 (U.I.C. rental payment to DPW); $6,420.00 (parking payments); (e) L'Esplanade Laurier—Olympic and York Ltd., 414 Cooper Street—Chomley Investments Ltd.; (f) (i)—L'Esplanade Laurier—lease purchase over 35 years; 414 Cooper Street—5 years plus 3 × 1 year options. (ii)—L'Esplanade Laurier—Olympia and York Ltd., 1 Yonge Street, Toronto, Ontario. 414 Cooper Street—Chomley Investments Ltd., c/o Glenview Management Ltd., Suite 400, 170 Laurier Avenue West, Ottawa, Ontario.

3. $285,505.09. The primary reason for the move was co-location with Canada Manpower, which in itself enchances our service to the public. In addition to this, the central nature of the location made it considerably easier to serve those in east, south and central Ottawa.

4. (a) There is no separate inventory for each of these offices; (b) $194,639. This includes L'Esplanade Laurier, 414 Cooper Street and a small office in Vanier.

5. Yes. (a) $6,400.00; (b) March 24, 1975.

6. Yes, a new single telephone system, which included a switchboard, was installed to serve both locations. (a) $6,110.50; (b) $6,110.50.

Order Paper Questions

RADIO CANADA INTERNATIONAL

Question No. 805—**Mr. Cossitt:**

1. Is the government aware of a press statement made to journalist Mr. Patrick Best by the Ambassador of the Soviet Union, His Excellency Alexander Yakovlev, to the effect that at no time did he complain to the Department of External Affairs or the government concerning programming to the Soviet Union by CBC Radio Canada International?

2. How does the government reconcile Mr. Yakovlev's statement with internal CBC memos signed by Mr. L. C. Chipman, Head of Eastern European Programming at the time, one dated December 10, 1975 and the other undated, which state exactly the opposite to the effect that Messrs. Hooper and Chistoff of the Department of External Affairs were approached by Mr. Yakovlev?

3. (a) Is Mr. Yakovlev's statement according to fact and, if so, has the government adopted a policy of slandering the Ambassador to Canada from the Soviet Union (b) is the government prepared to withdraw any statements made alleging such actions by Mr. Yakovlev and (i) if so, on what date (ii) if not, for what reason?

Mr. Fernand E. Leblanc (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State for External Affairs): In so far as the Department of External Affairs is concerned, the reply is as follows: 1. The government is aware of an article by Mr. Patrick Best on this subject which appeared on October 21, 1976.

2 and 3. (a) and (b) As the government is not in a position to confirm statements reportedly made by the Soviet ambassador to the press, it would not be appropriate for it to comment on them.

Question No. 806—**Mr. Cossitt:**

1. Was Mr. M. Mogiljansky, Head of the Russian Section of CBC Radio Canada International at the time the Honourable Member for Leeds released copies of internal CBC memos signed by Mr. Mogiljanksy and others which suggested interference by the Department of External Affairs with news broadcasts to the Soviet Union, recently demoted from his position and, if so, for what reason?

2. How many years was Mr. Mogiljansky in charge of the Russian Section and what is his complete employment history with CBC?

3. What part did Mr. Mogiljansky play originally in setting up the Russian Section of R.C.I.?

4. Is Mr. Mogiljansky being persecuted by the government for offering constructive criticism?

5. Is the government and CBC referring to Mr. Mogiljansky's change in position as a lateral transfer and, if so, how do they justify this?

6. Is it government policy to conduct vendettas against long standing public service employees who simply offer constructive criticism that might be helpful to the operation of the department or corporation concerned, in this case, CBC Radio International?

Hon. John Roberts (Secretary of State): 1. No. Mr. Mogiljansky was recently assigned to a new position in R.C.I.

2. Mr. Mogiljansky was in charge of the Russian section of R.C.I. for approximately one year and four months. It has not been customary to require the CBC to supply such details of its internal management and administration (the background to this custom is explained in the answer to question no. 2,530, May 22, 1975).

3. Mr. Mogiljansky was one of those involved in the setting up of the Russian section.

4. No. Mr. Mogiljansky has offered no criticism.

[Mr. Goodale.]

5. No. The CBC is describing these changes as transfers to new positions with no reduction in pay.

6. To be answered elsewhere. In so far as the Secretary of State is concerned: no.

Question No. 807—**Mr. Cossitt:**

1. Was Mr. Axel Thogerson, Assistant Director of Radio Canada International at the time the Honourable Member for Leeds released copies of internal CBC memos signed by Mr. Thogerson and others which suggested interference by the Department of External Affairs with news broadcasts to the Soviet Union, recently demoted from his position and, if so, for what reason?

2. What is Mr. Thogerson's complete employment history with CBC?

3. Is Mr. Thogerson being persecuted by the government for offering constructive criticism?

4. Is the government and CBC referring to Mr. Thogerson's change in position as a lateral transfer and, if so, how do they justify this?

Hon. John Roberts (Secretary of State): I am informed by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation as follows: 1. Mr. Axel Thogerson was never assistant director of RCI. He was for a time, assistant program director (shortwave). The memo by Mr. Thogerson did not suggest interference by the Department of External Affairs with news broadcasts to the Soviet Union. Mr. Thogerson was recently transferred to a new position within RCI.

2. It has not been customary to require the CBC to supply such details of its internal management and administration (the background to this custom is explained in the answer to Question No. 2,530, May 22, 1975).

3. No.

4. No. The CBC is describing these changes as transfers to new positions with no reduction in pay.

Question No. 808—**Mr. Cossitt:**

1. Was Mr. L. C. Chipman, Supervisor of Eastern European Division of Radio Canada International at the time the Honourable Member for Leeds released copies of internal CBC memos signed by Mr. Chipman and others which suggested interference by the Department of External Affairs with news broadcasts to the Soviet Union, recently demoted from his position and, if so, for what reason?

2. What is Mr. Chipman's complete employment history with CBC?

3. Is Mr. Chipman being persecuted by the government for offering constructive criticism?

4. Is the government and CBC referring to Mr. Chipman's change in position as a lateral transfer and, if so, how do they justify this?

Hon. John Roberts (Secretary of State): I am informed by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation as follows: 1. Mr. Chipman was recently transfered to a new position within RCI. No memos written by Mr. Chipman suggested interference by the Department of External Affairs.

2. It has not been customary to require the CBC to supply such details of its internal management and administration (the background to this custom is explained in the answer to Question No. 2,530, May 22, 1975).

3. No.

4. No. The CBC is describing these changes as transfers to new positions with no reduction in pay.

RELOCATION OF DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

Question No. 1,229—**Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton):**

1. Will the relocation of the Department of Veterans Affairs, as announced, to Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island, contribute to the effectiveness of the Department and, if so, in what manner?

2. Will the decentralization of the Department, as announced, provide better service to the veterans and his or her dependants and, if so, in what manner?

3. What provisions are being made for public servants who cannot relocate to Charlottetown?

4. Which government departments will be able to absorb such employees and how many fall within the category?

5. Is there any likelihood of such public servants, who cannot move, being forced to accept employment in the Public Service at a lower salary scale if they elect to remain in the Public Service in another department or agency?

6. Did the Minister, in a letter dated October 28, 1976, addressed to employees state that employees "are protected to the fullest" and, if so, what did the Minister mean by such a phrase?

7. What is the estimated cost per employee to transfer the bulk of the Department to Charlottetown?

8. What alternative measures for aiding Charlottetown were considered and for what reason were such alternatives abandoned in favour of decentralization of the Department?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): I am informed by the Department of Veterans Affairs and the Treasury Board Secretariat as follows: 1. The effectiveness of the Department of Veterans Affairs will not change as a result of relocation to Charlottetown. However, during the years preceding relocation the department will proceed with planned organizational, procedural and systems improvements which will increase the efficiency and effectiveness of operations.

2. The high standard of service to veterans and their dependants will be maintained. This service will continue to be provided on a personal basis at the Veterans Affairs field locations across Canada.

3. These provisions are described in Treasury Board Personnel Policy Manual including provision for first consideration for reassignment to other departments.

4. Insofar as the Department of Veterans Affairs is concerned, this question cannot be answered at this time.

5. In view of the 4-5 year span of relocation implementation, there is little likelihood that employees who choose not to relocate will be required to consider employment at lower salary levels.

6. Yes. Veterans Affairs employees who choose to relocate will be eligible for reimbursement of legitimate and reasonable removal costs as provided for in the Treasury Board Relocation Directive. Employees who do not choose to relocate will be accorded the provisions of current Treasury Board policies on human resource utilization described in the Treasury Board Personnel Management Manual.

7. Removal costs are estimated to be approximately $6,000 for each employee. At this time there can be no precise determination of the number of employees who will choose to relocate and the number of employees to be recruited at the new location.

8. None.

CANADIAN FLAX STRAW

Question No. 1,254—**Mr. Hnatyshyn:**

Is the government aware of the reports that Canadian flax straw has been used to the limit of its availability for making fine paper products and, if so, is the government giving consideration to ensuring that more of this product is produced in the coming crop year?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): In so far as Agriculture Canada is concerned: Yes. Flax straw presently used for making fine paper products is a by-product of flax seed production and current prices for flax straw do not provide an incentive for producers to increase flax production. Increases in flax acreage cannot be encouraged solely to provide more straw. In addition to the research conducted and supported by Agriculture Canada, as outlined in the answer to Question 1,255, the government is working with producers to investigate possible production and market possibilities of special fibre flax varieties. Government officials have met with flax producers and some members of the Flaxseed Growers of Western Canada have been to a meeting held in Ottawa to discuss the topic. Also, a group of producers and researchers were sponsored on a mission to Europe to investigate European production and utilization of flax fibre.

In so far as the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce is concerned: Presently a limited amount of flaxseed straw is being collected and used for the production of fine paper products. The collection and further processing of flax straw is being examined as a complementary source of revenue for flax growers. To this end, the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce has collaborated with the Flax Growers of Western Canada by funding a mission to western Europe to conduct trials on the production of flax fibre from Canadian flax straw, to evaluate processing technologies and processing equipment available and to evaluate market potential. It should also be noted that the department is assisting in a major way in the establishment of the "P.O.S." Pilot Plant Corporation in Saskatoon which has, as the prime objective, the value-added processing of grains and oilseeds including flax.

CANADIAN FLAX—POTENTIAL RESOURCE OF INDUSTRIAL OIL

Question No. 1,255—**Mr. Hnatyshyn:**

Is the government aware of the reports that industrial oil obtained from western Canadian flax is of high quality and is a possible continuing source of this important product and, if so, what research is the government undertaking to ensure that this potential resource is fully exploited?

Hon. E. F. Whelan (Minister of Agriculture): Yes. Agriculture Canada conducts research to obtain earlier ripening, improved yields, resistance to flax rust and superior oil and meal quality through plant breeding and this work is supported by genetic research. In addition, Agriculture Canada supports complementary research on flax at the University of Saskatchewan in order to expand the potential of flax as a major prairie

crop. It should also be noted that the department is assisting in a major way in the establishment of the "P.O.S." Pilot Plant Corporation in Saskatoon which has, as the prime objective, the value-added processing of grains and oilseeds including flax.

EMPLOYEES FROM PRIVATE EMPLOYMENT AGENCIES

Question No. 1,526—**Mr. McKenzie:**

1. Has the Department of Supply and Services obtained (a) part-time (b) full-time employees from private employment agencies in (i) British Columbia (ii) Alberta (iii) Saskatchewan (iv) Manitoba (v) Ontario (vi) Quebec (vii) New Brunswick (viii) Nova Scotia (ix) Prince Edward Island (x) Newfoundland and, if so, in each case, how many?

2. Are such employees paid from supplementary estimates and, if not, from what estimates are they paid?

3. By province, what was the (a) average hourly rate paid to employment agencies (b) average hourly rate paid to employees (c) total amount paid by the Department in (i) 1975 (ii) 1976?

Hon. Jean-Pierre Goyer (Minister of Supply and Services): 1. Yes. (a) i, vii, ix, x—Nil; ii—12; iii—3; iv—9; v—1,046; vi—44; viii—1. (b) i, ii, iii, iv, vi, vii, viii, ix, x—Nil; v—64.

2. Main estimates.

3. (a)

	1975	1976
Alberta	$6.30	$6.71
Saskatchewan	5.20	6.50
Manitoba	6.00	5.81
Ontario	8.25	7.65
Quebec	4.50	5.00
Nova Scotia	—	5.40

(b) This information is not available from department records as salary and pay arrangements are the responsibility of the agency and the employees. (c) 1975, $651,278.33; 1976, $1,083,965.31.

EMPLOYEES FROM PRIVATE EMPLOYMENT AGENCIES

Question No. 1,528—**Mr. McKenzie:**

1. Has the Department of the Solicitor General obtained (a) part-time (b) full-time employees from private employment agencies in (i) British Columbia (ii) Alberta (iii) Saskatchewan (iv) Manitoba (v) Ontario (vi) Quebec (vii) New Brunswick (viii) Nova Scotia (ix) Prince Edward Island (x) Newfoundland and, if so, in each case, how many?

2. Are such employees paid from supplementary estimates and, if not, from what estimates are they paid?

3. By province, what was the (a) average hourly rate paid to employment agencies (b) average hourly rate paid to employees (c) total amount paid by the Department in (i) 1975 (ii) 1976?

Hon. Francis Fox (Solicitor General): 1. (a) Yes.

	1975-76	1976-77
(i)	2	1
(ii-iv)	Nil	Nil
(v)	130	130
(vi)	Nil	Nil
(vii)	3	8
(viii-x)	Nil	Nil

[Mr. Whelan.]

(b) Yes.

	1975-76	1976-77
(i-iv)	Nil	Nil
(v)	12	13
(vi-x)	Nil	Nil

2. No. The employees are paid from main estimates.

3. (a)

	1975-76	1976-77
(i)	$5.90	$5.75
(ii-iv)	N/A	N/A
(v)	$6.98	$7.59
(vi)	N/A	N/A
(vii)	$4.75	$4.90
(viii-x)	N/A	N/A

(b) All agency employees are paid by their respective employment agency, and the hourly rates of pay they receive are a private matter between the agency (employer) and their employees. (c) (i) $223,143; (ii) $204,180.

Canadian Penitentiary Service and the National Parole Service: 1. (a) Yes.

	1975-76	1976-77
(i)	58	62
(ii)	8	3
(iii)	11	2
(iv)	Nil	Nil
(v)	78	117
(vi)	1	Nil
(vii)	2	Nil
(viii)	Nil	1
(ix and x)	Nil	Nil

(b) No.

2. No. Funding for payment is included in the main estimates.

3. (a)

	1975-76	1976-77
(i)	$6.28	$5.66
(ii)	$4.75	$4.37
(iii)	$5.00	$4.25
(iv)	Nil	Nil
(v)	$6.02	$5.54
(vi)	$5.15	Nil
(vii)	$4.90	Nil
(viii)	Nil	$4.85
(ix and x)	Nil	Nil

(b) The Canadian Penitentiary Service is not informed of the rate paid by the employment agencies to their employees. (c) (i) $171,507.70; (ii) $180,375.34.

Royal Canadian Mounted Police: 1. (a) No. (b) Yes.

	1975-76	1976-77
(i-iv)	Nil	Nil
(v)	59	80
(vi)	2	Nil
(vii-x)	Nil	Nil

2. No. The employees are paid from main estimates.

3. (a)

	1975-76	1976-77
(i-iv)	Nil	Nil
(v)	$6.05	$6.38
(vi)	$6.48	Nil
(vii-x)	Nil	Nil

(b) All agency employees are paid by their respective employment agency, and the hourly rates of pay they receive are a private matter between the agency (employer) and their employees. (c) (i) $161,749.16; (ii) $278,625.80.

National Parole Board: 1. (a) Yes.

	1975-76	1976-77
(i)	3	3
(ii)	Nil	Nil
(iii)	1	1
(iv)	Nil	Nil
(v)	14	8
(vi-x)	Nil	Nil

(b) No.

2. No. Funding for payment is included in the main estimates.

3. (a)

	1975-76	1976-77
(i)	$6.17	$6.25
(ii)	Nil	Nil
(iii)	$4.70	$5.45
(iv)	Nil	Nil
(v)	$4.95	$5.34
(vi-x)	Nil	Nil

(b) All agency employees are paid by their respective employment agency, and the hourly rates of pay they receive are a private matter between the agency (employer) and their employees. (c) (i) $6,976.79; (ii) $2,899.16.

PUBLIC SERVANTS IN QUEBEC

Question No. 1,618—**Mr. Coates:**

1. How many employees of the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources are located in the Province of Quebec and what is the estimated payroll for the fiscal year 1976-77?

2. What is the value of property and equipment associated with the operations of the Department in the Province?

3. What is the value of the cushion provided under the policies of the Department in association with the importations of foreign oil from the beginning of the programme to the end of the 1976-77 fiscal year?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): I am informed by the Departments of Energy, Mines and Resources and Public Works as follows: 1. Sixty-three employees; $839,690.

2. Value of property—See answer to part 2 of question No. 1,620 answered April 1, 1977. Estimated value of equipment—$651,286.

3. January 1, 1974 to end of fiscal year 1976-77, Quebec only—$2,300 million.

Question No. 1,619—**Mr. Coates:**

1. How many public servants in the Department of the Secretary of State are located in the Province of Quebec and what is the estimated payroll for the fiscal year 1976-77?

2. What is the value of buildings and equipment associated with the operations of the Department in the Province?

3. What is the estimated value of programmes presently underway in the Province that are associated with the operations of the Department?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): I am informed by the Departments of Public Works and the Secretary of State as follows: 1. Four hundred eighty. $7,514,636.

2 and 3. Value of buildings—See answer to part 2 of question No. 1,620 answered April 1, 1977.

Program	Operating expenditures and fixed assets (other than salaries)	Grants	Contributions	Total
Administration	1,000	—	—	1,000
Education				
Support	—	—	336,000,000	336,000,000
Translation	551,000	—	—	551,000
Citizenship	213,000	1,390,000	202,000	1,805,000
Approximate cost	765,000	1,390,000	336,202,000	338,357,000

NOTE: Salaries indicated in part 1 to be added.

Question No. 1,624—**Mr. Coates:**

1. How many employees of the Department of Supply and Services are located in the Province of Quebec and what is the estimated payroll for the fiscal year 1976-77?

2. How many government contracts are now being monitored by the Department, including defence projects and what is the estimated value of such contracts?

3. How many buildings and equipment under the responsibility of the Department are located in the Province and what is the estimated value in each case?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): I am informed by the Departments of Supply and Services and Public Works as follows: 1. One thousand five hundred twenty-six. $20,808,018.

2. Contracts:

	Vendor Location		Vendor Supply Point	
	No.	$000	No.	$000
National Defence	5,951	126,138	7,246	146,533
Total	20,420	437,445	27,774	399,191

3. Total value of equipment $2,128,343.56. Value of buildings—See answer to part 2 of question No. 1,620 answered April 1, 1977.

Order Paper Questions

Question No. 1,625—**Mr. Coates:**

1. How many members of the RCMP are located in the Province of Quebec and what is the estimated payroll for the fiscal year 1976-77?

2. What is the estimated value of buildings and equipment under the responsibility of the RCMP in the Province?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): I am informed by the Royal Canadian Mounted Police and the Department of Public Works as follows: 1. One thousand two hundred sixty-five. $21,913,500.

2. Value of buildings—See answer to part 2 of question No. 1,620 answered April 1, 1977. Estimated value of equipment—$4,800,000.

Question No. 1,626—**Mr. Coates:**

1. How many employees of the Department of Agriculture are in the Province of Quebec and what is the total payroll for the fiscal year 1976-77?

2. What is the estimated value of property and equipment owned by the Department in the Province?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): I am informed by Agriculture Canada and the Department of Public Works as follows: 1. 1,359 man-years and $21,321,659 are budgeted for 1976-77.

2. Value of property—See answer to part 2 of question No. 1,620 answered April 1, 1977. Value of equipment—$3,480,-440. Equipment records maintained by the department includes items which are considered attractive or have a value of more than $50.

Question No. 1,628—**Mr. Coates:**

1. How many employees of the (a) Canadian Penitentiary Service (b) Department of the Solicitor General (c) Department of Justice are located in the Province of Quebec and, in each case, what is the estimated payroll for the fiscal year 1976-77?

2. In each case, what is the value of buildings and equipment that the Department has in the Province?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): I am informed by the Departments of the Solicitor General, Justice and Public Works as follows: 1. (a) 2,228. $39,827,000. (b) 2 (Ministry Secretariat); $35,264. (c) 67. $1,282,186.66.

2. Value of buildings—See answer to part 2 of question No. 1,620 answered April 1, 1977. (a) Value of equipment—$9,200,000 (approximately); (b) Value of equipment—$4,880; (c) Value of equipment—$81,892.

Question No. 1,629—**Mr. Coates:**

1. How many employees of the Department of Regional Economic Expansion are located in the Province of Quebec and what is the estimated payroll for the fiscal year 1976-77?

2. What is the estimated value of property and equipment owned by DREE in the Province?

3. What is the total value of loans and grants awarded to industries in the Province since the inception of the Regional Development Incentives Programme and what is the outstanding indebtedness of Quebec businesses to the government as of December 31, 1976?

[Mr. Goodale.]

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): I am informed by the Departments of Public Works and Regional Economic Expansion as follows: 1. One hundred thirty-five. $2,277,038 as of December 31, 1976.

2. Value of buildings—See answer to part 2 of question No. 1,620 answered April 1, 1977. Value of equipment—$260,586.

3. (a) The department has awarded no loans since the inception of the Regional Development Incentives Program. However, as of December 31, 1976, for loan guarantee offers made and accepted, the amount of DREE guarantees, in respect of loans of $24 million is $16.5 million. (b) As of December 31, 1976, $217,630,125 in grants had been offered to industries in the province. (c) Quebec businesses owed no money to the department as of December 31, 1976.

Question No. 1,630—**Mr. Coates:**

1. (a) What are the names of Crown corporations, in addition to CNR, CBC and Air Canada, that operate in the Province of Quebec (b) what is the total number of employees of each located in the Province (c) what is the estimated payroll for each for the fiscal year 1976-77?

2. In each case, what is the estimated value of property and equipment owned in the Province?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation: 1. (b) 990. (c) $11,000,000 (estimated) year 1976.

2. The estimated value of residential properties owned by CMHC in the province of Québec, as at December 31, 1976, is as follows: CMHC owned: $106,169,146. Mortgage Insurance Fund: $44,240,212. Total: $150,409,358.

Export Development Corporation: It has not been the practice to answer questions concerning the internal administration of the Export Development Corporation inasmuch as the Export Development Act places the responsibility for such matters in its board of directors.

Farm Credit Corporation: 1. (b) 128 as at December 31, 1976. (c) $2.005 million (estimated).

2. No real property as at December 31, 1976. Equipment $59,020 as at December 31, 1976.

Federal Business Development Bank: 1. (b) 646. (c) $8,900,000. (estimated).

2. The Federal Business Development Bank does not own real estate for its own use in the province of Quebec but it does own office equipment and furniture located in its Head Office in Montreal and regional and branch offices. At March 31st, 1976, the book value of all fixed assets owned by FBDB was $2,082,852. A breakdown by province is not available.

Laurentian Pilotage Authority: 1. (b) 81. (c) $1,600,000.

2. $103,000.

Loto Canada Inc.: 1. (b) 31. (c) $383,832.

2. $49,750.

The St. Lawrence Seaway Authority: 1. (b) 432. (c) $7,225,000.

2. $212,000,000.

Teleglobe Canada: 1. (b) 700. (c) $18,435,818.

2. At cost $37,371,392. At net Book Value $21,929,003. Other proprietary corporations have no employees working in the province of Quebec.

IMMIGRATION ACTIVITIES

Question No. 1,917—**Mr. Schumacher:**

1. For all immigration activities, including appeals, how is work progressed through (a) local offices (b) overseas offices (c) regional offices (d) headquarters?

2. In each case, what is the (a) chain of command (b) name, title and location of those responsible at each decision-making level?

3. In each case, who is responsible for decisions on the movement of immigrants, according to each category, in Canada?

Hon. Bud Cullen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): The process of immigration activities is described in Volume 2, "The Immigration Program" of the Report of the Canadian Immigration and Population Study published in 1974. To reply to this question in more detail would require a complete explanation and documentation of all operations of the immigration division at headquarters and in the field including the work flow and decision-making process. The cost of compiling this detailed information is clearly prohibitive.

IMMIGRANTS FROM 1947 TO DATE

Question No. 1,918—**Mr. Schumacher:**

1. In each year since 1947 to date, how many immigrants by (a) country of origin (b) racial extraction (c) occupational qualifications (d) destination were accepted into Canada and, in each case, how many were (i) sponsored (ii) unsponsored?

2. For the same years, how many of those sponsored were (a) workers (b) non-workers and what was the sponsor relationship in each case?

3. For the same years, how many of those unsponsored were (a) workers (b) non-workers?

4. For the same years, how many visitors by (a) country of origin (b) racial extraction (c) location in Canada were granted landed immigrant status?

5. For the same years, how many Canadian emigrants by (a) province (b) age (c) qualifications (d) country of destination, left Canada?

Hon. Bud Cullen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): 1. (a) Available from Immigration Statistics which are published yearly. (b) Not available. (c) See 1(a). (d) See 1(a).

2. (a) Prior to 1967, statistics in the form requested not available. In October of 1967, the regulations were amended to include nominated relatives, sponsored dependants and independent classes. Therefore, the statistics provided below concerning sponsored immigrants destined to the labour force were: 1968, 5,958; 1969, 6,496; 1970, 6,523; 1971, 7,425; 1972, 7,764; 1973, 8,959; 1974, 10,606; 1975, 14,762; 1976, 16,448. (b) Prior to 1967 statistics in the form requested not available. (see 2(a)). Since that time, sponsored immigrants not destined to the labour force were as follows: 1968, 32,349; 1969, 27,052; 1970, 25,740; 1971, 26,025; 1972, 25,313; 1973, 33,042; 1974, 43,691; 1975, 49,563; 1976, 45,394. Sponsor relationship not readily available.

3. Data not available on unsponsored workers prior to 1964. The unsponsored class of immigrants was cancelled in 1967 with the introduction of the new immigration regulations. Therefore, the statistics below reflect the unsponsored workers and non-workers who came in Canada in the years 1964 to 1967 and independent immigrants from 1968 on: (a) 1964, 38,529; (b) 27,281; 1965, (a) 53,679; (b) 34,988; 1966, (a) 75,771; (b) 51,108; 1967, (a) 93,302; (b) 55,141; 1968, (a) 64,961; (b) 36,979; 1969, (a) 54,488; (b) 32,328; 1970, (a) 51,293; (b) 28,815; 1971, (a) 36,808; (b) 22,299; 1972, (a) 34,106; (b) 23,864; 1973, (a) 59,117; (b) 38,400; 1974, (a) 67,447; (b) 43,473; 1975, (a) 42,106; (b) 34,454; 1976, (a) 25,163; (b) 23,862.

4. Statistics on the number of "visitors" landed in Canada are not available as such. However, the following is the total number of applicants in Canada who were granted landed immigrants status since 1957. Prior to that date, data not readily available. 1957, 7,067; 1958, 8,149; 1959, 9,886; 1960, 8,648; 1961, 10,536; 1962, 11,243; 1963, 13,466; 1964, 13,872; 1965, 14,847; 1966, 18,045; 1967, 31,611; 1968, 32,619; 1969, 38,765; 1970, 43,010; 1971, 46,896; 1972, 45,079; 1973, 66,467; 1974, 45,089; 1975, 23,122; 1976, 25,212. (a), (b), (c) statistics, in the form requested, not available.

5. We do not record persons leaving Canada.

COST OF BUILDING "M.V. GULF GUARD"

Question No. 1,989—**Mr. Clarke:**

1. (a) What was the cost of building the M.V. *Gulf Guard*, now owned by the Canadian Commercial Corporation, for the original owners, Gulf Garden Foods (b) for what purpose was the boat built (c) for what length of time was it in use for Gulf Garden Foods before it was sold?

2. (a) For what purpose did the second owners, PEI Industrial Corporation purchase the boat (b) for what length of time was it in use for PEI IC (c) for what reason was the boat listed for sale by PEI IC (d) how much did PEI IC pay for the purchase of the boat from Gulf Garden Foods (e) for what reason was it transferred from PEI IC to Industrial Enterprises Incorporated?

3. (a) For what purpose did Breton Trawlers Ltd. purchase it from PEI IC (b) how much did they pay for it (c) for what length of time and in what capacity was it in operation for Breton Trawlers Ltd. before it was sold (d) for what reason was the boat listed for sale by the Breton Trawlers Ltd.?

4. When the Canadian Commercial Corporation purchased the boat from Breton Trawlers Ltd., was the Corporation aware that modifications would be necessary before the vessel would be suitable for the purpose intended by CIDA?

5. What "unforeseen requirements", as stated in the Auditor General's Report, caused an increase from $264,500 to $453,800 for a contract for modification of the vessel?

6. Did CIDA confer with the Republic of Colombia concerning the modifications necessary before the boat would be suitable for operation and, if so, for what reason did the Republic of Colombia find the vessel unstable and unsuitable?

7. Where is the boat at the present time?

8. What course of action does CIDA intend to take to put the M.V. *Gulf Guard* into operation?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): I am informed by the Department of Supply and Services and the Canadian International Development Agency as follows: 1. (a) This information is not available to us. (b) We have to assume for fishing as this is a fishing vessel, but beyond this we have no details. (c) Gulf

Garden Foods was the registered owner from Feb. 10/65 to Dec. 19/66 but we have no details as to use.

2. (a) We assume for fishing purposes as this is a fishing vessel, but no further details are available to us. (b) PEI Industrial Corporation was the registered owner from Dec. 19/66 to June 4/68 but we have no details as to use. (c) This information is not available to us. (d) This information is not available to us. (e) We understand that PEI IC was disbanded and therefore this vessel was transferred to Industrial Enterprises Inc.

3. (a) According to Ministry of Transport Registry of Shipping, Breton Trawlers Limited obtained the vessel from Industrial Enterprises Inc., not from PEI IC. The vessel was obtained for fishing in the Gulf off Prince Edward Island. (b) This information is not available to us. (c) Breton Trawlers Limited was the registered owner from August 13/69 to Dec. 28/73. The vessel was employed for fishing more or less during this period but fishing declined from 1972 onwards. (d) Because the fishing declined around Prince Edward Island in the Gulf area.

4. Yes.

5. The contract allowed for costs of design changes or additional work to be negotiated under Design Change Procedures. These included design changes requested by the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA)/Colombian Government costing $42,242.63, additional work arisings (which only became evident as the vessel was opened up so that the conversion requirements could be met) costing $62,209.12 and additional watch-keeping services costing $28,891.50 for a total of $133,343.25. These additional requirements therefore caused an increase from $264,500 to $397,843.25 to the contract for the modification of the vessel. The Auditor General's figure of $453,800 includes other charges accruing to the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA) for the total cost of the program including such items as Naval Architects fees, cost of winterizing the vessel, design investigation and the Department of Supply and Services cost recovery charges for contractual services.

6. (a) Colombian officials were consulted throughout the elaboration of designs for the vessel, and approved the final design. (b) The stability characteristics were determined in Canada as part of the conversion contract. When the vessel was inclined upon completion of the conversion work the figures obtained by the contractor indicated that the vessel could not operate safely in one condition of the requirement that she perform as a multimode fishing-training vessel. The *Gulf Guard* had been officially donated to Colombia before the stability characteristics of the vessel (as converted) were known. In the circumstances, CIDA rescinded the donation. Subsequent events including a second inclining test proved the vessel to be capable of operating safely in all fishing modes subject to a minor modification and revealed that the first inclining and stability investigation contained an error.

7. Sydney, Nova Scotia.

[Mr. Goodale.]

8. The Government of Colombia has been informed that the *Gulf Guard* can be certified for use as a multimode fishing-training vessel as originally intended. The vessel will be handed over on acceptance by the Government of Colombia.

PRIVATE EMPLOYMENT AGENCIES

Question No. 2,180—**Mr. McKenzie:**

1. With reference to the answer to Question No. 1,552, did the Ministry of State for Urban Affairs obtain (a) part-time (b) full-time help, that was not placed on the pay list at the Central Pay Office but paid in some other manner, from private employment agencies in (i) British Columbia (ii) Alberta (iii) Saskatchewan (iv) Manitoba (v) Ontario (vi) Quebec (vii) New Brunswick (viii) Nova Scotia (ix) Prince Edward Island (x) Newfoundland and, if so, in each case, how many persons were involved?

2. From what source were such persons paid?

3. What was the total amount paid to such persons in (a) 1975 (b) 1976?

Hon. André Ouellet (Minister of State for Urban Affairs): 1. (a) No; (b) Yes—(i), (ii), (iii), (iv), (vii), (viii), (ix), and (x): Not applicable; (v) Yes. 1975-76: 207 persons; 1976-77: 94 persons. (vi) Yes. 1975-76: Nil; 1976-77: 5 persons.

2. Operating Vote, Standard Object 04.

3. (a) $431,931; (b) $299,878.

NOTE: These persons were all hired to work full-time, i.e., 37½ hours per week, but they were temporary in that they were hired for a short, fixed length of time through a private employment agency and were paid by the private employment agency.

VALUE OF FEDERAL PROPERTIES

Question No. 2,225—**Mr. Herbert:**

What is the value of federal properties by province and for the National Capital Region?

Mr. Alexandre Cyr (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Public Works): In so far as the Department of Public Works is concerned: This question cannot reasonably be answered as our records are not maintained to show the value of our holdings. We do have original cost data, but this generally would be a very poor measure of the market or replacement value of our holdings. To determine the market value would be an extremely costly and time consuming task as it would involve the individual appraisal of every building and property; including presumably marine structures and equipment.

TOTAL NUMBER OF PUBLIC SERVANTS WORKING IN HULL, QUEBEC

Question No. 2,267—**Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton):**

1. What is the total number of public servants and employees of Crown corporations and agencies whose place of work is in Hull, Quebec?

2. How many such employees were residing in the Province of Ontario as of April 1, 1976?

3. What is the anticipated total number of such employees who will be employed in Hull, Quebec by the year 1980?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Treasury Board: 1. As of February 28, 1977: 5,428 federal public servants.

NOTE: This includes all employees in Metropolitan Hull in departments or agencies which are subject to the Public Service Staff Relations Act, Schedule 1, Part 1.

2. No information is available.

3. No information is available.

Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation: 1. Fifty-two.

2. Twelve.

3. No information is available.

Farm Credit Corporation: 1. One.

2. None.

3. One.

Federal Business Development Bank: 1. Nine.

2. None.

3. No information is available.

Royal Canadian Mint: 1. One hundred and thirty nine.

2. Eighty five

3. No information is available.

CMHC—VANCOUVER BRANCH OFFICE

Question No. 2,292—**Mr. Clarke (Vancouver Quadra):**

1. Did the Vancouver Branch Office of CMHC move from its own building at 2286 West 12th to rented premises at 5511 West Boulevard and, if so (a) for what reason (b) what is the area leased (c) what is the rental rate (i) per annum (ii) per square foot?

2. Are there provisions in the lease for (a) rental increases (b) escalation for taxes, etc. and, if so, what are they?

3. What is the term (length) of the lease and date of commencement?

4. Is payment made for parking space and, if so, how much and for how many spaces?

5. Does provision exist for fireproof storage to replace the vault at the old offices and, if so, what is it?

6. (a) Has the government owned building at 2286 W. 12th been vacated and, if so, on what date (b) have efforts been made to lease or sell it and, if so, what are they (c) have the services of the Department of Public Works been enlisted to dispose of it and, if not, for what reason?

7. (a) How many persons are employed at the Vancouver Branch Office and how many are in management positions (b) how many new (i) departments (ii) management positions have been created since the Office moved to 2286 West 12th in 1954?

8. In the past 5 years, what has been the volume of (a) loans and their dollar value (b) foreclosures (c) other activities handled by the Vancouver Branch Office?

Hon. André Ouellet (Minister of State for Urban Affairs): I am advised as follows by Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation: 1. Yes. (a) Vancouver Branch Office of CMHC moved from 2286 West 12th Avenue to 5511 West Boulevard to consolidate its operations under one roof and to provide space for needed expansion. (b) and (c) The provision of space for Corporation offices is a matter of internal administration and is included in the Administrative Budget of CMHC approved annually by its Board of Directors.

2, 3, 4 and 5. See answer to 1(b) above.

6. (a) CMHC vacated its building at 2286 West 12th Avenue in May 1976. (b) The building was advertised for sale by public tender, the closing date being December 14, 1976. There were 27 requests for tender documents but only two bids were received. Neither of these was acceptable. Two offers to purchase were subsequently received on April 6th and 19th and the property was sold effective June 1, 1977. (c) Notice of the availability of the building was circulated to all Government departments in the Vancouver area through the Department of Public Works on February 3, 1976 but none expressed an interest in acquiring the property.

7. (a) The staff employed at Vancouver Branch of CMHC totals 172, (154 regular employees and 18 on contract), of which 11 are in management. (b) Information to answer this question is not available.

8. (a) and (c) See Table 1 opposite page. (b) The Vancouver office handled 242 foreclosure actions in the past five years.

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE COMMISSION—TELEPHONE NUMBER OF UIC'S OFFICE IN JONQUIÈRE

Question No. 2,384—**Mr. Fortin:**

1. Is the telephone number of UIC's office at Jonquière, Quebec confidential and (a) if so, for what reason (b) if not, for what reason does UIC refuse to give it?

2. What is the telephone number of UIC's office at Jonquière?

Hon. Bud Cullen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): 1. No, it is not confidential. (a) Not applicable. (b) This office is in the process of being set up and does not as yet have the staff required to provide information by telephone. This service is provided toll free by the Chicoutimi office.

2. (418) 542-7507.

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE COMMISSION—REVOKING OF GUIDELINES

Question No. 2,388—**Mr. Fortin:**

On September 26, 1976, did five officers of the Quebec Unemployment Insurance Commission, wearing masks because allegedly they were afraid of being fired, submit documents to denounce certain methods of the UIC in Quebec, especially some guidelines signed by Mr. Robert Sanschagrin, Chief of Insurance Services in Quebec, providing that it is not necessary to indicate summons, form letters or other documents that a beneficiary must be able to speak one of the two official languages and, stating also that if a beneficiary who does not speak one of the languages would come without an interpreter, he would be considered uneligible under subsection 55(5) of the Act and, if so, have the guidelines been revoked since that time?

Hon. Bud Cullen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): The five persons wearing masks were not identified as officers of the Unemployment Insurance Commission.

TABLE 1

NHA ACTIVITY[1] VANCOUVER BRANCH, CMHC, 1972-1976

Item	1972				1973				1974				1975				1976			
	Loans	Units	Hostel Beds	$000	Loans	Units	Hostel Beds	$000	Loans	Units	Hostel Beds	$000	Loans	Units	Hostel Beds	$000	Loans	Units	Hostel Beds	$000
Loans for Housing[2]																				
Approved Lenders	5,690	8,355	576	149,466	4,589	5,765	482	122,486	3,558	3,812	—	113,930	7,961	8,482	—	307,996	8,752	11,147	122	439,552
CMHC[3]	183	1,194	435	15,013	271	1,141	1,273	22,920	1,014	3,602	549	73,942	885	3,388	426	76,376	1,094	2,969	485	37,878
F/P Housing Projects	3	561	—	7,148	4	1,267	—	19,527	4	131	151	2,469	1	17	—	19	—	—	—	—
Loans for Other Purposes[4]	14	—	—	18,485	10	—	—	20,214	16	—	—	6,216	10	—	—	23,917	23	—	—	16,335
F/P Land Assembly Projects	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	355	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Grants for Community Revitalization[5]	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	5	—	—	2,500	6	—	—	1,900	12	—	—	5,100
Grants for Infrastructure[6]	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	8	—	—	574	58	—	—	3,453
Grants for Other Purposes[7]	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	30	—	—	198	13	—	—	73	7	—	—	56

[1] Data are gross.
[2] New and existing housing.
[3] Includes Residential Rehabilitation.
[4] Land assembly, water and sewerage projects.
[5] Urban renewal, neighbourhood improvement.
[6] Water and sewerage projects, municipal incentive.
[7] Start-up funds.

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE COMMISSION—ICE PROGRAM GUIDELINES

Question No. 2,391—**Mr. Fortin:**

1. During a press conference held on September 26, 1976, did five agents of UIC wearing a hood, disclose the content of a guideline sent to all directors of UIC offices in Quebec by Mrs. Claire Duquette on behalf of the Head of Insurance, Mr. Robert Sanschagrin, which stipulated that hereafter, agents who used to phone the claimants under the ICE Programme to inquire about their availability before disqualifying them, should stop this practice immediately and disqualify without further ceremony any claimant who did not show for his ICE interview and, if so (a) is this guideline applied in other areas of Canada (b) has this practice been abolished (i) in Quebec (ii) elsewhere and, if so, on what date?

2. Since the month of April 1976, what percentage of this type of excluded claimants have regained their right to receive their allowances, for each month and in each area of Canada?

Hon. Bud Cullen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): 1. Not applicable, since the five persons wearing hoods were not identified as employees of the U.I.C.

2. Not applicable.

MAPLE LEAF MONARCH COMPANY

Question No. 2,448—**Mr. Neil:**

Did DREE or any other department provide funds by way of grant or loan to Maple Leaf Monarch Co. to establish an oil seed crushing plant at Windsor, Ontario?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): I am informed by the Departments of Agriculture, Finance, Industry, Trade and Commerce and Regional Economic Expansion as follows: no.

KOOTENAY WEST—MINISTERIAL ADVISORY BOARD EXPENSES

Question No. 2,479—**Mr. Brisco:**

1. What was the total cost of expenses for attendance of the members of the Ministerial Advisory Board of Kootenay West at meetings for the first series of applications under the Canada Works and Young Canada Works Programmes?

2. What is the estimated salary of the project officers involved in the review of the Programmes for Kootenay West?

Hon. Bud Cullen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): 1. $1,567.

2. Two project officers have been designated to serve the constituency of Kootenay West. Their annual salary ranges from $14,296 to $16,207.

CONTRACT AWARDED TO UNLICENSED MOVER IN BRITISH COLUMBIA TO MOVE POST OFFICE

Question No. 2,540—**Mr. McKinnon:**

1. Did the Department of Public Works or any other department award in 1977 a contract to an unlicensed mover to move the main post office from Victoria to Saanich, British Columbia, in breach of the stipulation in the contract put out to tender, namely section 6, page one of three, "Permits and By-laws", which states "The Contractor shall comply with all laws and regulations, relating to the work, whether federal, provincial or municipal, as if the work were for a person other than Her Majesty, and shall pay for all permits and certificates required in respect of the work"?

2. Was the contractor awarded this particular contract in breach of any federal, provincial or municipal law or regulation?

Hon. Judd Buchanan (Minister of Public Works): 1. A contract was awarded by the Department of Public Works to a contractor who was registered in New Westminster. He was to comply with Section 6 and obtain all necessary permits and certificates. We have subsequently discovered he did not comply technically with our contract clause. A provincial motor carrier license was not obtained.

2. To our knowledge, the contractor was not in breach of any law or regulations. He did not require a municipal permit because the move involved more than one municipality and he was exempt from a provincial license because the move was for the federal government.

CMHC—SALARIES OF MEMBERS OF BOARD

Question No. 2,747—**Mr. Robinson:**

What is the salary of the (a) Executive (b) Director (c) Chairman (d) Vice-Chairman (e) board members of Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation?

Hon. André Ouellet (Minister of State for Urban Affairs): I am advised as follows by Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation: (a) The Chairman of the Board of Directors of CMHC receives a salary of $53,000 per annum. (b) The President of CMHC receives a salary in the range from $45,000 to $50,000 per annum. (c) The Vice-Presidents of CMHC receive salaries in the range from $40,000 to $45,000 per annum. (d) The three members of the Board of Directors of CMHC, appointed from the Public Service of Canada, do not receive additional remuneration because of their appointments. The five members of the Board of Directors of CMHC, appointed from outside the Public Service, receive $150 per diem for attendance at meetings of the Board of Directors.

RURAL AND REMOTE HOUSING PROGRAMME

Question No. 2,774—**Mr. Hogan:**

For the fiscal year (a) 1975 (b) 1976, what was the total number and value of homes built and repaired under the Rural and Remote Housing Programme in (i) the Municipality of the County of Cape Breton and what was the breakdown of the figures by location (i.e. Louisbourg, Marion Bridge, etc.) (ii) all other counties of Nova Scotia?

Mr. André Ouellet (Minister of State for Urban Affairs): I am advised as follows by Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation. See Table 1 following.

RURAL AND NATIVE HOUSING UNDER THE NHA
NOVA SCOTIA, 1975-1976 (1)

County	New Housing (Sec. 40)				Rehabilitation (Sec. 34.1)			
	1975		1976		1975		1976	
	Units	$000	Units	$000	Units	$000	Units	$000
Cape Breton	35	910	—	—	—	—	11	49
Birch Grove	1	26	—	—	—	—	—	—

Order Paper Questions

County	New Housing (Sec. 40)				Rehabilitation (Sec. 34.1)			
	1975		1976		1975		1976	
	Units	$000	Units	$000	Units	$000	Units	$000
Bras D'Or	7	182	—	—	—	—	1	5
Broughton	1	26	—	—	—	—	—	—
Donkin	4	104	—	—	—	—	1	4
Florence	11	286	—	—	—	—	3	13
Louisburg	1	26	—	—	—	—	—	—
New Boston	1	26	—	—	—	—	—	—
Point Aconi	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	4
Port Morien	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	4
Reserve	5	130	—	—	—	—	3	13
Scotchtown	4	104	—	—	—	—	1	5
Annapolis	—	—	—	—	—	—	7	34
Antigonish	—	—	17	442	—	—	16	78
Colchester	—	—	3	78	—	—	1	5
Cumberland	—	—	14	364	—	—	14	68
Digby	3	78	13	338	—	—	8	39
Guysborough	28	807	16	464	—	—	45	218
Hants	1	26	8	208	—	—	10	48
Kings	1	26	19	494	—	—	26	126
Lunenburg	3	78	2	52	—	—	5	24
Queens	1	26	4	104	—	—	4	19
Yarmouth	5	130	15	390	—	—	23	111

(1) Data are gross and preliminary.

WESTMINSTER HOSPITAL—LONDON, ONTARIO

Question No. 2,860—**Mr. Marshall:**

1. Under the agreement signed on June 13, 1977 between the Minister of Veterans Affairs and the Minister of Health for Ontario with regard to the transfer of DVA's Westminster Hospital in London on October 3, 1977, what are the details involved in the transfer of (a) all the buildings (b) the land?

2. What is the location of all the buildings?

3. With regard to the provision of an $18 million capital grant to the Province of Ontario for up-grading of hospital facilities and new construction over a five year period, what are the details of the participation, involvement and responsibility the Department of Veterans Affairs will have in the spending of these funds?

Hon. Daniel J. MacDonald (Minister of Veterans Affairs): 1. (a) and (b) All of the land, buildings and chattels located north of Commissioners Road shall be transferred outright to the Province of Ontario for the sum of one dollar. The land, buildings and chattels located south of Commissioners Road will be leased to the province for the sum of one dollar a year for a five-year period. In addition, the province will permit the Canadian Red Cross Society to remain in possession of the Red Cross Lodge and to operate in a manner consistent with its present manner of operation. Also, the Society may remain in possession of the space and accommodation it presently occupies on the ground floor of the Works Building on the north side of Commissioners Road, and in the Waterloo Pavilion of the Western Counties Wing.

2. North of Commissioners Road on 78.12 acres and South of Commissioners Road on 246.5 acres.

3. The obligation of Canada to make a capital grant of $18 million is subject to the condition that the construction, purchasing and installation of facilities shall be related to the improvement of health facilities for the benefit of veterans, and will be carried out in strict compliance with all applicable federal and provincial enactments. The amount of the capital grant when payable shall be paid in the following manner: (a) An amount of $500,000 within 30 days after the effective date of transfer. (b) With respect to construction of facilities, by progress payments payable within 30 days after the production by the province of statements satisfactory to Canada—verified by the province as to the amount of, and the entitlement of a contractor to the amount of each such progress claim. (c) With respect to the replacement of obsolescent equipment and furnishings, purchasing and installing additional equipment and furnishings, the full purchase price when delivered on site, including installation costs where applicable, within 30 days after production by the province of statements satisfactory to Canada verifying the completed installation. (d) With respect to the acquisition of existing buildings, within 30 days after production by the province of a statement of the amount of the cost together with the certificate of a solicitor certifying as to clear title to the facility and registration of same in the name of the province, or its designee, as the case may be.

FARM CREDIT CORPORATION—MANAGEMENT AUDIT

Question No. 2,893—**Mr. Beatty:**

1. Was the management audit of the Farm Credit Corporation awarded to the Sibbald Group and completed in the Spring of 1976 and, if so, what individuals or corporations tendered and, in each case, what was the bid submitted?

2. What criteria were used for the selection of the successful bidder?

Hon. E. F. Whelan (Minister of Agriculture): Farm Credit Corporation advises:

1. On September 24, 1976, the Corporation accepted the tender submitted by The Sibbald Group, Haskins & Sells Associates, to undertake a Management Audit. The report was completed in April 1977. Tenders were received as follows: Bureau of Management Consultants—$225. per man per day excluding travel expenses. A progress review was proposed after $12,500. had been spent to decide if the Corporation wished to proceed. Ernst & Ernst—$64,000. Manitoba Institute of Management Inc.—$89,400. The Sibbald Group, Has-

kins & Sells Associates—$64,000. In addition to the above, the Chairman of the Corporation requested that the following projects be undertaken by the Sibbald Group: Research, preparation and presentation relating to the division of duties and authorities between the Chairman and the Vice-Chairman; and Preparation and presentation of Report for Senior Management—$12,872.80.

2. Criteria for selection of successful bidder were as follows: Approach, personnel resources, experience and interest in the project, and cost estimate.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE EXPENDITURES—KOOTENAY WEST

Question No. 2,912—**Mr. Brisco:**

What is the best estimate of the amount spent by the Department of Agriculture in the Constituency of Kootenay West from (a) 1968 to 1974 (b) 1974 to date?

Hon. E. F. Whelan (Minister of Agriculture): (a) $418,212. (b) $341,970.

* * *

● (1300)

[*English*]

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, if the following questions could be made orders for returns, those returns could be tabled immediately. I think from the pile of papers on my desk the reason for taking this course is obvious; it is the lengthy nature of the answers. The numbers are as follows: 207, 1,480, 1,698, 1,741, 2,052, 2,376, 2,439 and 2,455.

[*Text*]

EMPLOYEES FROM PRIVATE EMPLOYMENT AGENCIES

Question No. 207—**Mr. Orlikow:**

1. How much was paid to private employment agencies for workers supplied to the Public Service in the years (a) 1973 (b) 1974 (c) 1975?

2. How many man-years of work were performed by such workers in each year?

Return tabled.

CRTC—LICENCE FOR CABLE SYSTEM IN NEWFOUNDLAND

Question No. 1,480—**Mr. Nowlan:**

1. Has CRTC awarded a licence to a cable system to serve St. John's, Newfoundland and, if so (a) to whom and on what probable starting date (b) what channels will be carried?

Order Paper Questions

2. (a) Did CRTC order payment to be made to any local outlets (television and radio stations) by the cable system and, if so, on what formula and to which companies (b) who requested that an order be issued for such payments (c) do similar payments exist in any other part of Canada?

3. Did CRTC also approve the grant of a licence to a FM-radio network to serve Newfoundland and, if so, to whom?

4. Who are the shareholders of the Newfoundland Broadcasting Company?

5. Has the Commission received an application to dispose of any of the shares of the Newfoundland Broadcasting Company by its present shareholders and, if so, what was the decision?

6. Has CRTC received complaints since July 1, 1975 regarding the operation of any of the stations owned by the Newfoundland Broadcasting Company and, if so (a) how many (b) what was their nature (c) what action was taken, if any?

Return tabled.

METRIC SYSTEM

Question No. 1,698—**Mr. Howie:**

1. For each department, what has been the cost to date of (a) introducing (b) advertising metric measurement?

2. What has been the cost to date of educational programmes, including the distribution of aids and guides on the conversion to metric measurement?

3. Have incentives and income tax deductions been offered to the private sector to help defray the costs of conversion to metric measurement and, if so (a) what are they (b) what is the cost to date?

4. For the year 1976, what proportion of Canada's foreign trade, in terms of (a) imports (b) exports, was conducted with countries using (i) metric measurement (ii) other systems of measurement?

5. In the case of Canada's foreign trade being conducted with countries not using the metric system of measurement, for the year 1976, what (a) were the countries (b) were the values of the imports and exports (c) was the proportion of Canada's total foreign trade represented by such values (d) was the system of measurement used by the countries?

Return tabled.

CMHC—HIRING OF LAWYERS IN QUEBEC

Question No. 1,741—**Mr. Allard:**

For each fiscal year since 1968, did Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation hire lawyers or lawyer firms in the Constituencies of (a) Gaspé (b) Bonaventure—Îles-de-Madeleine (c) Matane (d) Rimouski (e) Rivière-du-Loup—Temiscouata and, if so (i) what are their names (ii) on what basis were they selected (iii) what amount did they receive in fees and other costs?

Return tabled.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE—TRAVEL EXPENDITURE

Question No. 2,052—**Mr. Schellenberger:**

1. In each fiscal year (a) 1974-75 (b) 1975-76, what was the aggregate expenditure by the Department of Agriculture for travel abroad by (a) the Minister and his immediate staff (b) departmental staff (c) the staff of boards, commissions, tribunals, Crown corporations or similar agencies reporting to the Minister (d) others whose expenses were paid in part or in whole directly or indirectly?

2. In the case of each expenditure in excess of $200 (a) what was the purpose of the trip (b) what was the furthest destination (c) what is the name of the person and how long was he/she outside the country (d) what was the nature of the expenditure (e) how many others were in the party making the trip?

Return tabled.

Order Paper Questions

TEACHERS, PROFESSORS AND LECTURERS ENTERING CANADA

Question No. 2,376—**Mr. Cossitt:**

1. What is the number of (a) elementary school teachers (b) secondary school teachers (c) university professors, lecturers etc. who entered Canada in each of the past five years and what is the overall total in each category?

2. (a) For each category what is the breakdown of the countries of origin (b) how many went to each province?

Return tabled.

EFFECTS OF PREMIER LÉVESQUE'S STATEMENT IN NEW YORK

Question No, 2,439—**Mr. Cossitt:**

1. Following the address of Premier René Levesque to a financial gathering in New York City earlier this year, did CBC French network include in its newscasts the next day that Quebec stocks took a considerable drop in stock markets that day and, if not, for what reason?

2. Following the press conference statement by the Prime Minister that Separatism was having a severe effect on the Quebec economy, did CBC French network fail to report the statement and, if so, for what reason?

3. Did CBC French network carry reports that the use of two languages in aviation was a possible cause of a large air disaster in Yugoslavia and, if not, for what reason?

4. What are the names and job designations of all CBC French network personnel who had any part in the decision not to carry such items?

Return tabled.

LIP GRANTS

Question No. 2,455—**Mr. Gauthier (Roberval):**

During the past five years, did the Department of Manpower and Immigration grant subsidies to projects under the Local Initiatives Programme and, if so, in each case, what was the (a) name and number of the project (b) amount of the subsidy (c) name of the municipality involved?

Return tabled.

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker: Is it agreed that the questions enumerated shall be deemed to be made orders for returns, with returns tabled forthwith?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Cossitt: Mr. Speaker, it is not often anyone rises to congratulate the parliamentary secretary, because we have tried for a year and a half to get answers to some of these early questions to which a response has finally been forthcoming today, perhaps because of complaints from various members of the opposition. I might say, though, that we also received these answers about half an hour ago, before the House gave permission for them to be released. Perhaps the parliamentary secretary could tell us how this happened. It may be it was because of his anxiety to satisfy the House, having at long last procured the replies to these questions.

The only complaint I might mention at this moment is that the questions concerning the use by government ministers of government aircraft still remain unanswered. The reason for this seems to be obvious—the answers would be embarrassing to the government. But if the House is still to be sitting next week, as the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) indicated earlier might be the case, perhaps the parliamentary secretary could tell us whether these questions will be answered before we finally adjourn for the summer recess.

[Mr. Schellenberger.]

Mr. Speaker: I should say, following the point of order raised by the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Cossitt), that our staff may have been involved in releasing to the opposition one of the documents which was handed to us on the basis of the usual procedure, that is, that it would be retained in our possession until the point at which approval for its release was given by the House.

Mr. Goodale: In response to the hon. member's question with respect to the number of questions remaining on the order paper and having to do with the use of government aircraft, I think I can give him the assurance he is seeking. I have indicated to him all along that my intention was to provide answers not only to those questions but to all questions on the order paper before the end of this session, and I am hopeful I can provide the answers to the questions to which he has referred at the earliest opportunity, certainly before the end of this session.

* * *

STARRED QUESTION

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): There is a starred question to be dealt with, Mr. Speaker. Would you be good enough to call question 2,937? Before dealing with this question I should point out that a portion of it appears in the form of a complicated table, details of which would take a considerable length of time to read. It is in response to part 3 of the question, and it consists of a number of columns of figures. I would seek permission of the House to have that table appear in *Hansard* as read.

Mr. Speaker: Is that agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

*FARM CREDIT CORPORATION—HOTEL ACCOUNT

Question No. 2,937—**Mr. Beatty:**

1. Was an account with the Talisman Hotel in Ottawa opened by the Farm Credit Corporation and, if so (a) on what date was it first opened (b) on whose authority was the decision made to cover expenses in this fashion instead of through the submission of regular expense accounts?

2. Who are the officials of the Corporation entitled to charge items to this account?

3. By month, since the opening of the account, what was the dollar amount charged (a) for accommodation (b) for liquor (c) for food (d) for any other goods or services and, in each case, what were the items charged (e) in total?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, the answer is: 1. Yes. (*a*) April 18, 1975; (*b*) Chairman.

2. B. H. Kristjanson, Chairman, W. R. deGruchy, Secretary to the Corporation.

Northern Gas Pipeline

3. Month	(a)	Dining Room Charges Specified (b)	(c)	Dining Room Not specified (b)+(c)	Gratuities (d)	(e)
May 1975	—	46.95	73.86	9.50	14.50	144.81
June	—	18.04	37.10	—	6.50	61.64
July	—	10.70	13.05	—	3.00	26.75
August	—	15.64	25.08	—	5.00	45.72
September	—	105.25	168.65	81.13	46.30	401.33
October	79.58	31.15	213.03	40.16	32.32	396.24
November	—	—	—	108.65	11.95	120.60
December	—	—	—	20.40	2.00	22.40
	79.58	227.73	530.77	259.84	121.57	1219.49
January 1976,	—	—	—	96.60	5.00	101.60
May	—	—	—	115.35	6.75	122.10
June	—	—	—	39.85	4.00	43.85
July	—	—	—	31.55	3.20	34.75
September	—	—	—	43.65	5.05	48.70
October	—	—	—	15.44	2.00	17.44
November	32.10	—	19.70	66.05	7.80	125.65
December	—	—	—	74.19	9.00	83.19
	32.10	—	19.70	482.68	42.80	577.28
January 1977	42.85	12.40	8.15	48.50	2.55	114.45
May	—	—	—	41.25	4.25	45.50
	42.85	12.40	8.15	89.75	6.80	159.95
Total	154.53	240.13	558.62	832.27	171.17	1956.72

* * *

THE ROYAL ASSENT

Mr. Speaker: It is my duty to inform the House that I have received the following communication:

Sir,

I have the honour to inform you that the Honourable R.G.B. Dickson, LL.D., D.C.L., Puisne Judge of the Supreme Court of Canada, in his capacity as Deputy Governor General, will proceed to the Senate chamber to-day, the 5th day of August, at 4.45 p.m., for the purpose of giving royal assent to certain bills.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your obedient servant,
D. C. McKinnon
Comptroller of the Household

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): One o'clock.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

ENERGY

CONSIDERATION OF PROPOSALS FOR NORTHERN GAS PIPELINE

The House resumed, from Thursday, August 4, consideration of the motion of Mr. MacEachen:

That this House recognizes the social, economic, environmental and energy issues surrounding the question of northern gas pipelines and, believing that the resolution of these issues must reflect the national interest, approves the position of the government that all relevant reports must be considered before deciding on a pipeline and its route; and the amendment thereto of Mr. Broadbent.

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

At 1.08 p.m. the House took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 2 p.m.

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I would like to move a motion, with the consent of the House. As hon. members know, the office of the Commissioner of Official Languages became vacant at the end of July. My intention is to move a motion to secure a replacement. So if I have the agreement of the House to do that, I will be glad to do it.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): That will be agreeable, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Agreed, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Caouette (Témiscamingue): Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Jones: I am not prepared to give consent for that, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: There is no consent for the President of the Privy Council (Mr. MacEachen) to move the motion. We will therefore proceed with the debate. At the time of adjournment yesterday, the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Dupras) had the floor.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Maurice Dupras (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, I regret that the House and the Canadian people cannot learn who will be the successor of Mr. Keith Spicer, who has performed some excellent work as Official Languages Commissioner, but I hope anyhow that the appointment will be made as soon as possible.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Order. Let me remind the hon. member of the subject now before the House. To my mind, the remark he just made is irrelevant in this debate.

Mr. Dupras: Mr. Speaker, as I indicated when the Chair gave me the floor last night, the construction of a pipeline assumes, for us Canadians, such importance as to be comparable with the great project achieved by our ancestors, namely the construction of the railway linking the east with the west, or the construction, more recently, of the St. Lawrence Seaway, as some of my colleagues pointed out yesterday during the debate, for it will contribute in a large measure to making Canada self-sufficient in matters of energy.

This special debate tops off several serious studies undertaken as early as in 1967, at which time the task force known as the North-West Project was set up whose main objectives were to make feasibility and engineering studies for the construction of a pipeline to transport natural gas from the Pointed Mountain in the Northwest Territories to the markets in the south. Some time later, in 1969, the Mackenzie Valley Pipeline Research Ltd. was created with a view to adding to the northwest project studies on a pipeline from Alaska and the Mackenzie Delta, as well as a link with existing pipelines. In 1970, other companies and task forces joined this core of researchers.

Following those important studies, groups of contractors applied to the National Energy Board for authorization to build a pipeline from Alaska and the Mackenzie delta to southern markets, by way of the Mackenzie Valley. In October 1976, Foothills Ltd. offered to build a pipeline for the transport of Alaska gas to American markets through the Yukon, British Columbia, Alberta, and Saskatchewan, a project whose approval was recommended by the National Energy Board last July. For us, eastern Canadians, this project represents many advantages well beyond the guarantee of an energy supply and assumes a very great importance. First, the implementation of this project will call for the participation of human and industrial resources in Canada and will obviously imply almost exclusive participation of the industry in Canada and naturally in the province of Quebec, more specifically for manufacturing the equipment needed to carry out the project such as compressors, generators, pumps, heavy machinery, air exchangers and so on. All this entails the creation of numerous jobs while at the same time boosting the processing industry in that province, not to mention the direct economic impact it will have all over the northwest region. Among the various benefits we are likely to get from that project, we must point out also, and they are not the least, the numerous permanent positions which will open up and which will be filled by natives. In short, Mr. Speaker, building a pipeline will represent another monument to the entrepreneurship of Canadians, a quality which is the pride of our country and which keeps on amazing the whole world. This great undertaking will be tailored to the size of our country.

In the few minutes available to me, how can I enumerate all the reasons that prompt us to build this pipeline now, whether we agree on the Foothills Yukon Ltd. or the Canadian Arctic Gas proposals? The two are feasible without jeopardizing the environment and if there ever was a project as important as this one which has been considered as exhaustively as this pipeline, I cannot recall it, Mr. Speaker. This leads me to say that I find we have given a great deal more importance to environmental protection in the construction of a pipeline than we did to the opinion of Montrealers when time came to build Decarie Boulevard or the east-west expressway. Never was there such exhaustive consultation to make Canadians understand how important the building of such a project is. As I was saying, Mr. Speaker, the two are feasible without jeopardizing the environment and the self-reliance about which the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Gillespie) is talking in the foreword of the document entitled "An energy strategy for Canada", a document which the Leader of the Opposition does not seem to be aware of since he claimed that Canada has no energy policy. I suggest he should read it, for the minister stated we have in Canada the expertise, the material resources, the technology and the necessary energy resources we need to reduce our dependency on imported gas.

To achieve this, we shall have to reduce the rate of increase in our future energy needs, substitute more abundant types of energy resources for those which are less abundant, and speed up our search for oil and gas so as to transform our potential resources in proven resources and thus meet our needs. All these solutions are expensive, but we have no choice: we shall have to apply them fully, or else we shall be faced with energy shortages which will worsen our dependency on expensive and questionable oil imports, and even cut down on the available stocks in Canada. We are able to prevent the occurrence of those last two possibilities and we have to act accordingly. Those are, Mr. Speaker, the views of the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources.

Furthermore, among the important reasons why we want to carry out this project now, there is also this opportunity we have to do so jointly and in sharing the costs with our neighbours south of the border, the Americans, with whom, it has to be admitted, we are already sharing the American continent as well as a continental defence system. We are also sharing many joint ventures, not to mention the professional hockey leagues, the major baseball leagues, Biscaine Boulevard in Miami and finally Cape Cod. Therefore we should not take offense at it, but feel a legitimate satisfaction at the fact that the solution to some of our energy problems could at the same time help resolve part of the serious difficulties our neighbours south of the border have faced these few last years.

Like the beneficial effects that the major gas discovery in the North Sea brought the British, something which is now being called the British economic miracle and which is the envy of the world of finance, even leading a Swiss banker to say that the British economic problems had been overcome through the valorization of the natural resources in the North Sea, the recovery, transformation and utilization of frontier natural gas represents in this country a capital event which in a few years will surely be called the economic event of the century. In the province of Quebec alone if consumption of

natural gas is to go from 6 per cent of total energy consumption to about 18 or 20 per cent one may extrapolate on the saving of oil which could result. That increased volume of gas consumption will help maintain the competitive quality of the industry of that province while also at the same time helping heat our residences and institutions.

One can also envisage the possibility of the day being delayed when the construction program for a nuclear reactor network will have to be implemented to provide the province with the energy supply it will need. It must also be anticipated that the construction of pipelines to serve the province and linking large cities which are not already supplied with natural gas will stir up construction activities leading to the establishment of infrastructures, Quebec City still being one of the rare large cities in North America not being yet supplied with that source of energy.

Mr. Speaker, the importance of that project for all Canadians was stressed by most hon. members who spoke before me in this debate, and it does seem that the most important question is not so much whether we are going to build the pipeline but rather when it will be built and what route it will follow. In light of the various reports that were produced by the Berger Commission, the National Energy Board as well as others who considered this important problem, the cabinet seems prepared to make a decision, and I am sure that decision and the challenge it will pose for all Canadians will be taken up by all Canadians.

● (1440)

[*English*]

Mr. Doug Neil (Moose Jaw): Mr. Speaker, my leader has set out very clearly the position of the official opposition with respect to a pipeline to bring gas from the Arctic. He has said, first of all, that we wholeheartedly support the principle of a gas pipeline, that the primary purpose of a pipeline is to deliver frontier gas to southern Canada, and that the secondary purpose of a pipeline is to deliver American gas to American consumers. He also said that based on available evidence—and I would like to emphasize the words "available evidence"—we support the Alcan route as recommended by the National Energy Board.

In order for a pipeline to be a reality, the approval of the United States will be required because at the moment there are not sufficient reserves of natural gas in the Delta to warrant a Canadian pipeline. The United States, of course, has the option of moving its gas down the El Paso route from Prudhoe Bay to Valdez, where it would be liquefied, put into LNG tankers and carried down the coast to California, or alternatively, as the President of the United States said in a speech a few days ago, through a new Panama Canal to the Gulf coast and eastern ports.

I read a report in yesterday's *Globe and Mail* that Basil Robinson, Canada's northern pipeline co-ordinator, and his team of negotiators received a "frosty" reception from their counterparts in Washington when they were down to work out the parameters of a Canada-U.S. agreement on an Alaska Highway pipeline. I find this very hard to comprehend. Are we to understand that this was the first meeting held between Canada and the United States to consider pipeline proposals? That is, of course, other than the brief meeting which took place between President Carter and our Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau). I wonder, too, if the group of Canadian negotiators will include a representative of the government of the Yukon. After all, if we choose to build a pipeline along the Alcan route, it will affect the Yukon and it seens only logical, therefore, to include in the negotiations a representative of the Yukon, possibly an elected representative, or the Commissioner of the Yukon.

● (1420)

We face an impending world energy crisis, which makes it imperative for the United States to build a gas pipeline for moving its gas to the south, and also makes it imperative for Canada to build a pipeline for moving our gas to the south. Therefore, a Canada-U.S. line would be to our common advantage. Surely it would have made sense to hold a series of meetings during the past two or three years at which the two governments could have arrived at a tentative agreement or basic understanding, instead of waiting until the eleventh hour to begin the hard bargaining which will lead to an agreement.

I appreciate that applications for competing pipelines have been made in Canada and in the United States, that hearings must be held and decisions made; but would it not have been more reasonable to negotiate on the basis of all the options open to us? If that had happened, the government could have told the opposition parties in this debate, "We have worked out certain tentative proposals with the United States on the basis of existing options, and these are the alternatives. Let us now debate them on the basis of all the facts." It did not happen this way. We are now debating an issue on which we do not have all the relevant facts. The government is playing politics, hoping, I suspect, that the opposition will make a statement or statements based on inadequate evidence which the government can use at some future time to its political advantage. I note that yesterday the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Gillespie) asked my leader the official opposition's position on the pipeline down the Mackenzie Valley, the CAGPL route. Allow me to read the following exchange which is recorded on page 8040 of *Hansard:*

MR. GILLESPIE: Has the Leader of the Opposition categorically rejected the option of the CAGPL route?

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I think I indicated in the House clearly to everybody, including the minister, that on the basis of available information we think preference should be given to the Alcan route. We say that on the basis of information available to the House of Commons. We do not rule out anything categorically the details of which we do not know and which the minister may know.

In the last two weeks I and several members of my party spent five days in the Mackenzie Valley and in the Yukon. It was one of several trips I have taken in the past few years north of 60°. We talked to people in Hay River, Yellowknife, Norman Wells, Inuvik, Tuktoyaktuk and Whitehorse. We talked to natives and whites alike. Up and down the whole valley there is a feeling of bewilderment and despair because

this government, without justification, led the people of the valley to believe there was no doubt the Mackenzie Valley pipeline would be built. The people in the valley built their hopes on it.

In Hay River, the headquarters of Northern Transportation Company Limited, a Crown corporation which carries freight by barge up and down the Mackenzie Valley and out to the islands in the Beaufort Sea, NTCL spent $20 million on barges and tugs in anticipation of activity to be created by construction of the pipeline. You will find the majority of this equipment either in drydock or tied up at wharves and not being used. In Norman Wells one will note that the government built some 20 houses, costing about $80,000 each, to accommodate the government employees it was anticipated would be needed in the area when the pipeline was built. Walking around Norman Wells you will come on a pile of 50 or 60 pieces of brand new furniture, chesterfields, chairs, and so on, still wrapped in cardboard. The furniture was destined for the houses under construction. Rain has fallen on it several times and I think it is now useless. Many thousands of dollars were wasted. As one resident said offhandedly to us, it will probably be thrown on the garbage dump.

One finds that Inuvik, at the suggestion of this government, developed an area and installed infrastructure for a new subdivision for homes for the people who would move into the town during the pipeline construction period and subsequently. This development cost the town several million dollars. We were told at Inuvik, as well, that DREE and the Industrial Development Bank had encouraged business to expand in anticipation of the pipeline being built. Now many businessmen are faced with large loan repayments which they are unable to meet. There are possibilities of shutdowns of businesses and even of bankruptcy. As I said earlier, there is a feeling of despair up and down the valley, despair caused by this government's lack of leadership, by lack of departmental co-ordination, by assumptions on the part of either ministers of the Crown or senior officials of their departments that, without doubt, a decision in favour of a Mackenzie Valley pipeline would be handed down.

I should be remiss in my duty if I did not put on record some of the feelings of many of the residents of the north with respect to the Berger commission hearings. We were told time and again that the report does not represent the true feelings of the majority of the native people but expresses the views, given through the mouths of native people appearing before the commission, of radical white advisers from the south. One name mentioned frequently was Mel Watkins, known to many as the former leader of the Waffle party. His views differ greatly from the views of the vast majority of Canadians and were so radical that the party to my left could not live with him.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Neil: I am told for at least two years he was paid a salary of $45,000 a year by the Indian Brotherhood. We asked those who raised the issue why they did not appear before the Berger commission to give their side of the story. Without exception, the answer given was that the majority of the groups which appeared before the commission were funded by the federal government. They were able to take the time to travel and had the funds to do so, whereas the people expressing their concern to us had businesses to look after and just did not have the time and the funds. Mr. Speaker, as I said earlier, I think it important to record in *Hansard* the views of those people.

In yesterday's mail, all members received a letter from John W. Steen, MLA for the western Arctic. That letter was dated July 14, 1977. Time will not permit me to read the whole letter into the record, but I would like to read three paragraphs. This is what Mr. Steen said:

● (1430)

I am a member of the Northwest Territories legislative assembly: although this assembly does not have the status of a provincial legislature, the members are no less the official representatives of our constitutents.

We, on the Northwest Territories legislative assembly are appalled at the tendency, however well intentioned, for southern Canadians to want to make our decisions for us. We are frustrated by our inability, due to our limited access to mass media, to make our true needs and desires known and understood nationally. Look at how much attention was given to Judge Berger's report and how little attention was paid to our assembly's assessment to the prospective Mackenzie Valley pipeline.

Once again, my plea to you is to let democracy work in the Northwest Territories—listen to the duly elected representatives of all peoples of the Northwest Territories. Do not force a moratorium down our throats.

If members will take the time to check the record, it will show that nine of the 15 elected members of the legislative assembly of the Northwest Territories are of native origin. I would suggest that these members do represent all the people in the territory. As representatives of all the people in the territory, the council must be actively involved not only in the negotiating area but in the final decision-making with respect to native land claims. The members of the legislative assembly recognize the right of the natives to a settlement of their land claims.

In the past four years I have made six trips into the Mackenzie Valley and have talked to a great many people. Not once did I talk to an individual who was opposed to a settlement. Without exception they said there should be a settlement and that the settlement must be just and equitable. However, they are opposed to a settlement along the lines of the Dene proposal. I would like to say, on my own behalf and on behalf of the official opposition, that we are opposed to any settlement along the lines proposed by the Dene. I can only classify their proposal as apartheid. It is interesting to note that the various organizations and groups throughout Canada who so vocally support the Dene proposal condemn even more vocally the apartheid policy of South Africa. How inconsistent can they be? In the debate yesterday, when the hon. member for Lambton Kent (Mr. Holmes) spoke he talked of the Dene proposal and apartheid and suggested that the government was sympathetic to it. The hon. minister for Indian Affairs and Northern Development (Mr. Allmand) then became quite agitated and I gathered from his remarks shouted across the floor of the House that he was denying it.

I would like to read into the record an excerpt from a letter dated June 28, 1977, written by the minister to David N. Searle, a member of the council of the Northwest Territories. The minister, referring to a meeting on April 19, 1977, in Yellowknife, said:

> As I mentioned during our meeting, I reject the concept of an exclusively ethnic political unit, although I am not opposed to political units with native majorities, provided that minority political rights are protected.

I think this House and the people of Canada are entitled to an explanation of just what he means by that statement. Was he stating his own personal views, or government policy? The north, particularly the Northwest Territories, has suffered too long from the failure of the government to establish a northern policy. In the Diefenbaker years there was the vision of the north and the roads to resources policy. There was enthusiasm and anticipation on the part of all Canadians. It struck their imagination. But it was more than a vision. Projects were started. Some were completed, but unfortunately when the government changed, the north was forgotten. Prime Minister Pearson laughed at the Dempster Highway and said it was a road from igloo to igloo. Had that highway been built as planned by the Diefenbaker government, much of the equipment and supplies for Prudhoe Bay would have been carried over it. Think of what that would have done to Inuvik and Tuktoyaktuk.

This government has been a failure as far as the north is concerned. It has done everything it could to discourage development. It suspended the northern oil and gas regulations in 1970, and seven years later, despite repeated demands from oil companies and the official opposition, they still have not been drafted and promulgated. There has been a land freeze, preventing the development of some rich farmland and market gardening. There has been a freeze with respect to mineral exploration and development. The operation NCPC, a Crown corporation, has resulted in extremely high power rates to the residents of the north.

These are just a few examples of negligence of this government. They have failed to accept the fact that the territories at this point in time should have progressed to self-government by a phasing in of responsibility, that over the years the people of the north should have been consulted through their elected representatives to work out programs for the development of the north. The government may argue that settlement of land claims has held up development, but as someone mentioned yesterday in this debate, it was not until three years ago that the Prime Minister recognized the rights of the natives to a land settlement.

What is the future of the territories? How can the feeling of bewilderment and despair be overcome? I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that immediate steps must be taken to develop a policy that will stimulate oil and gas exploration in the Delta and the sedimentary basin of the valley. There must be a stimulus to mineral exploration and development. There must be a policy of hydro development tied into a Canadian power grid. There must be an opening up of farmland. There must be a good, hard look taken at logging in the southern part of the territories. There must be development of a transportation system in the north, in the broadest sense. The policies must not be developed solely in Ottawa, but primarily by the elected representatives of the people in the north with the co-operation of Ottawa. I see my time is up. I will close by saying that the situation in the valley is critical. I plead with this government to take immediate steps to work toward a solution to the problems.

Mr. Wally Firth (Northwest Territories): Mr. Speaker, I am indeed pleased to make a few comments on the motion before the House at this time. It is a very important decision that will affect not only the people living in the Yukon and Northwest Territories but all of the north. Indeed, the long-range effects of this major decision which I expect will be made within the next few weeks will affect all of Canada. I am willing to support this motion and amendment because of the quality of reports produced for the government in the past several months. I suggest that these be received by the government and given full consideration. However, I can only support this motion if I can see that the government truly and in good faith is willing to base its decision on the evidence and recommendations made public this past spring and summer.

If the government is using this motion to support a decision based on some other secret or confidential material it has prepared, and if in the next week or so we are treated to a decision based on information that is not now public, the cabinet will have made themselves, parliament and indeed everyone else involved look rather foolish. I certainly hope that does not happen. The decision that is to be made is a tall order for any group of people. I would like to help by reviewing the recommendations that have been made thus far. I would also like to add my own emphasis to these recommendations because the decision the government will be making in the near future is going to change my part of the country perhaps more than any other decision that may be made about the north in this decade.

• (1440)

I hope that all hon. members of the House will share my concern that the views of northern people are given just a little bit more of a fair hearing in deciding whether to build a gas pipeline down the Mackenzie Valley, along the Alcan route or whatever.

I should like to touch on some of the comments made by the major boards and commissions which have reported to the government on northern pipelines. By this I mean Mr. Justice Berger, the members of the National Energy Board, and the members of the Lysyk and Hill inquiries. First of all, I would again congratulate those people who worked so hard and conscientiously to prepare this material. To Judge Berger and the staff of the Berger inquiry, the people of the north, I believe, owe a debt that will be very difficult to repay. To the members and the staff of the other commissions and the NEB we owe a similar debt of gratitude for the full and fair way in which they have completed this work.

The manner in which these boards and commissions have included the public directly in the decision-making process is a welcome change from the way things have been done in the past, and I hope that these methods will set a precedent for the future. The way in which this material has been gathered shows the depth of feeling of Canadians generally about this major decision which affects the north. It shows that small groups and even individuals can have an influence on something as big and powerful as Canadian Arctic Gas. I believe that if it were not for the efforts of these boards and commissions, groups and individuals who devoted so much time and effort, we would now be watching Arctic Gas laying its pipeline along the Mackenzie Valley, which might have been a bad, even a dangerous, situation. These commissions and the people who appeared before them helped prevent that, and I certainly hope the government does not treat their efforts lightly.

In his report to this House, Mr. Justice Berger spoke of the social and economic cost of building a pipeline along the Mackenzie. Mr. Lysyk has this to say:

> The main benefits from the pipeline will be concentrated outside the Yukon, largely south of the 49th parallel, whereas the most significant costs, in terms of both economic dislocation and social disruption, will be experienced in the Yukon.

The point is, Mr. Speaker, that when pipeliners go north to build they are not doing the northern people a favour. If the government decides to build a pipeline in either the Yukon or the Northwest Territories, it had better realize that it will do nothing but double or even triple our cost of living. There will be very few of us who will benefit from high wages; most of us will just have to pay. If the government does decide to go ahead, I plead with the government to have something a little more potent on hand than their useless wage controls.

I shall return to this question later as I would now like to go to the substance of the evidence. My reading of the four reports gives me the obvious general conclusion that there is a favourable reaction to the Foothills route, or, as it is more popularly known, the Alcan pipeline route, down the Alaska Highway. To my mind this is the best of a lot of bad choices and I would urge the government to consider it.

There are some loose ends though to be found in the fine print of these reports. These loose ends are not the fault of the commissions, but they are there and the government will have to do something about tying these loose ends together. In my view, one important loose end is the question of how pipeline development will mesh in with a settlement of land claims made by the native people of both the Yukon and the Northwest Territories.

It always strikes me as odd, Mr. Speaker, when you mention the words "northern development" to most people in the southern part of Canada they immediately think you are talking about a pipeline, or a hydroelectric project covering two billion acres, or anything that is really big and which costs more money than most of us can imagine. I will admit that some people in southern Canada do include, say, things such as forestry or fishing in their definition of "northern development", but their number is few. Not that these things are not, strictly speaking, northern development; but I think these people miss the point that by far the most important kind of northern development—this is a point I have made several times not only in this House but elsewhere—would be a just settlement of native land claims both in the Yukon and the Northwest Territories. Not only is settlement of a land claim economic development, in my humble opinion; it is also the means of social and political development for just over half, if not more, of the people of the north.

A just land claim settlement will set the background for most development, including construction of a pipeline in the future. A settlement would allow participation at several levels of government by native people through the economic activities that will shape the environment and the future of the people of the Yukon and Northwest Territories. I hope that as a result we will have some power, in terms of financial resources, to become participants in whatever economic development we choose, instead of being, as in the past, the victims of economic development which someone else far away from the scene chooses for us.

Perhaps more importantly, Mr. Speaker, a just land settlement will set the guidelines for how northern people will govern themselves and will relate to other levels of government both in the territories and in the rest of the country. A just land claims settlement would also influence the general land use patterns of the two territories. So far as this matter is concerned, the government does not have to listen only to me. Of the four reports that I have mentioned, three devote space to the topic of land claims. The fourth, the Hill report on environmental impact in the Yukon, did not include this topic within its scope.

Judge Berger has a lot to say in his report about land claims, and what he says is the best proof that he was able to understand the position taken by the native peoples at the hearings he conducted up and down the Mackenzie and indeed all across the country. At one in his report Judge Berger has this to say:

> Euro-Canadian society has refused to take native culture seriously. European institutions, values and use of land were seen as the basis of culture. Native institutions, values and language were rejected, ignored or misunderstood and—given the native peoples use of the land—the Europeans had no difficulty in supposing that native people possessed no real culture at all.

Judge Berger goes on to say this:

> Native culture is not static. The things the native people have said to this inquiry should not be regarded as a lament for a lost way of life, but as a plea for an opportunity to shape their own future, out of their own past. They are not seeking to entrench the past, but to build on it.

Judge Berger recommends that a period or ten years be set aside, and if this is done not only can a land claims settlement be reached but the settlement can be implemented before construction of a pipeline starts. He is adamant that no pipeline should be built before land claims are settled. He was speaking, of course, of conditions in the Northwest Territories.

Mr. Lysyk agreed that land claims in the Yukon must be settled before construction of a pipeline begins. He suggests that the period for implementation of the settlement be four

years. In the Yukon the native people have reached a kind of consensus. Based on that, they are willing to start negotiations for their claims. I am amazed that they have been able to complete this process in such a short time and with such apparent success.

● (1450)

In the Northwest Territories things are different. We have more than one culture, seven different languages and a different set of economic and political conditions. It will take much more time to work out a position that all the people in the Northwest Territories can feel comfortable with. This explains why the two territories need different time frames to complete a land claims settlement.

There is another important point which must be discussed, and I am referring to the other far-reaching effects of the building of a pipeline to the western Arctic, the Northwest Territories and the Yukon. I am speaking of the people who work in our mines, in our government departments, people who are employed by small business and people who own small businesses in the north. They will have to face a very big problem, and that is the effect of increased wages, high cost of living and the kinds of things which will come about as a result of high wages being paid to pipeline workers.

People in the mining business, small business, and so on, will have a difficult time contending with that. In the Yukon, these people make up by far the largest section of the work force. In the Northwest Territories, they are also a substantial percentage of the population. Presently these people, along with everyone else in the territories, face a cost of living far higher than anyone in the south. Also, it is harder to find a job in these territories than anywhere else in the country. I do not believe the building of any pipeline will help that.

In Alaska, during the construction period of their oil pipeline, the state was flooded with unemployed people from the lower 48 states, so much so that real unemployment in the state increased. There were more people without work during the construction period than before it started. This inflation will hit people who, even though their wages will no longer be controlled, I expect, will not be earning the pipeliner's dream wages. As I mentioned earlier, the miners will not, and the public service employees certainly will not. I could go on and on about this, but I believe there are a number of things that should be done before the construction of a pipeline commences. This is why I agree with the Lysyk recommendation for the Yukon, of a period of delay of four years, and the recommendation by Berger of ten years in the Northwest Territories.

Will the government make sure that Whitehorse and Yellowknife can afford to pay police officers, when the going rate for a night watchman is $4,000 or $5,000 a month on a pipeline-building project? Will they provide housing where a bunkroom full of people can cost $75 a week? Something like that happened along the route in Alaska during the building of the oil pipeline.

Another project that should be recommended before the building of any pipeline is the massive log housing program. There should also be job training. The Yukon people should be lobbying for the paving of the Alaska Highway, which would provide some jobs. The building of a massive log housing program in the Yukon and the Northwest Territories would assist the economy of those territories during the waiting period before settlement of land claims, and so on.

In conclusion, I should like to extend an invitation to all members of this House and all members of the other place to come to the north and see for themselves the kind of beauty and the kind of problems that have to be contended with up there. Perhaps if more members of this House and the other place had gone to visit the Northwest Territories in the past few years, the decision frontbenchers over there will have to make, or intend to make before too long, would have been a somewhat easier task.

Members opposite on the front benches have a big decision to make. They must assure a place for the rational development of gas, oil and other mineral wealth of the north. At the same time, they must assure a place in the development for the people of the north. They can turn it into a model of how men and women can live with respect for the land and the several cultures, or they can destroy the unique land and unique people. On behalf of the people of the Northwest Territories in particular, and all northerners, I say to the members in the front benches opposite, "Please be careful".

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen) wishes to ask a question. This can be done only with the consent of the hon. member, and it must be done quickly because there is only half a minute of his time remaining.

Mr. Firth: Agreed.

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Speaker, could the hon. member tell the House how he can take the position he does, opposing the pipeline down the Mackenzie on the basis he does, when the 15 elected members of the Northwest Territories Council, nine of whom are native, take the opposite view?

Mr. Firth: Mr. Speaker, it is part of democracy. I have for many years been very, very concerned about the building of a pipeline down the Alaska Highway as well as the building of a possible pipeline along the Mackenzie route. I take this position on the basis of the 40 years I have lived in the Northwest Territories. I worked as a hunter-trapper, I talked to many, many people and I listened very carefully to the views put forward to Mr. Justice Berger. As I mentioned in my speech, I am basing this not only on the report of Mr. Berger but also on the Lysyk report, the NEB report and my personal experience from having lived in both territories.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gilles Caouette (Témiscamingue): Mr. Speaker, first of all I think that most Canadians are in favour of building an oil or gas pipeline, particularly because of the psychosis which has

been created for several years by the government and some so-called specialists who are trying to convince the public that there is a shortage of oil products. The government took every advantage of this and so has forced the Canadian people to accept the continuous increases in the gas and fuel prices. And today it says that Canada commits itself to build a pipeline and that a continuous supply is guaranteed for Canadians and it implies that this supply will cost less than the methods presently used.

It must be noted that the project guarantees at least a 25 year supply with the normal resources alone. This is what the studies indicate, which proves without any doubt that once again the so-called specialists, who try to make people believe there was a shortage of gas and oil products, were completely wrong.

● (1500)

To distract attention from the cost of installation, the debate has been centred on native rights and the environment. The Berger report speaks at length about this and even suggests a 10 year moratorium before starting to build a pipeline. I am wondering whether the experts have tried to make the population understand what such a project would cost—more than $10 billion according to pre-production estimates. Absolutely not. The experts talk about costs, but not more than is necessary. They talk about all sorts of aspects, but they forget to talk about money. The cost for the government and the companies involved has no importance or nearly none. When we consider what each investigation has cost—$48 million for the least expensive and more than $100 million for some others—we are talking about large expenditures. But this remains untold. What seems more important is to hide this figure of $10 billion to the population and to say that the cost is small and that it will contribute to stimulate the economy in an area of the country and that this investment will create employment.

What we of the Social Credit deplore is precisely this tendency of the government to refuse to reveal clearly and emphatically the cost of its projects for Canadians. However, we all know that Canadians will be the ones to pay for the project and that, according to present rates, interests of 9, 10 and even 12 per cent will have to be paid on these $10 billion. However, this is not mentioned. Whether the investment is made by private companies or jointly with the government, it still remains that Canadians will pay the cost.

The motion we are discussing today attempts to emphasize the agreement of all parties to the building of a pipeline, which forces us to set certain priorities, namely the significance of and need for such a project, and especially its impact.

Clearly there is an all-important factor, capacity for a nation to be self-sufficient. It is important for a country like Canada to be independent, not to depend on foreign countries. This one reason alone gives us the right to support the construction of a pipeline that would obviously allow us to use our own resources.

[Mr. Caouette (Témiscamingue).]

We feel that this one reason is ample justification for supporting the project, with the provisos stated earlier and others I shall refer to later.

My second question concerns the need for a pipeline. Is it important for Canada's development, is it absolutely necessary? This may be the key to the whole problem. Although the proposed pipeline now appears to be a necessity of some sort, we wonder whether it will still be four or ten years from now.

Since all reports agree on a four- to ten-year postponement, we can justifiably ask ourselves whether, during that period, the government would not be better advised to spend the pipeline's estimated cost on researching other forms of energy that would not harm the environment. The proposed delays are based on environment and native sociology reasons. Every report refers to the need for postponing construction to obtain a better knowledge of the environment. Would it not be better if the government looked for other sources of energy? How far down the road can we expect that solar energy will be tapped, that tide or wind energy will be in general use and, in a still more technologically advanced area, that the earth's magnetic energy will be developed? This is the question I am pondering. Why not spend the same amount of money on developing other forms of energy? Will the pipeline project seriously jeopardize research in other fields? Why did the studies not order comparative analyses of the development of other resources and that of oil and gas transportation?

To my mind, a government concerned with the common good would have, right from the start, ordered such a report before looking into which route would be the best for building a 20- or 48-inch pipeline. I agree with the idea of a pipeline, but I am still reticent about its value in twenty years from now, especially knowing that Canadians, in 100 years from now, will still be paying for the cost of the project which will probably have been profitable for barely ten years. Still, I am quite willing to try to find out what its consequences will be. But, once again, I have to refer to all those studies which, without a single exception, point out the ecological dangers while at the same time advising us that it is impossible to evaluate its repercussions, at least the most important, namely the respect of our aboriginals and the environment. In that respect alone, we are floundering in strange waters, at the risk of making the same error as our ancestors who, in the name of industrialization, did not evaluate the destruction of the environment, the pollution of our rivers by industrial waste, and so many other consequences we are now up against.

Nevertheless, I must congratulate those responsible for the reports for at least thinking about the future impact of such a project. And for that I endorse the suggestion, but as I mentioned my support remains conditional on the answers that will be provided by the further inquiries, if any, and the attitude of the government. For the economic good of the country we certainly support the proposed pipeline but for the good of Canadians we believe that the government would be more respectful of reality if it tried just as much to develop the other sources of energy that seem to me to be less risky for the environment.

In conclusion, I want to mention that whatever project the government accepts, its financing will be done under the present economic and monetary policy based on the conventional methods of the old parties; whatever the project approved by government, it will force the people to pay ten times the actual value of the project, if it is a gas pipeline it will force the people to pay ten times the actual cost of the pipeline with only one pipeline being built. As usual, Canadians will pay for one pipeline and ten of them to financiers. Unfortunately, that is the normal practice of a government that remained hooked on the economic residues of the eighteenth century. I am much more looking forward to a debate on the changing of that economic policy than a proposed pipeline such as the one that is now before us.

On the whole, those are the remarks I wanted to make and I want to repeat that, unfortunately, whatever the attitude of this government on whether or not to approve a pipeline, once again through interests or the multiplication of interests Canadians will have to pay the cost of such a facility not one time but ten times over as happens with all government investments. I think that in the case of a project which initially should cost an estimated $10 billion—if one takes the example of James Bay the estimates were about 80 per cent below actual cost—one realizes that when such a project gets going we will no longer be talking about $10 billion but a much more considerable figure. What is unfortunate in all this is that the government does not want to take into consideration the suggestions made by the Social Credit Party of Canada, but projects of such magnitude as this should, if the government gets directly involved, be financed by interest free loans. So, once again, the ideas put forward with respect to a gas pipeline are certainly a contribution to the Canadian economy but at the same time it is also a deficit, an unthinkable debt to put on the backs of Canadians.

● (1510)

[*English*]

Mr. Frank Maine (Wellington): Mr. Speaker, with regard to the decision on whether or not to build the northern pipeline, there are five major questions which must be addressed and answered.

The first question is that of need. Do we need the energy, do we need the gas in the north to bring down to southern markets?

The second question relates to the science and technology involved in building a pipeline. Do we have the necessary science and technology to construct a pipeline adequately and safely to transport the natural gas?

The third question involves the environment. Can a pipeline be built with adequate safeguards to the environment so that the ecological price will not be devastating?

The fourth major question is that of the native land claims. Can we resolve these satisfactorily to give justice and equity to the people involved?

The fifth and most important question over-all because it affects the previous four questions is that of economics. Can we satisfy the four earlier requirements and reach an economically viable solution? I would like to deal with each of these questions in some detail.

The first and most important question is that of need. Do we need the energy; do we need the natural gas to construct a pipeline to bring it down from the north? I heard no evidence to the contrary expressed in the House yesterday or today that both the United States and Canada have a need for more energy, and, in particular, for more natural gas. The question is not if, but when. Here we come to the first major difference between the two needs, that of the United States and that of Canada. The U.S. need is immediate. If anything, it is more than immediate. They needed gas last year, as was evident from the crisis which occurred in the U.S. last winter at which time we were able to assist them in solving some of the major problems they faced. Canada's need is not immediate. Right now we have adequate gas—if anything, we have a small surplus of gas. As can be projected from the studies that have been tabled, our real need will be in the early 1980's, assuming the continuation of past practices.

There are some options which could be exercised to change that situation quite significantly. I will come back to the question of need and some of its implications after I have addressed the other four major questions. In the area of science and technology, judging from the reports we have seen, there is no question that we have an adequate data base to answer the questions involved. There is still some work to be done, especially in the area of engineering, as has been brought to light recently with respect to the proposed Alcan line, both with the Dawson Bulge and the Dempster Lateral. The engineering studies have not been completed and will have to be finalized before a decision can be reached.

The same situation exists with regard to the environmental question. There is an indication that we can answer the questions involved, that we can satisfactorily protect our environment in the future, but we have not yet completed the work that must be done. The second phase of the Lysyk inquiry should be undertaken as soon as possible to finalize the questions that have not yet been answered adequately, and that will take some time. But there is no indication at this stage that we cannot solve the environmental questions within the economic constraints.

The fourth question, that of the native land claims settlement, and the related socio-economic effects of the pipeline on the natives. Again, both the Berger and Lysyk inquiries addressed these questions in some detail. I fully agree that these questions should be given a high priority and that all attempts should be made to answer them before the construction of the pipeline. Again, we have to maintain an adequate awareness of the economic constraints in this question. There is not an unlimited amount of money to spend.

This brings me to the fifth point to be addressed, that of economics. It depends on the settlement of the above questions,

but it is also guided by the alternative solutions to bringing natural gas from the north.

Because of the different needs of Canada and the United States several alternatives are open to us. I should like to illustrate briefly the four options that I consider to be viable options in attempting to satisfy our energy needs by way of satisfactory transportation. First there is the Alcan route by itself. By this I mean a pipeline from Prudhoe Bay via Fairbanks and Whitehorse down to British Columbia and Alberta with no side connections, strictly a natural gas pipeline to transport gas from Prudhoe Bay south to the markets in the United States.

The second option is the Alcan route with the Dempster Lateral, with or without the Dawson Bulge. Again there are several questions to be answered in that option: the economics of the change, the engineering studies that have not yet been done, and the environmental questions.

The third option is one which I think defines the economic limitations, that is, the El Paso line which takes the natural gas from the northern slope in Alaska by pipeline to Valdez on the southern Alaskan coast and then by liquefied natural gas (LNG) tanker to the southern 48 states.

There is a fourth alternative to consider so far as Canadian needs are concerned, and that is the Polar Gas option whereby instead of taking U.S. gas to U.S. markets, as the El Paso route does, we will take Canadian gas from the Arctic islands to Canadian markets via liquefied natural gas tankers. I would like to emphasize that that option has not been outlined in this debate so far but it is a very viable option and it satisfies the very pertinent questions that are raised.

As I mentioned earlier, our needs for gas are not immediate and if we are looking primarily at satisfying our markets so far as natural gas is concerned, we do not have the same time pressure as do the Americans. Therefore, in our time frame, if for one reason or another the Dempster Lateral is not a viable alternative, the Polar Gas LNG tanker route is a viable solution to consider. We are not talking about having to build a pipeline. We have to liquefy the natural gas in the Arctic islands after collecting it, and then ship it by LNG tanker through the Northwest Passage down to the east coast. There are many attractive features about this option, and I submit that this is a very real option which should be considered in our negotiations with the United States.

● (1520)

This brings me to the question of the negotiations with the United States and the very important variables Canada should consider in these negotiations. Time is a very pressing question as far as the need for gas by the Americans is concerned. The question of the swapping of natural gas to buy more time is another question. Right now Canada has an excess, and when I talk about swapping I am talking about volume for volume at the same price. In other words, if we give them some of our gas now at whatever the going price, that gas should be replaced at the same price sometime in the future with American gas from the Arctic slope.

[Mr. Maine.]

The details of the route are also further negotiating points. These details have been suggested by a variety of sources. The National Energy Board has brought in some new variations. There have been other reports which have raised other questions as to route options which have not been fully discussed or decided upon. Another negotiating point is the whole question of native land claims. There has been debate already on the American position as to whether the pipeline treaty recently signed by Canada and the United States prohibits a $200 million pay-out which has been recommended in the Lysyk report and in other reports.

In the Canadian context I think it would only be fair to keep in mind the James Bay settlement. It would be appropriate to use that settlement in the Yukon. I think the settlement with the natives in the Yukon should not be any lesser a settlement than that arrived at with the Indians in the James Bay area. Conversely, we cannot have a settlement in the Yukon which is better than that at James Bay, for equality reasons and for economic reasons in competition with the El Paso option.

Then there are further negotiating points to consider. With regard to the option of the Dempster Lateral, environmental and engineering studies should be started as soon as possible. If that option is the one to be utilized, there is the whole question of Canadian content as well as the question of financing. With Canadian participation and with Canadian gas going to Canadian markets from Canadian fields it is quite different from the Alcan route without the Dempster Lateral, in which case we are talking only about U.S. gas going to U.S. markets. In that case I think there is no justification whatsoever for any dependence on Canadian financing for that option at all. These are negotiating points we should be very aware of and use very wisely and strongly.

The question of science and technology is another important negotiating point. There should be Canadian content not only in the materials and labour for the pipeline but also in the engineering design. We have a pretty lousy deal in the Canada-U.S. auto pact. Canada has not benefitted at all with regard to science and technology in the auto pact. All research and development and all engineering design is done in Detroit. In this regard Canada does not participate independently in the automotive industry. Canada is completely dependent on the United States, and Canada has only manufacturing facilities. I feel that is a totally untenable situation. We should learn from that mistake and not make it again with any pipeline in the north. We should be involved not only in materials and labour but also in engineering design and development capability. That would benefit us in the future for future pipelines which will undoubtedly be built.

I therefore recommend, as other parties have done, that Canada proceed with negotiations with the United States, that there be given approval in principle to build a northern pipeline, but let it be contingent on a satisfactory resolution of several of the details I have mentioned. After the negotiations have resulted in mutual satisfaction, legislation should be introduced into the Canadian Parliament which would provide the details of the route and other pertinent aspects which will

have been negotiated so that parliament can debate this important and massive project and make a final decision in full view of the Canadian public so that there can be full participation of all the people in the country.

Mr. Bill Jarvis (Perth-Wilmot): Mr. Speaker, first I should like to congratulate the hon. member for Wellington (Mr. Maine). I can only say that if the excellent speech he made had been made by the President of the Privy Council (Mr. MacEachen), or if the minister's speech had been half as good, the government would have had something of which to be proud.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Jarvis: Many points were raised by the hon. member for Wellington, but I would like to make one observation on one specific point. He spoke about the possibility of the alternative of moving gas from northern regions by ship, or by what I call the eastern route. I agree that it is a possible and viable alternative, but it is deplorable that the government pays lip service to our shipbuilding industry and to the reconstitution of our merchant marine but does absolutely nothing to encourage an expertise in one area of merchant marine in which Canada should be expert, and that is the type of navigation and transportation the hon. member for Wellington has just outlined so ably.

The motion which is the subject matter of this debate asks that this House recognize four issues surrounding the question of northern gas pipelines. These are social, economic, environmental and energy issues. Much could be said about each, but time limitations permit me to deal with only one of these, that being the environment.

I start with the proposition—which is likely self-evident—that a pipeline does nothing to enhance our Canadian environment. Therefore the challenge is to minimize the impact this huge project would have on the ecology of our far north. Probably the greatest risk would be experienced during the construction period, but I would like to remind the House that the potential for an adverse impact upon the environment continues during the time which might be called the withdrawal from construction period and during the third stage, which is the continuing period of pipeline operation.

For those who might question the importance of these latter two stages I need only point out the problems which have been experienced in Alaska with the recently completed Alyeska oil pipeline. In the few short weeks since the completion of that line there have been serious problems of technical faults, operation error, waste disposal, and suspected sabotage. The risks arising from these problems affect not only the environment but may also have a serious social and economic impact as well as bring about an interruption of energy supply.

I remind the government, therefore, that the need for control and precautionary measures does not terminate with the end of construction. I further remind the government that in the event of construction of a pipeline the government will have no excuse whatsoever for not having in place adequate controls for the withdrawal from construction and operation periods. This requires particular emphasis because this is a government which has had a long and unhappy history of permitting dangerous situations to develop and then reacting to them without adequate studies and preparation, and nowhere has this been more obvious than within the Department of the Environment.

As an example we need only look to the Beaufort Sea, an area which experienced what could only be called a crash study on environmental impact, followed by a hope and pray period, and then followed by the granting of drilling permits with conditions which possibly are too stringent and possibly are too lenient. Who knows? Had the Department of the Environment spent a comparable amount of effort and resources in becoming scientifically excellent in its weather and ice predictions, we could likely have been in a much more flexible and confident position when drilling permits were issued. Therefore, with regard to the period following construction of a pipeline I ask that the government adopt what is, for it, a unique course of action; and that is planning instead of reacting.

However, the immediate concern is the construction period, in the event the government should give its approval. The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Clark) has said that we approve in principle the Alcan route on the basis of available information. There is a deplorable and inexcusable lack of environmental information on the Alcan proposal, and I assure this House that I do not seize upon this lack of information as an excuse for opposing construction of a pipeline. I regard it as a missing tool essential to the planning and construction of a pipeline which is as compatible with our environmental concerns as is possible.

There are two basic sources of the necessary environmental data. The first of these sources is government, principally through its Department of Fisheries and the Environment, the second, of course, is the private sector and, in the case of a pipeline, one expects to receive substantial data from the company or group of companies that proposes and seeks government approval for the construction.

● (1530)

Such was certainly the case with regard to the proponents of the Mackenzie Valley route who commissioned and filed at least 41 volumes of biological reports. I do not suggest that the proponents of the Alcan route have done nothing in this regard, because they have filed significant and helpful material including, incidentally, an initial environmental evaluation prepared by the Alaska highway pipeline panel which was sponsored by Foothills Pipe Lines Limited. To suggest, however, that we have received anything more than very preliminary environmental information would simply not be in accordance with the facts. I suggest that it is the direct responsibility of the pipeline proponents to bear the cost of supplying all necessary environmental data. Second, I believe, on the basis of information received from these companies, that they acknowledge this responsibility and are willing to assume it.

The other source of environmental information, as I have mentioned, is government itself. Much baseline data has been accumulated over the years by various government departments or agencies. Other data may be gathered more effectively and efficiently by government than by the private sector proponent. Recognizing that it is the proponent's responsibility to prepare the required reports, it is government's responsibility to supply any existing data to the proponent. Where government is better able to gather additional data, it is its responsibility to do so. If this demands accelerated or additional programs resulting in unbudgeted costs, it is the proponent and not the taxpayer who should likely pay these costs.

Finally, the government is responsible for evaluating the proponent's reports and, as a result, prescribing the regulations and conditions attaching to any approval for pipeline construction.

With regard to the Alcan proposal, the principal environmental report is that of the environmental assessment panel dated July 27, 1977, and entitled "Alaska Highway Pipeline". This report has come to be called the Hill report because the distinguished chairman of the panel was Dr. Harry M. Hill of the Department of the Environment.

On August 30, 1976, Foothills made its application for a certificate of public convenience and necessity to the National Energy Board. On the same day, August 30, 1976, it applied to the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development (Mr. Allmand) for a right-of-way to build its pipeline through part of the Yukon. At this point it was obvious that this proposal required the application of the government's environmental assessment and review process, commonly called EARP. This was obvious on August 30, 1976, first because a significant part of the project would pass through federally administered lands and, second, because the project had the potential for significant environmental impact. Despite this it took almost seven months, until March 21, 1977, before the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development referred the matter to his colleague, the Minister of Fisheries and the Environment (Mr. LeBlanc), for an assessment of the environmental impact. This seven month delay is not only unexplained; in my party's view it is inexcusable and unacceptable.

Hon. members should realize that the normal EARP procedure is for the EARP panel to issue guidelines under which the proponent prepares an environmental impact statement. The EARP panel then does the technical review of the report and makes its recommendations to the minister. With regard to the Foothills proposal, the request for a review was not even made until seven months after the Foothills application, which certainly indicated that the government was not even treating the application seriously at the time.

Following receipt of the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development's application for a review, the Minister of Fisheries and the Environment then took almost another month, until April 19, 1977, before he formed a panel, or at least appointed Dr. Hill as chairman. In my view that was a reasonable time span in which to establish an environmental assessment review panel. He then proceeded to give the panel until August 1 to prepare its report, less than three and a half months. Dr. Hill, in the introduction to his report, points out at page 3:

> The short lead time available made a normal environmental assessment of the project impossible at this time.

He then goes on to say at page 4:

> The requirement for the environmental assessment panel to file an interim report by August 1, 1977 necessitated a significant departure from procedures normally followed in panel operations.

As if the situation faced by Dr. Hill and his colleagues on the panel were not difficult enough, they were asked subsequently to consider alternate Yukon routes, plus consideration of the Dempster Lateral, plus a comparison of the environmental impact between the Mackenzie Valley and Alaska highway routes. In my view this was an impossible task. I in no way question the ability or integrity of the Hill panel; on the other hand, I point out that their report is printed testimony to the frustration of attempting to do too much too late. Therefore when we in this party indicate that our support for the Alcan route is based on available information, we emphasize that the Hill report points out quite accurately, the serious lack of environmental information. My approach to this report is to use it not as an environmental assessment but as a catalogue of problem areas which must be faced immediately, effectively and efficiently.

I repeat that I do not search for environmental problems to find an excuse for delaying or opposing important decisions but rather to ensure that the implementation of these decisions may be accomplished with the minimum of adverse impact to the Canadian environment.

Let me quickly run through the Hill report, with particular emphasis on the deficiency of information which it outlines. I deal first with Chapter III, to do with physical and engineering concerns. With respect to geotechnical aspects, mainly permafrost and seismic activity, the panel devotes almost a full page to information deficiencies, including emphasis on a limited data base. With regard to water crossings, there is an inadequacy of biologic, hydrologic and soils data. Concerning erosion control the panel says that stabilization techniques are not sufficiently developed. Insufficient information is available to predict the impact of various facilities and structures.

According to chapter IV dealing with biological concerns, there is insufficient knowledge of life histories and exploitation rate of fish, and major deficiencies exist in the knowledge of wildlife and waterfowl populations. In chapter V on unique and sensitive areas, the panel says we require detailed environmental assessments of four specified geographic areas. According to chapter VI on aesthetics and recreation, a systematic assessment of probable aesthetic impact is required. Chapter VII deals with associated developments. The panel was not convinced that sufficient planning had been done to minimize the impact of such projects as highways and hydroelectric construction. Chapter VIII deals with other possible pipeline routes. In addition to the Alaska highway route, the panel considered alternates along the Klondike highway and Tintina Trench, but they concluded that insufficient data was available

to draw any definite conclusion from a comparison of alternate routes in the southern Yukon.

To put all of this in perspective, Mr. Speaker, we must realize that the Hill report concludes that the pipeline can be constructed and operated in an environmentally acceptable manner, provided three conditions are met: first, that the environmental planning is properly carried out; second, that we can avoid or solve the problems in unique and sensitive geographic areas; and third, that environmental problems associated with permafrost areas can be overcome.

Similarly, there is nothing in the report to indicate that these three conditions cannot be met within the permissible time frame between now and the commencement of construction. Finally, the panel concluded that the Alcan route is environmentally preferable to a Mackenzie Valley route.

Therefore, in connection with Canadian accommodation to permit the United States to move its natural gas through our territory to U.S. consumers, if the government were to approve in principle the Alcan route, it seems self-evident that the normal EARP procedures should be expedited so that we might benefit from a proper and meaningful environmental assessment review, having confidence that such review could be completed in a reasonable time. This is consistent with the commitment made by the Minister of the Environment on April 19, 1977, when he first established the Hill panel. At that time the minister said:

> . . . If the Alaska highway pipeline project is still a contender after decisions have been made in the competing proposals, the normal panel procedure would then be followed.

It is essential that the minister, given the situation I have mentioned, reaffirm this commitment at the earliest possible date.

As I have said, Mr. Speaker, this all relates to the secondary purpose of this whole exercise, that of moving U.S. gas to U.S. markets. The primary objective has for years been the transportation of Canadian natural gas to Canadian markets. It was this objective which initiated all of the various studies and applications and which must remain our principal concern. The shift in emphasis from the Mackenzie route to the Alcan route does nothing to mitigate this concern about Canadian resources destined for Canadian consumers.

● (1540)

There are a number of possibilities in terms of moving this gas. Much has been said during this debate about the Dempster Lateral to connect with the Alcan line. This would permit Mackenzie Delta and Beaufort Sea gas to be transported via this spur to connect with the main Unites States line near Dawson. There are other alternatives as well. The important point is this—if a real possibility, not probability, but real possibility, exists that a certain route or routes may be used for transporting this gas, the time to commence the environmental assessment review process is now. It will be inexcusable for the Minister of the Environment to wait, as has been the government's policy, until a situation develops when we can do little more than react because time limitations do not permit us to do the proper planning.

I put the minister on notice that we in this party and, I believe, Canadians everywhere, will not permit him and the government to ignore their obligation to our country to provide an environmental process in keeping with the importance of our trusteeship for our Canadian environment.

In chapter VIII of his report Dr. Hill deals with the Dempster Lateral and points out that three to five years would be required for a program to evaluate potential environmental impacts and mitigative measures. The report lists point after point wherein adequate information is lacking. The report goes on to conclude that, if a decision is made to continue planning for the transportation of Alaska gas through the southern Yukon, an environmental impact assessment of the construction and operation of the Dempster Highway be undertaken immediately.

The panel points out that the study of the highway itself is a prerequisite to the assessment for the possible pipeline. It is to this recommendation that the minister must respond, and I point out to him that this conclusion of his own officials is not based on the probability of moving Canadian gas along this route.

Dr. Hill and his colleagues are saying, in the clearest terms, that continued planning to construct the line to move United States gas through the southern Yukon is reason enough for us to prepare now our environmental assessment of the Dempster Lateral.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would like to quote from the report of the Alaska Highway pipeline panel which, as you know, was a committee of distinguished Canadians sponsored by Foothills Pipe Lines Ltd. and whose initial environmental evaluation I found most helpful and informative. This group had this to say:

> If the government is not ready to control the pipeline, the pipeline should not be built.

In terms of environmental concerns we on this side expect that the first evidence of government control would be the assumption and discharge of government responsibility. Regretfully, little evidence of this is available to date. To permit seven months to go by before application for creation of the EARP panel is evidence only of the government's wish to avoid its responsibility.

Perhaps a positive response to the Hill report, on behalf of the Minister of the Environment, might be the first small step toward the recognition of its responsibility and assumption of control that Canadians deserve to expect from their government.

Mr. Hugh A. Anderson (Comox-Alberni): Mr. Speaker, as a member from British Columbia I am honoured to participate in this debate. As a British Columbian I also support the construction of the Alcan Pipeline if the Canadian government is able through negotiations to arrive at a satisfactory agreement with the United States, satisfactory to Canada and at the

same time assisting our neighbour to the south, the United States of America, at a time when I consider their need to be critical for natural gas.

The Canadian government will indeed be facing a challenge because the United States will be tough bargainers. This is in no way depreciating the United States. However, at all times it must be remembered that the Alcan Pipeline will be transporting American gas to American consumers through Canada, and although economically Canada will gain certain advantages, Canada will also incur social disadvantages.

In my opinion Canada must deal from a position of strength, taking into consideration the Americans' need for natural gas, a strength based on our desire to assist this nation solve its critical gas shortage, a strength based on principles of fairness and equity to both Canada and the United States.

In order to show our realization of the critical need the United States has for natural gas in the northern tier, we as Canadians should be willing to lift export restrictions on Alberta natural gas in conjunction with the Alberta government before next winter, if an agreement in principle can be reached regarding pipeline construction, and to have the gas replaced in the future when Prudhoe Bay gas begins flowing through the Alcan pipeline. This would assist independent producers in Alberta, assist rectify our balance of payments deficit, and also indicate our awareness of the critical need facing the United States for natural gas.

I would also recommend to the cabinet that the price be set at current export gas rates, and that Canada have the option to purchase the same quantity exported, an option that may not be required if further significant natural gas finds are made at some subsequent date.

Negotiations with the United States must clearly give absolute sovereignty over choice of route, and timetable to the people of Canada. Needless to say that project and construction management, labour content, financing and construction itself must be Canadian in content. One problem that has already surfaced is that of shortages in certain skilled professions. I would recommend that with the three to four year lead time an assessment be made of labour requirements, and where shortages exist of skilled labour such as welders, pipefitters, and so forth, provincial and union consultation take place through Manpower in order that Canadians are put to work. It would be a shame if we had to import construction workers from other parts of the world at a time when we in Canada have significantly high unemployment.

At the present time Foothills is well aware that imported workers will be required if no concerted effort is made to train and upgrade Canadians. We are talking of a significant labour force for the construction of the Alcan pipeline. At peak construction period the total manpower requirements are expected to reach 7,800.

It would be the height of absurdity if unemployed Canadians did not work during the pipeline construction because the skills are not there. We have a lead in period of time where there could be consultation between the federal government, provincial governments, labour, the unions and so on in order to get these people upgraded, not only for pipeline construction but past the completion of the pipeline. I hope the government will be cognizant of the fact that we have an opportunity that may not come our way again. We must upgrade the skills of Canadians in order that the construction of the line will be done for Canadians by Canadians.

We are all aware that the United States has an alternative to the building of a pipeline in Canada. El Paso has proposed the building of a pipeline from Prudhoe Bay to Valdez and then trans-shipping liquefied natural gas to California. As a member from British Columbia, I am totally opposed to any increase in tanker traffic of any size, form or shape. I only wish that we had television in the House today, Mr. Speaker, because I would jump and dance around a bit to make sure that this point is made. I think that even my friends in the Conservative party from British Columbia will agree with me on this issue. We do not agree with the Conservative party in British Columbia on very much, but I think that even they would agree, indeed any Conservative, Liberal, NDP-er or Social Crediter, that we in British Columbia are opposed to tanker traffic off our west coast. I do not think it would be unfair to say that there is no one issue in British Columbia today on which the people are so totally united. We are well aware of what will happen, that it is only a question of time, and this explains why we do not want any tanker traffic.

• (1550)

I would also ask the cabinet, when it sits down with United States negotiators to discuss the problems associated with Cherry Point, which is in the state of Washington—

Mr. Friesen: Aw, thanks!

Mr. Anderson: Well, Mr. Speaker, not everybody is as brilliant as my colleague from British Columbia.

Mr. Friesen: That's for sure. I agree.

Mr. Anderson: The port of Cherry Point, Washington, handles the unloading of Prudhoe Bay crude. Many groups in British Columbia have quite rightly pointed out the dangers associated with tanker traffic in the Juan de Fuca straits. There is no doubt, Mr. Speaker, that if Cherry Point, Washington, continues to be used as the terminal for trans-shipment of Alaskan crude, a spill will occur. Common sense tells us a docking facility should be located outside the most heavily congested shipping area of British Columbia. Since discussions with Washington will be dealing with energy, Canada should take the basket approach and ask for a review of current outstanding irritants which include Cherry Point, and I guarantee the government will have the unqualified support of the people of British Columbia in its deliberations, including that of Conservatives.

The National Energy Board, in its long deliberations over 214 days of public hearings, with 1,200 exhibits, 900 public documents, and 37,000 pages of hearing transcripts, had to determine the need for a pipeline to bridge Prudhoe Bay gas to

American markets. Two major questions arise in my mind: one, whether the benefits would outweigh the costs to Canada; and two, whether the pipeline would facilitate or hinder the connection of Mackenzie Delta gas to markets, both in cost and timing.

The National Energy Board has concluded it would be prudent to provide a safety margin in connecting new sources of supply. Exhausting western reserves before connecting Delta gas is foolish. We are all aware of the long lead times needed to connect new sources to market. Undue delay in a decision would also narrow our options and United States participation would be lost.

Also, consideration must be given to Delta exploration which would certainly be curtailed if no action is discernible. Unfortunately previous exploration has not firmed up reserves that justify a Delta pipeline. The 5.3 trillion cubic feet can be tapped with a Dempster spur but the earlier Foothills proposal for a Maple Leaf line is not feasible in the foreseeable future.

The National Energy Board option of connecting Delta reserves with the transportation of Alaskan gas is correct, and I believe that with the swapping of Alberta gas for Alaskan gas a greater lead time could be justified for resolving land claims, carrying out further environmental assessments, and in general preparing for an orderly and rational construction of the Alcan pipeline.

I should like to commend Justice Berger, Dean Lysyk, the National Energy Board and Dr. Hall from Environment Canada for their excellent work and trust that Dr. Thompson, entrusted with a similar responsibility in British Columbia, will proceed as expeditiously as possible, with the example of the Lysyk commission as a guideline.

I applaud the government position to set up an agency to handle all aspects of pipeline co-ordination and planning if indeed negotiations with the United States lead us to proceed with the construction of a pipeline. As I mentioned earlier, one of the questions which could be brought before this agency is the upgrading of worker skills in order to ensure Canadian content not only in the pipe but in manpower.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I think this gives us a golden opportunity to do several things in the Yukon. This is the third "golden rush" which may come to the Yukon area. The first, of course, was the Klondike; the second was the construction of the Alaska Highway. Perhaps the third will be construction of the Alcan pipeline. I think that the Yukon is mature in the financial sense. However, without being derogatory to the Yukon, I think socially there is an immaturity. Perhaps construction of a pipeline will enable the native people as well as white people to work together on a project of benefit to the Yukon. I hope this opportunity will also enable the people in southern Canada to have a better appreciation of the north. The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Clark) appears to find this humorous.

Mr. Clark: I find it pathetic.

Mr. Anderson: When he went to the Yukon and came up with the decision that his party would support the Yukon financially, he took a southerner's position without understanding anything of the north. Perhaps a pipeline will bridge that gap of understanding between northern Canada and southern Canada, one that perhaps should have been crossed several years ago.

Hon. Alvin Hamilton (Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain): Mr. Speaker, it is with a feeling of some sadness that I participate in this debate. It is almost exactly 20 years ago when, as the first act of the Diefenbaker administration, we proposed a royal commission on energy to look into the terrible things which had happened to Canada in the case of Westcoast Transmission in 1954 and in the case of TransCanada PipeLines in 1956. I remember the horrible mistakes which were made during that whole period, and I now see the government repeating those mistakes, probably unwittingly, today.

Even more than the feeling of sadness which I have over the ignorance of the government regarding the mistakes we have made in the past is the feeling of personal sadness that I have over the several thousand people who lived in the Yukon and Northwest Territories when, as a southern government, we built schools all through the settlements of the Yukon, and in the Northwest Territories in the larger settlements, and asked the native people to give up their young and send them to these schools. We flew them into schools at Fort Smith, Yellowknife and Inuvik and flew them back for their holidays. The appeal that we made to their parents was very simple, and at that time honest and sincere: if you give us your children—because we know there is no future on the land for them,—and we educate them in the white man's ways, there will be a job for them when they graduate.

• (1600)

Those schools were built mostly during the period from 1957 to 1963. The students who came into those schools in the early days in Fort Smith, Yellowknife, Inuvik, and up as far as Old Crow, have graduated; but they are still awaiting the development that was promised. They were told that if they left their homes, their loved ones, and came to these boarding schools for eight to ten months of the year we would provide work for them.

When the government changed in 1963, all development stopped in the north. Regulations that we had to induce the oil and gas industries to explore and expand were suspended in 1970 and are still not in effect. The dream we had in 1957 was that we knew by 1980 North America would be short of energy and minerals. We also knew that it would take 20 years to lead time to get into the north and make access to these resources available to the whole world, and not only North America. Part of that equation was the human factor. We promised a future to these young Indians and Eskimos, and we have failed in that pledge which was made in good faith 20 years ago, because we sit opposite a government that is only concerned with public relations or, as they call it, communications—anything to keep in the headlines. It has ignored

Canadian interests from first to last. If anyone reads the history of our country from 1939 to 1957, he will see that the history was the same. The leading historian of our nation called it "the forked road". We took the wrong fork in the road.

I say these remarks in introduction because I want to get to the part of this problem that offers opportunity, which is not all lost. I should have liked to hear in this debate how this whole energy development on the North American continent plays an active part in the total development of the world. With a world begging for development and begging for higher standards of living, we stand in our places talking about trivialities. I am sorry the hon. member for Edmonton-Strathcona (Mr. Roche) could not get his speech in, because he would have dealt with that subject.

We have learned lesson after lesson over the last 30 or 40 years. One thing I have noticed is that they are orientated the wrong way and they are costly. When we set up the National Energy Board Act, we set up hearings for specific purposes. Other functions have been added since, such as native rights and the environment. All these things were not connected and moving completely without concern for the other factor. As the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Clark) said in opening up the debate yesterday, we are debating something and we have not got the information. Everyone is recommending the Dempster route because no one has studied it. The only ones they do not recommend are the ones they have studied. Partially these hearings are to blame.

Business has learned that before you start on a big project you must have a conceptual hearing to look at the entire strategy, so that every component part has a place in this strategy. From this you build your critical path so that each person knows what he has to do and the time he has to do it in. Over the last seven years the first lesson we have learned is that the whole concept of the technique of hearings in these cases should be changed. If we have an industrial or a development strategy, it should be put down as a concept, and around that concept you begin to build what you have to do.

The next thing is this question of socio-economic responsibility. I heard the Leader of the Opposition say yesterday that he wanted one of the conditions to be that private companies would have some share in the economic and social responsibility of a major construction project.

This gas has nothing to do with Canada, except for the odd little bit which will spurt up alongside the pipeline. This is American gas going from one American state to another American state. We must lay down the conditions under which they build through our country. It is as simple as that. This should apply to domestic enterprises as well. What share is to be borne by all the people of Canada of the socio-economic costs? What share is to be borne by the private entrepreneur?

Another significant lesson is transportation. Twenty years ago I stood in this House to say that the major priority was transportation to open up the north. That is still the major priority. Here we are 20 years later, after having started a program of opening up the north, and we still have not got one major land route to the Arctic. We got up 80 miles north of the starting place in the Yukon. We got to Yellowknife, and stopped when the government changed in 1963. We should have a transportation corridor in place including a railway, the road, and the pipeline. All this spending of money locating routes has to stop. It is just not allowable up there in the north.

I could list case after case where we have completely failed as Canadians to fight for Canadian interests. Even Berger, duped as he was by the doctrines and rhetoric of the Waffle or the anti-Americans, did not say there should not be a pipeline on the Mackenzie. He knows there has to be one. He simply said to postpone it ten years to give native people a longer time to complete their bargaining for native rights; but that turned out to be the death knell for the people of the valley. Based on our promises, the people of the valley have been let down and destroyed by the National Energy Board report and the Berger report. Both of those reports were far from honest and far from objective.

This country has to get back to economics. We cannot afford to fiddle around any more with irrelevant issues, which is all we have done for ten years. This pipeline is a courtesy to a neighbour. Just as the Americans gave us the right to move Canadian oil from western Canada to the east through American territory, we should give them the same right. When we moved gas from western Canada, coming out of Manitoba, through the northern states and into Ontario, the Americans exacted conditions from us. In the Great Lakes application of 1966 they said we were spending all the money because it was our gas that was going through and that they wanted 50 per cent of the shares of the ownership, and they got it. We would not have got the pipeline otherwise. The U.S. government backs up American private companies. We accepted those conditions. If they want to move a pipeline through this country, we will help them in every way we can. We will do everything we can to facilitate it, even though it has been a farce to date.

I should like to refer to the advantage of it, which we do not understand, but the Americans, the Arabs and the Japenese do. When the Alberta Gas Trunk Pipeline Company was set up the provincial government moved and indicated that there would be five classes of shares, with so many shares going to the producing companies and so many shares going to the consuming companies, and that they would have votes. The government was to step in and buy two shares, and the public would be allowed the great majority of the shares if they lived in Alberta. Alberta people swarmed into the banks and the provincial treasury offices and bought many more shares than were available, and they had to be distributed pro rata. Today Alberta Gas Trunk is owned by the people of Alberta, but they do not have a vote in the company. The votes are left to the government.

During the past 20 years that company has operated without interference from the Alberta government. Relatively it is a very small company with a few hundred million dollars in assets, but it will now take over a $10 billion empire if this proposal for the Alcan route goes through. If they use the

same technique in controlling the massive investment which would go into this pipeline, $10 billion, you will find a little company like the Alberta Gas Company, a monopoly set up by the government of Alberta, with two shares owned by the government of Alberta, controlling this big entreprise to carry gas from American states to American states, and the people who are going to make the money will be those who hold the equity, because when you finance a pipeline it is traditional that you put so many shares out in equity, risk shares, and four or five or six times more in senior financing bonds. Suppose you have a conservative ratio of one to four. Those proportions are added together to make a rate base.

● (1610)

The total amount invested in equity and bonds is added together to give a rate base upon which the National Energy Board sets the rates of return. The Board usually sets a rate of return in the area of 9 per cent to 10 per cent. When they pay off the senior financing, the money paid to the pipeline company is the same as though the money had not been paid back as to bonds, and all the money ultimately goes to the shareholders. This is called a leverage situation. So if you have a one into four ratio, 20 per cent of the amount of participation at the beginning gets 100 per cent of the revenue. As a result, the value of the shares goes up five, six or seven times. This is the plum that every smart cookie in the whole world seeks. This is why the Americans asked for and got 80 per cent of the ownership of the TransCanada Pipeline when it started; this is why they asked for 50 per cent of the ownership of Great Lakes; this is why they asked 50 per cent of the ownership of West Coast Transmission in 1974.

When you know how many times you have been gored by men who understand the technique of oil pipeline financing you do not put yourself in a position to be gored again if you are smart. All the government has to do is think through the experience of West Coast in 1954 and of TransCanada Pipelines in 1956. Let members opposite read the debates which took place in this House in 1966 when the opposition persuaded the government to change its policy completely. If the government shows the strength to stand up, with all parties supporting it, and say they want equity to go to Canadians, they will get it. The Americans have no choice, because the only other option which faces them is to haul the gas down in pressurized ships specially constructed to carry liquid natural gas. This would add another chore to the work of the already hard-pressed American navy which cannot even keep peace in the Mediterranean. It would have to undertake the further task of seeking to protect a vital product going by sea. It is bad enough having to ask them to protect oil shipments.

Then, when the ships reach the west coast of the United States after all the expense of changing the natural into liquid form under great pressure, the cargo must be changed back to natural gas again to be sent to the people of Chicago through another pipeline costing $3 billion or $4 billion. Think of what the people of Chicago would have to pay for their own gas.

I go through the simple steps surrounding the financing of a pipeline to reinforce my plea to the House and to the government: please, don't let this chance slip by. Give Canadians an opportunity to get that first billion or billion and a half of equity. And when the project begins to pay off and the value of the shares goes up five or ten times we shall forgive the government for some of the mistakes it has made in the last 20 years. Think it through, let us not miss this opportunity. The Americans will have no argument to put up. They did it to us on the occasions I have mentioned.

I would ask for a lot more. I would say "You are going to need a paved highway to move all that stuff up along the Alcan route. We will build that highway and construct it to accommodate the big trucks needed to haul all that steel. But we want the Panhandle. That land was stolen from us in connivance with the British in 1906. We want it back."

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Hamilton (Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain): And if we don't get it back we want access to the sea. Lay down conditions. No Americans live in the Panhandle. It was put there specifically as a barrier, 25 miles east from tidewater, to keep us from the sea. And a great corner of North America is barred from the market because of that artificial, man-made barrier put up by the Americans and the British against Canada in 1906.

Oh yes, I would list a lot of conditions. We in the opposition have already listed seven or eight of them. But I have said enough to illustrate my point. Let us not be gored a fourth time in one generation. Three times is enough. Let us make some money out of the pipeline. That is what the Americans understand.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, let me say this: I have heard talk in this debate about a single agency to correlate all those 30 agencies which are involved in pipeline construction. I am not opposing that idea. It is a sensible one. But this operation amounts to an international treaty of an economic sort which will require a watchful eye on the part of the Canadian government and of all the Canadian interests involved for 30 years to come.

I believe it will be necessary to bring enabling legislation before the House to consider this whole project as being a 35 or 40-year deal, because if we leave it to the small holding companies, joined by ten or 15 operating companies, and give them monopolistic power to run this operation, in the absence of any control by the federal government we shall not be serving Canadian interests. Consider West Coast Transmission owned by the B.C. government, the Alberta Gas Company owned by the Alberta government, and the techniques of the operation of those two companies. If you put them in charge of this big pipeline it will be the same as putting a weasel in charge of a hen house.

Get the Canadian government into the picture. Make sure it has two or three directors on the board to see that Canadian interests are protected and that the operation is not run entirely by power hungry individuals who understand pipeline

financing. I am suggesting to the government that all is not lost. Let it get on the ball and act like Canadians for a change. Let Canadians have a chance to make a few dollars.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Order, please. I regret to interrupt the hon. member but the time allotted to him has expired.

Hon. Alastair Gillespie (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, as I listened to the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Clark) yesterday I could not help thinking of the advice sometimes given to young corporate lawyers—if you have a weak case, shout. The rest of the advice is: it will not do any good if you shout louder.

The hon. gentleman spoke of the sins of this government with respect to northern economic policy, with respect to northern development, with respect to native issues, with respect to conservation, with respect to energy supply management. What he failed to do was tell us that for the first time an attempt has been made by him to make a start on articulating an energy policy for his party.

● (1620)

He said that he favours the construction of the Foothills Yukon pipeline on the basis of information he has at present. Admittedly this was drawn out by a question at the end of his speech, but it is a stand, and we on this side of the House are happy to see that the Tories for the first time in a long time agree on something.

Mr. Fraser: You are not speaking for your backbenchers.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Gillespie: I have a feeling that I am cutting in pretty close. I have a feeling that the truth irks a little bit. For the first time I believe that the Tory party, at least temporarily, has been able to agree on something.

I will not spend much of my time on the hon. member's remarks about energy conservation. He knows, or he should know, that the measures we have implemented in this country outstrip those in the U.S. Mind you, from time to time, as some of his members like to remind us, that is the particular yardstick that we should follow, but perhaps he should look at the record. He should recognize also that conservation is also a provincial responsibility, and I suggest to him that he might do more for the energy conserving attitudes that he espouses and the practices he supports if he were to call up Queen's Park and ask them to get a move on the energy insulation program.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Gillespie: His views about northern development will appear peculiar to many Canadians who read newspapers and listen to radio and television. People in the north are organizing a strong cultural base. They are speaking to the media and to the politicians and, what is more, they are being assisted in their work by federal agencies with federal funds.

[Mr. Hamilton (Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain).]

The Leader of the Opposition appeared annoyed yesterday that the government had not yet announced a decision. Let us remember that the motion was moved because the government was asked by the Leader of the Opposition to provide an opportunity for debate before a decision in principle on a major project for this country has been taken, perhaps the biggest construction project ever undertaken in this country. Has he already forgotten that he asked to be heard? Has he already forgotten that he and other members asked to be heard before the government took a decision?

Mr. Fraser: We expected you to give us some idea of what you wanted to do.

Mr. Gillespie: The government has now consulted parliament. I believe we have taken our responsibility in doing so. Our responsibility now is to keep parliament informed, and eventually to let parliament decide whether it agrees with the form of that decision. That is the parliamentary process and the parliamentary system. I am sure the Leader of the Opposition would have been the first to criticize the government had the government House leader stood up yesterday and announced a decision.

One other speaker who I think should be singled out in the debate yesterday was the leader of the NDP (Mr. Broadbent). He adopted what can only be described as a ludicrous position for his party. It is the members of his party who had said that they wanted to have an input into the decision, that they wanted all members of parliament to have an input into the decision, or as many as could be heard, before the decision is taken. But what was the first thing he did? He placed an amendment before the House which in effect asks the House to take a decision before the House has even heard the views of members. Of course that is not the first time the NDP has adopted ludicrous positions.

My colleague, the government House leader, yesterday recited some of the events leading up to this debate. He spoke about the reports and the actions which gave existence to the reports: The Berger report, the NEB report, the Dean Lysyk report, the second Berger report, and the environmental assessment review process. He underlined as well the native interests and the concerns of the government with respect to those interests and the environmental interests with respect to a pipeline. He outlined the options for Canada and he also indicated rather strongly some of the complexities involved in reaching a decision of this magnitude.

I think it might be helpful to cast our minds back to the recent U.S. experience in Alaska. The U.S. has already experienced and faced up to environmental and native questions when it built the Alyeska line. Those complexities and difficulties with respect to the native claims and the environment were not insubstantial. There would be additional environmental problems for us if they were to decide to go for El Paso. Of course they would have to weigh the industrial benefits and the environmental costs which an El Paso route would involve against the lower prices and delivery to markets

of an overland Canadian route. This issue involves big money, big impact and big results, so it will not be settled overnight.

In concluding this debate I wish to place the spotlight for a moment on the question of energy supply and to summarize my impressions of the debate against the background of the major supply question for Canada.

The National Energy Board made reference to its 1975 report on natural gas supply requirements. It noted that some conditions have changed, basically as a result of the significantly higher prices which have brought supply and demand more in balance. Regrettably, the absence of assurances as to a secure supply—users will just not contract for gas without a five to ten years guarantee of supply—has resulted in an almost stagnant market for gas in Canada outside of Alberta in recent years. I call it regrettable because the prospects for oil production in Canada are much more serious. The alternatives are high cost tar sands and heavy oil production and imports.

I know a pipeline decision would clearly raise the question of how we provide that long term assurance of natural gas supplies which consumers and the distributing utilities need in order to plan for greater use of natural gas and less dependence on oil, particularly imported oil. It is thus not only a question of whether or not we need northern gas and, if so, when, but also whether or not we are going to indicate to natural gas users and potential users that there is a supply available not only in Alberta but also in the frontier. We need to be able to indicate to gas users that their investment is protected for its life, that they will not be cold if they decide to heat their homes and run their factories with natural gas.

We need to be able to indicate to potential gas users that the government's strategy is to use natural gas to the maximum extent wherever economical, and this requires the long term assurance of supply. Otherwise a major opportunity to replace foreign oil and to reduce our growing dependence on foreign oil will be severely threatened and forgone.

On the matter of the deliverability of gas, which in the final analysis is more important than a reserve estimate, I can say that analyses by my department and the National Energy Board on deliverability profiles show production from existing western Canada reserves peaking in 1981. When so-called trend gas is added, production will peak in 1983-84. After that time, amounts of trend gas deliverability cannot offset the decline in deliverability of the established reserves.

● (1630)

The Board has performed some very important sensitivity tests on its own projections of supply and demand. In one case when optimistic assumptions are used with respect to supply and a low growth rate for gas demand is assumed, an approximate balance between supply and demand, with no shortfalls, is obtained until the year 1990. I think it is important that we understand that. That is under one set of assumptions that the National Energy Board has used for this sensitivity analysis. I believe this points to the degree of uncertainty regarding the first year of shortfall, and, inasmuch as less than expected supply trends and high demand growth could bring the supply-demand crossover point forward into the early 1980's, it does emphasize the importance of preparing for expected shortages well in advance rather than risking the country's energy supply on a fine calculation of a year or two of shortage. This is the fine tuning, in other words, into which some spokesmen have allowed themselves to be drawn. For this reason the board has emphasized the importance of frontier gas supply by the first half of the 1980's.

Finally, I would like to refer to some policy considerations relative to the supply and timing of Mackenzie Delta gas. In the report I released last year concerning our energy strategy for Canada emphasis was given to policies for self-reliance. Included in the policy elements are energy conservation and increased exploration and development. Those elements are directly related to curtailing demand growth and increasing energy supply to reduce the energy gap forecast for 1985. This remains our objective, and the opening up of new supply sources, whether in frontier areas or in the heavy oil areas of western Canada, is fundamental to the attainment of self-reliance.

The National Energy Board, after a very thorough and independent analysis, as I have said, has concluded that frontier gas supply before the mid-1980's is an essential element of the country's supply and demand equation. Here I must point out just one of perhaps several discrepancies in the positions taken by the Leader of the Opposition and his energy critic, the hon. member for St. John's West (Mr. Crosbie). On the one hand the Leader of the Opposition was saying "Damm the torpedoes, full speed ahead, we must have energy self-sufficiency by the year 1990". Bringing domestic demand, he said, into some kind of harmony by then was not only realizable but absolutely essential.

However, his energy critic, on the other hand, adopted a rather more relaxed attitude. He said that our need for frontier gas from the Delta or the Beaufort Sea will not come in the last half of the 1980's, or need not come. He said we should gamble. That was one of the words he used. He said we can get by without frontier gas until then. That was an incredibly rash statement, but any of us who have watched the hon. member for St. John's West in this House realize that was fully in character.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Gillespie: I have no intention of entering the debate between the hon. member for St. John's West on the one hand and his leader on the other with respect to the energy self-sufficiency policy of their party, but I point out only that Canada could fall short of this goal if the Leader of the Opposition cannot persuade his energy critic to see some greater urgency in the matter. Indeed, far from having attained self-sufficency, we could be faced with energy shortages if we took the kinds of risks the hon. member for St. John's West appears willing to take.

In acknowledging the need for frontier gas I am not in any way proposing to lessen the pressure we must maintain toward

the objective of new oil supplies from the tar sands and the heavy oil areas of Alberta. In fact that development is complementary to frontier gas development. Both are needed urgently. Nor am I suggesting that our energy conservation measures should be less stringent because we can achieve a supply and demand balance through new sources of supply. We must, in fact, increase our conservation efforts. The fact is that we are projecting an energy supply gap for 1985, even assuming frontier gas supplies and a considerable turnaround in the energy consumption habits of all Canadians. The extent to which we fail to bring on any of these new energy sources or to convince people about the importance of conservation will be a measure of the widening gap in our 1985 energy projections and beyond.

The alternative to greater self-reliance is an increasing dependence on imported oil. Forecasts of the world energy situation in the latter half of the next decade point to increasing competitive demand for decreasing supplies, and that can have only one result: escalating prices, very high prices or, at worst, a major security of supply problem.

While these supply conditions pertain to the mid-1980's and beyond, there is a tendency to forget about the long lead times involved in major resource development and transportation projects and to set aside the necessary decisions until it is too late to undertake a well planned program. This in turn often leads to crash programs which are costly and ineffective. The time for a decision on a northern pipeline is now. With a decision in principle preparations can be completed in a thorough manner and the facilities carefully constructed to open up new sources of energy supply for all Canadians.

As perhaps the last speaker in this debate I would like to compliment hon. members of all parties who have participated. I would particularly like to thank hon. members of the official opposition for finally turning their minds to the development of an energy policy.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Gillespie: I am pleased that the policy they have adopted is very similar to ours. After all, imitation is the sincerest form of flattery.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Gillespie: I would like now to summarize briefly some of the main points in the debate.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Order, please. I regret to inform the hon. minister that his allotted time has expired.

Mr. Stevens: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the minister would permit a question at this time.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): The minister's time has expired. The only way he can accept a question is with unanimous consent. Does the minister have unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

[Mr. Gillespie.]

Mr. Stevens: Mr. Speaker, I thank hon. members for allowing me to ask my question. Earlier today the minister indicated that if he received a specific request with respect to certain of the cartel documents he has in his possession he would consider releasing them. I have two preliminary lists or schedules of such documents which I would like to deliver to the minister at this time. Would the minister indicate if he would accept the lists from me, and would he indicate to the House when we might receive the documents?

Some hon. Members: Order!

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): That question does not pertain to the debate.

Mr. Gillespie: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. It was my understanding that I had the indulgence of the House to summarize the debate. My summary would cover the speeches of various hon. members. I thought I had until a quarter to five. I ask the indulgence of the House for a few moments.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): I point out to the minister that the time allocation was 40 minutes for the leaders of each party and 20 minutes for all other speakers. Due to the fact that the President of the Privy Council (Mr. MacEachen) spoke on behalf of the government first, the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Gillespie) was allocated 20 minutes.

● (1640)

Mr. Peter C. Bawden (Calgary South): Mr. Speaker, I had hoped to express my views in 20 minutes but understand I shall have available only two or three minutes. Therefore I have put aside my notes and will begin by commenting on the remarks of the minister. He commented on what the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Clark) said and also said, I think, that if we follow the counsel of the hon. member for St. John's West (Mr. Crosbie) we shall face energy shortages in the years ahead. It is incredible that the minister who was in charge of energy affairs in this country when we were self-sufficient in energy, when reserves were growing, when our prospects for energy supplies were favourable, indeed excellent, should have brought this country to the position in which in the next five years it will be on its knees from the point of view of energy supplies. That is shameful.

Personally I believe the question of northern pipelines is greatly connected with the question of energy supplies in Canada. This point has been covered adequately; yet it is important to note that by 1980, in little more than two years, Canada will import some 390,000 barrels a day, according to figures the National Energy Board gave us, and by 1985, only about seven years away, Canada will depend on foreign sources for over half its oil. Given these projections and estimates as to where our future energy supplies will come from, we must look carefully at this country's pipelines.

The minister who is responsible for energy matters in Canada should reflect upon what others have said about energy to North America. Speaking on energy, the President

of the United States referred to it in April this year as the greatest challenge his country would face during our lifetime. He said the energy crisis has not yet overwhelmed us but it will if we do not act quickly. He said we must not be selfish or timid if we hope to have a decent world for our children and grandchildren. He concluded by saying we must simply balance our supply and demand for energy with our rapidly shrinking resources. By acting now we can control our future, instead of letting the future control us.

The minister referred again today to his strategies, his studies and to many reports. We have had, since the present minister and previous minister assumed the responsibility for their portfolios, nothing in the way of action. We have had all kinds of reports and heard a lot of talk. The minister speaks of the problems facing us but does nothing. Actually almost everything the government, including the minister, has done in the last few years with respect to energy has been negative, has in fact been a detriment to the acquisition of future supplies.

An hon. Member: We have had government by regulation.

Mr. Bawden: An hon. member mentions rule by regulation. The government's actions in the area of energy are but another example of that rule. I do not think we have emphasized sufficiently in this debate the matter of Canada's security of future energy supplies. If we are to import about half our energy supplies, a substantial proportion will be shipped via the Indian Ocean and round South Africa. We shall be highly dependent on a number of foreign powers for our energy supplies. This, in addition to our economic difficulties, is a most serious problem to those of us who live in northern latitudes.

I say to you, Mr. Speaker, it is very much in our interest to work together with the United States to make possible the construction of a northern pipeline. While we can be instrumental in making available to the United States sizable quantities of its own energy supplies, we can at the same time, probably by using the Dempster route, eventually bring into use our Mackenzie Delta and Beaufort Sea gas.

On reflecting on the events of the past months, after having visited recently the Mackenzie Delta, something I have done many times, I am impressed by a number of facts. For example, both natives and whites alike told me and my colleagues, when we visited the Delta, that Mr. Justice Berger's report does not properly represent the views of the northern people. The reason is, I think, that the views expressed to Mr. Justice Berger were largely those of a group of experts from Toronto, who arrived in the north on an aircraft ahead of Mr. Justice Berger and persuaded the natives as to what they should say. These same gentlemen probably wrote their reports right at the University of Toronto. We asked businessmen in the north why they did not put forward their views; or, why were we hearing from them views which had not been expressed to Mr. Justice Berger? The reason is this: the experts from Toronto were funded directly and indirectly by the government. They had funds which enabled them to sit at the hearings for days on end and to buy airline tickets which are expensive items in northern communities. But the small businessmen, the young people who were enterprising and had staked their future in the north, had no chance to express their views, because they had neither the time nor the money to do it.

I can hardly fail to remind the House that Mr. Justice Berger himself at one time was an elected representative and formerly the leader of the New Democratic Party in British Columbia. As one northerner put it, asking Mr. Justice Berger to report on matters in the north is akin to appointing a cardinal to head a commission on abortion.

What are this country's energy reserves, and what are our potential sources of supply? We have a good deal of potential for supplies in Alberta. We have potential supplies off the east coast, but in deep water and probably cannot extract those supplies with presently known technology. I expect we shall need to learn new technologies. We have the Alberta oil sands and the heavy oils in Alberta. But the frontier area most likely to yield energy supplies immediately is the Mackenzie Delta.

We shall need all of this country's energy reserves. All will be required, each in their own time. The development of some can be hurried; the development of others cannot be. Huge sums of money will be required for exploration in our provinces and off the east coast. In view of the enormous costs of these developments, we shall need to time them carefully. Today we have known reserves in our western Arctic areas. The reports of the National Energy Board make clear that this area is the next and most important source which should be tapped for Canadian energy needs.

The projected production from the Mackenzie Delta would meet the growth in Canada's energy needs for less than two years. That should make it clear we shall need all our energy resources. We cannot stand aside at this time, awaiting the development of the oil sands, or the heavy oil reserves. We must make use of our present opportunity to bring on stream Mackenzie Delta gas.

It has been said in this debate that by agreeing to the pipeline we shall do the United States a favour. Before I deal with the point let me draw attention to the outstanding job done for many years by the Canadian Arctic gas group. This government told it to get to work and undertake studies in thousands of important areas. The group did its work well. It conducted undoubtedly one of the most thorough studies ever undertaken on northern ecological and transportation matters.

I ask again, who will be dealt a favour? I say that, yes, we can help the United States, and it is important for us to do so. But I also suggest this project is greatly to Canada's advantage. Today we desperately need the economic stimulus of this pipeline and its construction projects. This, of course, is largely due to the mess that our country is in as a result of the economic mismanagement of the government sitting opposite.

• (1650)

We cannot afford to build our own pipeline at the present time from our western Arctic reserves because they are not large enough. However, the Alaska-Yukon line which is pro-

posed by the Foothills group in Calgary to build their line within 480 miles of our reserves brings our reserves within reasonable distance of a major transportation artery. The energy supply of North America would be more secure and the strength of the economy of our largest trading partner would be increased.

Our supply of energy is important to us. Equally important to us is that the United States receives their supply of energy. Hon. members will recall how many Americans were out of jobs last winter and how seriously the slump in their economy affected Canada.

There is one other aspect. The pipeline group intends to employ thousands of people on the pipeline, something in the area of 5,000 or 6,000. This will be multiplied at least five times in other parts of Canada. That would be Hamilton, the maritimes, and as I told the hon. member for St. John's East (Mr. McGrath), they will probably eat a lot of fish in those pipeline camps.

I understand that another factor being considered is gas swaps. At the present time the important problem facing the United States is their short-term supply. The President of the United States has put into place a long term program but, as hon. members know, it takes a long lead time to bring these supplies on stream.

It is my understanding that affiliates of the Alaska-Yukon pipeline company are at the present time willing to deal with the United States on short-term supplies from western Canada. This is of considerable importance to the United States.

We have these additional supplies available. There appear to be various formulae to make possible their implementation. I urge the government to support these efforts and, wherever possible, to back those who are attempting to use these important levers to bring about acceptance by the United States of this particular route.

As I reflect on the figures of our own energy shortfalls in the eighties, I find them frightening. What is of even more concern is that the problem we have in energy is not truly an energy problem, but a political problem. It seems little short of incredible that Canada is programmed by this government in its studies to permit itself to lapse into heavy dependence on outside sources on the whims of foreign powers for its essential energy supply. It is all the more tragic when we realize that this potential energy is available in Canada through the various sources that we have.

There is the example of the northern regulations. This minister ought to be ashamed of himself. He has told this House and committee on more than two dozen occasions in the past six or eight months that these regulations would be available very soon. He said as recently as this past June that he would introduce them this session. We are well into the summer, and no regulations. This speaks very well for the concern the government has for the energy problem, and indeed the competence of the minister.

It is interesting that the government's program, the shortage and desperation in our actual supply situation, lead us very much into the 1980's when we will be facing deficits which will not permit us to buy supplies. I wonder if the minister is aware of that.

Yesterday the Leader of the Opposition pointed out that studies by the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and others clearly indicate that by the middle of the 1980's oil may very well not be available. This master plan, these studies, these words, all that we hear from this minister brings us to our maximum problem, our maximum shortages at the very time when world supplies will be phasing out and may very well be unavailable to us.

On the question of a northern pipeline, the government is obligated to come forward with some answers. It has had this problem for many years. The opportunity to build an oil line through Canada came at the time that Alaska oil was to be brought from Alaska. The government failed to react. It said no. It had an opportunity at that time to take steps to make possible the energy corridors, but it failed miserably. It is continuing to do so.

THE ROYAL ASSENT

[*English*]

A message was delivered by the Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod as follows:

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

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

And being returned:

Mr. Speaker informed the House that the Deputy Governor General had been pleased to give, in Her Majesty's name, the Royal Assent to the following bills:

Bill C-24, An Act respecting immigration to Canada—Chapter 52.

Bill C-51, An Act to amend the Criminal Code, the Customs Tariff, the Parole Act, the Penitentiary Act and the Prisons and Reformatories Act—Chapter 53.

Bill C-27, An Act to establish the Department of Employment and Immigration, the Canada Employment and Immigration Commission and the Canada Employment and Immigration Advisory Council, to amend the Unemployment Insurance Act, 1971 and to amend certain other statutes in consequence thereof—Chapter 54.

Bill C-23, An Act to facilitate conversion to the metric system of measurement—Chapter 55.

Bill C-34, An Act to amend the Canadian Wheat Board Act respecting the establishment of marketing plans and to amend the Western Grain Stabilization Act in consequence thereof—Chapter 56.

Mr. Speaker: It being five o'clock, pursuant to the order made by this House on Monday, July 25, 1977, this House stands adjourned until Monday, October 17, 1977, at two o'clock in the afternoon.

The House adjourned at 5.10 p.m., until Monday, October 17, 1977, at 2 p.m., according to order made July 25, 1977.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Tuesday, August 9, 1977

The House met at 2 p.m.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

THE CANADIAN ECONOMY

PROPOSALS FOR IMPROVING ECONOMIC SITUATION—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. James Gillies (Don Valley): Mr. Speaker, in light of the fact that unemployment is now 878,000, a record for the month of July, in light of the fact that second quarter job vacancies have dropped to only four per thousand from 14 per thousand three years ago, and in light of the fact that the bill for unemployment insurance benefits in May was $12 million per day, I move, seconded by the hon. member for St. John's East (Mr. McGrath):

That this House urges the government to adopt the following Progressive Conservative program for the economic reconstruction of this country: income tax cuts of $250 million to low and middle income earners; a cut in the federal sales tax on building materials to stimulate housing and create employment in the construction industry; long term fiscal or tax contracts for companies investing in Atlantic Canada or Quebec; a new budget with major emphasis on private sector job creation; and a reallocation of government funds presently budgeted for inessential projects to direct job creation programs.

Mr. Speaker: The question called under Standing Order 43 by the hon. member for Don Valley can be put for debate only with the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

* * *

HOUSE OF COMMONS

CITING OF ORDER FOR RECALL OF PARLIAMENT

Mr. Speaker: I should inform the House that by virtue of a resolution passed by the House on Monday, July 25, 1977, appearing in *Votes and Proceedings* at page 1441, dealing with the adjournment of the House, I caused to be published in the edition of the *Canada Gazette* for August 6, 1977 a notice causing this House to meet this day, which reads as follows:

In accordance with the provisions of the resolution adopted by the House on Monday, July 25, 1977, having been satisfied after consultation with the Government, that the public interest requires that the House should meet at an earlier time during the adjournment, I hereby give notice that the House of Commons shall meet on Tuesday, August 9, 1977, at 2.00 o'clock p.m., for the purpose of considering legislation in relation to an impending strike by the Canadian Air Traffic Control Association and to transact the business of the House as if it had been duly adjourned to that time.

Given under my hand and seal at Ottawa this 6th day of August, 1977.

James Jerome
Speaker
House of Commons
Canada

In addition, on the same date I sent telegrams to each member of the House containing the substance of that notice.

* * *

COMBINES

PROPOSED REFERENCE TO COMMITTEE OF ACTIVITIES OF ALLEGED URANIUM CARTEL—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Sinclair Stevens (York-Simcoe): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a matter of urgent and pressing necessity under Standing Order 43. As it is now clear an international cartel in uranium succeeded in rigging world prices, so that the floor price per pound of uranium was set in the $14 per pound range in the early part of 1974, and as it is now evident from the director's minutes of Ontario Hydro that this "world price" was proposed by Rio Algom in their uranium offer to Ontario Hydro of February 25, 1974, and that Denison in the same period proposed to Ontario Hydro a floor price of $14.50 per pound, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Don Valley (Mr. Gillies):

That a reference be made to the public accounts standing committee of this House so that the activities of this uranium cartel may be reviewed with particular reference to their impact on Canadian domestic consumers.

Mr. Speaker: The presentation of such a motion requires unanimous consent. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

* * *

INDUSTRY

SUGGESTION STEEL RAILS BE ORDERED FROM SYDNEY STEEL PLANT—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Andy Hogan (Cape Breton-East Richmond): Mr. Speaker, I rise under the provisions of Standing Order 43 on a matter of urgent and pressing necessity. In light of the continuing increase in unemployment particularly in the Atlantic

provinces and most disastrously in Cape Breton, and with the requirements needed for materials to upgrade and rehabilitate the rail system in western Canada, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Regina-Lake Centre (Mr. Benjamin):

That this House request the government to provide capital funds necessary and require the railways to place orders for and stockpile the many hundreds of miles of steel rails in preparing for such work and that priority be given to the steel mill in Sydney, Nova Scotia, for the filling of these orders so as to provide immediate and substantial employment.

Mr. Speaker: Such a motion can be presented for debate only with the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

* * *

THE MINISTRY

SUGGESTION MINISTER OF FINANCE RESIGN—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Ray Hnatyshyn (Saskatoon-Biggar): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a matter of urgent and pressing necessity under the provisions of Standing Order 43. In the years since the current finance minister first joined the cabinet, he has been responsible first for the uranium cartel, for our present legacy of energy rises as minister of energy, and now, as Minister of Finance, for record inflation followed by record unemployment. The long arm of coincidence cannot be stretched to encompass so many acts without indicating incompetence. Therefore, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Edmonton Centre (Mr. Paproski):

That this House demands the minister now resign.

Mr. Speaker: Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

* * *

HOUSE OF COMMONS

PROPOSED CHANGE IN RULES TO PROVIDE FOR DEBATE OF BACK-TO-WORK LEGISLATION FOR AIR TRAFFIC CONTROLLERS—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Ralph Stewart (Cochrane): Mr. Speaker, I rise under the provisions of Standing Order 43 to move a motion which would permit us to accomplish what we came here to do. Since our convening at this time in emergency session has been prompted by a crisis in the country, the Canadian public expects us to debate the matter as soon as possible.

● (1410)

The ordinary rules of this House are such that many hours can be used discussing a number of other matters, thus denying us the possibility of getting to the debate at hand for some time and therefore at great additional cost to the Canadian taxpayers. I therefore move, seconded by the hon. member for Saint-Jacques (Mr. Guilbault):

That this House agrees to set aside all routine proceedings, including oral questions, and proceed with the emergency debate forthwith.

Furthermore, in order to preserve the prerogatives of members who wish to do so, that when all stages of the emergency legislation are passed, an additional sitting day be made available for the purpose of discussing matters that would normally be dealt with in routine proceedings.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Such a motion can be discussed only with unanimous consent? Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

* * *

SOCIAL SECURITY

PROPOSALS TO IMPROVE PENSION PLANS—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that this session might end one of these days, it is time that we started thinking about the next one. I therefore move, seconded by the hon. member for Timiskaming (Mr. Peters):

That this House urges the government to include in the Speech from the Throne at the opening of the third session of this parliament legislation to increase the basic amount of the old age pension, to make both old age security and the Canada Pension Plan available at age 60 to those who are out of the labour market, to establish pension equality between men and women, to increase the basic rate of the war disability pension, and to establish pro rata pensions for the widows of veterans whose disability pension was less than 48 per cent.

Mr. Speaker: In view of the nature of the motion being a recommendation and since it relates to the beginning of the next session, I can hardly assign to it the urgency required under the Standing Order.

* * *

AIR CANADA

SUGGESTED AUTHORIZATION OF SERVICE TO REGINA, BRANDON AND TORONTO—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Hon. W. G. Dinsdale (Brandon-Souris): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a matter of urgent public necessity under Standing Order 43. In view of the fact that many towns and cities in western Manitoba and eastern Saskatchewan have been without air service not for three days but for more than four years, and in light of the promise of the Minister of Transport (Mr. Lang) to provide a subsidy for a jet service between Regina, Brandon and Toronto as well as a subsidy for a connecting commuter service, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Dauphin (Mr. Ritchie):

That the Minister of Transport authorize Air Canada to provide the daily jet service between Regina, Brandon and Toronto and return at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. Speaker: The presentation for debate of such a motion requires unanimous consent. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[*English*]

THE CANADIAN ECONOMY

POSSIBILITY OF NEW BUDGET WITH JOB-CREATING PROVISIONS AND DIRECT JOB-CREATING MEASURES

Mr. Joe Clark (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister and it comes in light of the fact that today's unemployment figures for the month of July are the highest in the history of Statistics Canada. Since it is very clear from the statistics revealed today that the job creating part of the budget of this spring simply has not taken hold, has not created the jobs that Canadians require, will the Prime Minister tell the House whether it is his intention to bring in a new budget at the earliest possible time, a budget that will include effective incentives to the Canadian private sector that will create the jobs that Canadians need?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, while sharing the concern of the Leader of the Opposition on the high rate of unemployment, I would not agree with his feeling that the budget has not begun to take effect. If the hon. member looks at the figures for the first six months of the year, he will see that there has been a relatively strong increase in employment. Of course, the number of people entering the labour force has also been very high, and this is the cause of the present statistic. As to the solution, I will keep the hon. member's suggestion in mind.

Mr. Clark: What I was looking at in part was the large number of new entrants to the work force, something which surely should not come to this government as a surprise. They have been there for years. Also what I was looking at was a speech given on July 12 by the President of the Treasury Board in which he admitted that there does not yet appear to be the kind of response to the budget the government was looking for. At that time the President of the Treasury Board indicated that the government might have to move away from encouragement of the private sector and move toward direct public sector job creation.

An hon. Member: It's about time.

Mr. Clark: That has the knee jerk support of the NDP, but I would like to know whether the President of the Treasury

Board was speaking for the government and whether it is the intention of the government of Canada now in light of the clear failure of its March budget—which is admitted by the President of the Treasury Board—to move toward direct job creation or whether the government is going to bring new stimulus to the private sector to create the jobs Canadians require.

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, I cannot recall if the Leader of the Opposition was present, but just a few days ago the Minister of Finance dealt at some length with this very question in answer to a question of privilege raised by the leader of the New Democratic Party. I encourage the hon. gentleman to look at *Hansard*, and he might find the answer.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

POSSIBILITY OF CONFERENCE OF PROVINCES, LABOUR AND BUSINESS

Mr. Joe Clark (Leader of the Opposition): As well as sending young Canadians looking for jobs out of the country because they cannot find them here perhaps the Prime Minister will also send *Hansard* to the hundreds of thousands of Canadians who are out of work right now, and their dependents, so that they can find what comfort they might from the fact that the Government of Canada refuses to respond to this new crisis in unemployment by taking action which might create jobs.

Since the Prime Minister is apparently unwilling to take action himself and in light of the crisis nature of the situation does the Prime Minister intend to call in representatives of the provinces and of organized labour and of business for a major economic conference which might give some leadership to this government, which lacks leadership in trying to create jobs for Canadians?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I must remind the Leader of the Opposition that his question had to do with some quotation from the President of the Treasury Board, and it is rather unfair to conclude from my answer—which was just a suggestion that the hon. gentleman look at the answers which had been given—that the government is not prepared to do many things, one of them being the convening of precisely the type of conference he just suggested. We discussed this with labour and business groups with which we met a couple of weeks ago, and we are hoping to have a positive response from them. One of the things we put to them was the suggestion of convening a conference of responsible decision makers in the economic sector, to which observers from the provinces could be present if they so desired.

Mr. Clark: What does the Government of Canada intend to do to create jobs for Canadians?

Mr. Trudeau: The Leader of the Opposition just made a suggestion, and I said we are going to do that very thing. Does he have another question?

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Oral Questions

UNEMPLOYMENT—POSSIBILITY OF NEW JOB-CREATING MEASURES

Mr. James A. McGrath (St. John's East): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a supplementary question to the Minister of Finance. In actual terms unemployment figures are up all across the country but are especially critical in the province of Quebec, which had the sharpest increase, as well as in the Atlantic provinces generally. Notwithstanding the job creation programs presently in force, is it the intention of the minister in the face of these startling statistics to announce to the House new job creation initiatives now?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to add to the quarter billion dollar announcement which was made by the Minister of Manpower and Immigration some weeks ago.

Mr. McGrath: Mr. Speaker, many of the jobless in the country are unemployed heads of families. A very large proportion of these people have been unemployed for three months or more, and they are running the risk of having their unemployment insurance benefits expire. I appeal to the minister to examine with his colleague, the Minister of Manpower and Immigration, the situation regarding unemployment insurance for people who have been unemployed for more than three months and perhaps through some program to assist these people so that they will not have to fall back on provinces which can ill afford to meet these extra welfare payments now.

● (1420)

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Speaker, my colleague and I will be most happy to look at that specific group of the work force. As I have indicated in the past in the House, job creation measures are specifically aimed at groups, such as those in the Atlantic provinces, where the levels of unemployment have been above the national average.

EFFECT OF UNEMPLOYMENT ON NATIONAL UNITY—SUGGESTED JOB-CREATING PROGRAM

Mr. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister, who correctly told the Leader of the Opposition that I had directed a question to the President of the Treasury Board in which I suggested that unemployment was contributing to national disunity and that the Minister of Finance had replied to the question. But the Prime Minister did not add that the Minister of Finance on Friday, August 5, withdrew his accusation about my having deliberately misled the House—

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Deliberately. That's the word.

Mr. Broadbent: —the clear implication being that the President of the Treasury Board was quoted accurately.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): No.

Mr. Broadbent: Let me ask the Prime Minister this question, Mr. Speaker. Since the President of the Treasury Board has already admitted that current levels of unemployment are contributing to national disunity, and considering that in the province of Quebec alone unemployment during the last month increased by 21,000, the largest increase in any province of Canada, from the point of view of unity in the country does the Prime Minister not think it is time for the government to move directly with respect to job creation programs of the kind the Minister of Finance promised last month but withdrew two weeks ago?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I find the question—

An hon. Member: A little long.

Mr. Trudeau: —rather surprising. I am not sure if the preamble to the question was necessary but it seems to me that in its present form it states a new falsehood. In it the hon. member said that the Minister of Finance withdrew his statement about the quotations by the hon. member not being to the effect he said. All the minister withdrew was the suggestion that there had been a deliberate misleading of the House, and that is the total picture. I am surprised that the leader of the New Democratic Party would not at least be correct in that.

Mr. Broadbent: Mr. Speaker, I hope the Prime Minister will answer my question when he replies again. Considering that ministers of the Crown have both raised the serious question of disunity and acknowledged it as being directly related to unemployment levels, and considering that since President Carter took office last fall unemployment in the United States has been dropping steadily to its present level of 6.9 per cent, whereas in the same period of time unemployment in Canada has worsened, will the Prime Minister now acknowledge that the financial policies of the government have been wrong and, from considerations of human dignity and national unity, commit the government to some new, early action to create jobs?

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, on a question so important, a question which I acknowledge, as does the Minister of Finance, is giving us great concern, I really do not understand why the NDP leader has to put in all these preambles which are wrong and misleading. It is well known that over a period of years the performance of the United States was very much worse than ours.

Mr. Broadbent: And they changed the president.

Mr. Trudeau: They changed their president, Mr. Speaker, and changed their economic policy.

Mr. Broadbent: Yes, and you know what happened.

Mr. Trudeau: That permitted them to catch up and do better than they had been doing for years.

Mr. Stevens: And their government is doing better than this government is doing.

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, I think the leader of the NDP is misguided again when he suggests that their policies are infallible and that unemployment has been steadily dropping. If he looks at the figures for June he will see that that is not the case. In the United States the figures have gone up.

Mr. Stevens: No, they have not. That is damned wrong.

Mr. Trudeau: Therefore, you cannot just assert a policy and say that that is the one which will apply, Mr. Speaker. You have to apply a policy to your country and do as best you can.

Mr. Broadbent: Mr. Speaker, the level of unemployment in the United States is 6.9 per cent and over 8 per cent in Canada. The Prime Minister is right in saying that the Americans changed their president and changed their policy. We are calling for the same thing in this country. Is the Prime Minister happy with the situation whereby, according to his own government's forecasts, we will spend $3.8 billion on unemployment insurance payouts alone this year? Does he not agree that money would be much better spent on job creation to provide jobs for people in Canada instead of handouts?

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, it is of course our intention, as we have said constantly, to do what we can from month to month to improve the economic situation in the country. The Minister of Finance made it clear in his budget last March that it would take a period of several months before we would see a marked improvement. As to the question of changing leaders, Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to hear a case from the leader of the NDP. If he wants to give the people of Canada an occasion very soon to change their leaders, I am prepared—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

* * *

COMBINES

ALLEGED URANIUM CARTEL—DATE WHEN FACTS AND DOCUMENTS WILL BE PUT BEFORE PARLIAMENT

Mr. Sinclair Stevens (York-Simcoe) Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister. Referring to the uranium cartel on Friday, the Prime Minister stated at page 8074 of *Hansard*, and I quote:

> We will put every fact we have before parliament so it can debate this matter properly.

Will the Prime Minister indicate when we may expect these facts to be put before parliament and will they include all the documents now before the Moss committee in Washington, of which 500 are still held on the secret list, and will the facts referred to by the Prime Minister include the material impounded by the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources during November 1976 and still held by the minister?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I remember the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources inviting the hon. member to state clearly what documents he would like. We will do our utmost to provide them to parliament. I understand that the hon. member has now tabled such a list on the Order Paper. We will be very glad to look at it and comply in so far as possible.

ALLEGED URANIUM CARTEL—POSSIBILITY OF AMENDING REGULATIONS PROHIBITING POSSESSION OF DOCUMENTS

Mr. Sinclair Stevens (York-Simcoe): Mr. Speaker, I would emphasize that the list on the Order Paper is only a preliminary list. The Prime Minister on Friday conveyed the impression that he was still considering amending the cover up regulation saying as he did at page 8072 of *Hansard*:

> —I would do everything possible to permit the opposition and the Canadian public to debate this fairly,—

Will the Prime Minister now indicate if he has asked to have the security of information order in council amended to ensure that it will not restrict a free and open debate and investigation in Canada with respect to uranium cartel activities.

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Yes, Mr. Speaker. I have asked that. The Minister of Justice is presently considering that possibility. I hope we will be able to give an answer to parliament within a day or two.

* * *

ENERGY

ALLEGED URANIUM CARTEL—REQUEST FOR RELEASE OF DOCUMENTS TO DIRECTOR OF COMBINES

Mr. Sinclair Stevens (York-Simcoe): Mr. Speaker, as we wait for that answer, perhaps I could direct a supplementary question to the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources. As the cover-up regulations permit the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources to consent to material being released, will the minister indicate if he would be willing to at least ask that the document that we now have in our possession touching on the uranium cartel be released to the Director of Investigation and Research under the Combines Investigation Act so that any six Canadians may pursuant to Section 7 of that Act ask for an inquiry with respect to the uranium cartel activities.

Hon. Alastair Gillespie (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, if there is any cover-up in this operation, it is a cover up operation attempted by the hon. member for York-Simcoe. It is he who is trying to cover-up the fact the Canadian government acted to protect the interests of the Canadian people.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Gillespie: What is surprising is that it has taken them ten months to discover that order in council which was published last September. I have seen a list of some 35 orders which the hon. member has asked to be tabled. We are giving consideration to doing so. I believe they fall into three different categories.

● (1430)

One has to do with motion 117 for a copy of my recent telex to Judge Daniel Snyder of the U.S. District Court for the western district of Pennsylvania. As this telex presents my government's position on the release in the United States of classified Canadian documents I have no difficulty about it being made public. Indeed, it is presently being translated.

The other documents fall into two different categories. Some 23 of the motions mentioned in the hon. member's release—he mentioned 28 and I am not sure whether the 23 and the 28 are identical—appear to relate to internal communications within the Gulf Oil Corporation of the United States, not of the Canadian corporation. It is most unlikely that any of this material exists in our files but a search is underway at the present time.

As to the remaining papers which are sought, we are presently looking at this aspect from the point of view of confidentiality in the light of the test which I mentioned to the House at the end of last week—the very nature of the agreements entered into.

NORTHERN GAS PIPELINE—SUGGESTION CANADIANS NOT FUND OR GUARANTEE PIPELINE

Mr. James Gillies (Don Valley): My question is directed to the Prime Minister, Mr. Speaker. It has to do with the recent decisions with respect to the Alcan pipeline in connection with the construction of which the government is now, presumably, about to enter into negotiation with the United States.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Gillies: Can the government tell us and the people of Canada that one of the non-negotiable items as far as Canada is concerned is that Canadian taxpayers will not be asked to fund or guarantee the pipeline in any way?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): If the hon. member is suggesting the financing of the pipeline in a direct way, yes, that is our view; we do not intend that the Canadian taxpayer should pay for it in any sense. But the possibility that along with benefits there will be some cost is inevitable, and it is our intention to make sure that this cost is paid by those who need the pipeline. The pipeline is needed by the Americans but it is also needed by Canadians and it will be a matter of making the best possible arrangements for Canada.

Mr. Gillies: I was concerned about whether or not the Canadian government would be willing to make any back-stop arrangements for the completion of the pipeline—whether the Canadian government is willing to take up a back-stop position with respect to any portion of the work?

Mr. Trudeau: If the question is stated in that way, the answer, and I gave it yesterday at the press conference, is unequivocally no.

[Mr. Gillespie.]

NORTHERN GAS PIPELINE—CANADIAN POSITION ON CONSTRUCTION OF DAWSON LOOP

Mr. James Gillies (Don Valley): I would ask the Prime Minister further whether or not our position with regard to the construction of the loop in the pipeline down through Dawson is a non-negotiable one as far as Canada is concerned. I want the Canadian people to know what the conditions are likely to be—

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Gillies: It is not like the cartel. They have every right to know whether or not our position on the Dawson loop is non-negotiable, so if it turns out there are economically viable reserves in the delta they can be brought out at the lowest cost.

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): The government indicated yesterday in its announcement that one of the reasons Canada undertook to negotiate a pipeline was that we wished to have access to our reserves in the Mackenzie delta. The way in which those reserves will be brought down is, of course, the subject of negotiation. I know the hon. gentleman has given a lot of thought to the subject and if he would make a list of the non-negotiable items he wants us to take to the Americans we would be very happy to have it, and, perhaps, if we were to stick with that list there would not be even much point in the negotiations.

NORTHERN GAS PIPELINE—REQUEST FOR ASSURANCE MATERIAL AND EQUIPMENT MANUFACTURED IN CANADA

Mr. R. E. McKinley (Huron-Middlesex): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources. Bearing in mind that Canadians are concerned that too much in the way of protection for producers and manufacturers has been given away without anything in return since the present government took office, and that the U.S. likes to protect its producers and manufacturers, will the hon. gentleman assure us that in negotiating with the United States for the building of a pipeline across Canada our negotiators will take steps to ensure that a large percentage of the material and equipment used is manufactured in Canada, thus protecting Canadian jobs?

Hon. Alastair Gillespie (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): It has been made clear from the start that Canadian content would be a very important part of our approach to these negotiations.

* * *

COMBINES

ALLEGED URANIUM CARTEL—REASON FOR CANADIAN PARTICIPATION BEYOND 1974

Mr. Bill Kempling (Halton-Wentworth): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs relating to the uranium cartel. Having told the House

on June 17 that he was "pleased the government withdrew its support of the arrangement as soon as possible after prices began to rise on 1974", will he explain why a letter written by a government official, Dr. Runnalls, of the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources in late September, 1975, clearly indicates that Canadians continued to participate in the cartel and even remained dues-paying members of the cartel through 1975 and possibly into 1976 at which time uranium prices leap-frogged off the quote sheets and recorded their most marked increases?

Hon. A. C. Abbott (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): In answering a question on June 17, I did so in accordance with the facts in my possession. However, if the hon. member has a letter which I have not seen I would be grateful if he would table it.

An hon. Member: How can a private member table a letter?

ALLEGED URANIUM CARTEL—EFFECT ON DOMESTIC PRICE

Mr. Bill Kempling (Halton-Wentworth): The minister assured the House on June 17 that the director of investigations was following the situation for "any indication that the Canadian consumer has been adversely affected by the cartel arrangement." Would he tell the House whether, on the basis of discussions he has had with the director or on the basis of his personal knowledge, he still feels the cartel has had no adverse effect on Canadian consumers? Can he state unequivocally that the cartel did not have a bearing upon the price paid by the Canadian consumer?

Hon. A. C. Abbott (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I cannot state unequivocally that it did not, but to the best of my knowledge the arrangement was legal at the time it was concluded, there were no domestic buyers in the market at the time who were affected by the arrangement, and any export limitations under the arrangement were legitimized by the regulations made under the Atomic Energy Control Act relating to an export association which is permitted under the Combines Investigation Act. So I have no information which would lead me to conclude that there was any illegality in the transaction. The hon. member is citing a letter: I would be very grateful if he would table it for our information.

Mr. Kempling: Would the minister answer the question which was put to him by my hon. friend from York-Simcoe in relation to the release to the director of investigations under the combines legislation of the material we have?

Mr. Speaker: Order. That was the question asked by the hon. member for York-Simcoe, which was answered.

Some hon. Members: It was not answered.

HEALTH

PROGRAM TO DEAL WITH HEROIN ADDICTION IN BRITISH COLUMBIA—POSSIBILITY OF FEDERAL PARTICIPATION

Mr. Hugh A. Anderson (Comox-Alberni): Mr. Speaker, my question is addressed to the Minister of National Health and Welfare. Recently, the province of British Columbia announced a new program to deal with heroin addiction, one upon which I congratulate those responsible. Can the minister advise the House whether he will be meeting with his provincial counterpart in the near future and whether the federal government will be providing assistance in any form to the province of British Columbia in connection with this worthwhile endeavour?

Hon. Marc Lalonde (Minister of National Health and Welfare): I have myself welcomed the initiative shown by the government of British Columbia in putting new money and effort into the fight against heroin addiction, though I have expressed some concern about the precise techniques being used. However, I have planned a meeting with my British Columbia colleagues toward the end of September, at which time we will review the British Columbia proposal.

● (1440)

As to co-operation, I have indicated that we would try to co-operate with the British Columbia government in every way we could. As to financial involvement, I must indicate that the federal government has already contributed substantially to health and social services costs in all provinces, including British Columbia. Obviously, whatever health and social services would be provided in these particular programs would be subject to the usual cost-sharing rules which exist under the health and social services legislation in Canada.

* * *

POST OFFICE

PROPOSED ROYAL COMMISSION OF INQUIRY—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. John Rodriguez (Nickel Belt): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Postmaster General. In view of the fact that Canada's air traffic controllers went on strike only after trying for nine months to reach a settlement with their employer, the government; and in view of the fact that the Canadian Union of Postal Workers is facing exactly the same serious problems with their employer, the Postmaster General; and that as in the case of the air traffic controllers these problems are being permitted to drag on for months and months thus poisoning the relations between workers and management, will the minister tell this House if he is now prepared to call a royal commission into the problems of the Post Office and to further assure the House that he will act on the findings of such a commission?

Hon. J.-J. Blais (Postmaster General): Mr. Speaker, I wish the hon. gentleman would use his evident contact with the

Union of Postal Workers in order to have them return to the bargaining table.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Blais: I fully recognize, with the hon. gentleman, that the relations between the workers and their employers cannot but be detrimentally affected by the dragging on of negotiations. However, I have sent invitations time and time again to have CUPW return to the negotiating table. They have refused. Now, we have had to make an application under the Public Service Staff Relations Act for a declaration indicating that they are not negotiating in good faith. We had the initial hearing returnable on August 3. They requested an adjournment because they were not prepared to proceed at that time. Unfortunately, that matter will not be determined until the week of August 17. We hope there is a recognition that we have a responsibility to the Canadian people to keep the mails moving, especially in view of the experience with CATCA. We hope as well that all hon. members, who have some influence on CUPW, would use their good offices to have them return to the bargaining table.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

* * *

PUBLIC SERVICE

CONFLICTING STATEMENTS ON RIGHT TO STRIKE—REQUEST FOR CLARIFICATION

Mr. John Rodriguez (Nickel Belt): Mr. Speaker, I see the Minister of Labour is not in his place, therefore I will direct my supplementary to the Prime Minister. In view of the fact that the Minister of Transport recently made a statement on a CBC program indicating that the government is prepared to remove the right to strike for those workers who are considered to be essential workers in the public sector—

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Rodriguez: I am sure we have all noted that the banging came from the government side of the House.

An hon. Member: Right on.

Mr. Rodriguez: Can the Prime Minister tell the House if the Minister of Transport was expressing a new government labour policy in regard to the right to strike of government employees?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Transport made it clear that he was expressing his opinion that it should be considered. I would not indicate that the government is considering it these days. The issue before the House is one of a single strike, and we want to deal with that before getting into any broader matters.

Mr. Rodriguez: Mr. Speaker, my final supplementary is directed to the Prime Minister. In view of the fact that the Prime Minister has changed Postmaster General as often as he has changed his underwear in trying to solve the problems of the Post Office, and in view of the fact that the Prime Minister said that he does not know what to do about solving the problems in the Post Office, is the Prime Minister prepared to remove this Postmaster General who is obviously incapable of dealing with the problem in the upcoming shuffle of the cabinet—

An hon. Member: Sit down.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

* * *

REGIONAL ECONOMIC EXPANSION

POSSIBILITY OF MODERNIZING SYDNEY STEEL PLANT—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Halifax): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Prime Minister. On July 25 for the second time I attempted to find out from the right hon. gentleman whether the government of Nova Scotia has made any specific proposal or request to the government of Canada in regard to the modernization of the Sydney Steel Plant. For the second time, the Prime Minister was unable to answer me; but he promised he would have someone send that information, which has not been sent. That is no way to treat a dog, let alone the people of Cape Breton. Could I have that information?

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

[*Translation*]

Hon. Marcel Lessard (Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): Mr. Speaker, I should like to answer the question in two points: First, we did receive from SYSCO a request for our assistance in the form of our participation in the study and completion of up-dating their facilities in Cape Breton; second, with regard to the information the hon. requested last week, I did take steps to have that information sent to his office and signed a letter to that effect advising him of the state of the situation.

* * *

[*English*]

ENERGY

ALLEGED URANIUM CARTEL—POSSIBILITY OF PERMITTING RELEASE OF DOCUMENTS AND INFORMATION RELATING TO CARTEL

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Prince Albert): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources. During the course of the reply to the hon. member for York-Simcoe, he stated that there was no cover-up at all. When he said it, he did so with such forcefulness as to convince anyone that he was covering up.

I have before me the order in council which was passed last September, and I ask him: does he intend to bring in any measure to allow any person to disclose or communicate the contents thereof, which is the agreement entered into with the cartel? Does he intend to bring in such a law to permit the information being given?

Hon. Alastair Gillespie (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, if the right hon. gentleman is asking: are we proposing to introduce a law to replace the authority we have under the order in council, the answer is no.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, I should like to turn to the next one: He is required to do something under the law as provided in the order in council. He can do so only with the consent of the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources. Therefore, I ask him: does he intend to give that consent? After all, every source of information has been concealed by this order in council, unless he is prepared to say that he will consent to this being done or that a law will be introduced, and he has already denied that.

Mr. Gillespie: Mr. Speaker, if the right hon. gentleman were to reread the answer I gave on Friday of last week and the answers I gave today, he should recognize that we have under expeditious consideration at the present time the making public, the tabling, and the answering of the questions placed on the order paper by the hon. member for York-Simcoe.

An hon. Member: You sound like Richard Nixon.

Mr. Gillespie: The hon. member has listed a number of documents. We are looking into our files to see if we have any documents. In some cases, we may not have them.

An hon. Member: You have got them.

Mr. Gillespie: In cases where we may have them, we are examining them from the point of view of the confidentiality of those documents. We will make our determination just as soon as we possibly can.

Mr. Diefenbaker: I heard the hon. member's explanation the other day. It might as well have been in Sanskrit if one were to understand what he endeavoured to say. In all seriousness I ask him: what are you covering up? Why is this order in council in the form it is? I have looked over the records and there has not been one in all of Canada's history which I can find that denies Canadians in such a manner the right to have information on the question or to disclose what anyone may know concerning it.

I should also suggest to him that he read what took place in 1956 when the St. Laurent government endeavoured to cover everything up in a manner which was amateur compared to this and what happened to them.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

• (1450)

Mr. Gillespie: Mr. Speaker, as I recall, when the right hon. gentleman was Prime Minister one of the things that concerned him most of all was Canadian sovereignty. I think it might be useful to remind him of positions that he used to take to protect the Canadian interest when it comes to the extraterritorial reach of foreign laws.

ALLEGED URANIUM CARTEL—REQUEST FOR TABLING OF LETTER FROM DR. O. J. C. RUNNALLS IN SEPTEMBER, 1975

Mr. Walter Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, having regard to the expression used by the minister of wanting to "disclosure completely" to the House of Commons, I would call the minister's attention to the question asked by my colleague from Halton-Wentworth of the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. In referring to the letter which is referred to in notice of motion No. 118 on the order paper, which is the copy of the letter dated September, 1975 from Dr. O. J. C. Runnalls to Gulf Minerals Canada Limited, his colleague, a minister of the Crown, asked the hon. member to table his letter, which of course he cannot do. However, that letter is in the custody of the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources. Following the desire of the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs to have the letter tabled, would the minister make arrangements forthwith to table the letter referred to in motion No. 118 on the order paper?

Hon. Alastair Gillespie (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, I will be very pleased to look at it this afternoon to determine, first of all, whether that letter exists. Perhaps the hon. member would like to send me a copy so that I can determine to what it is that he is referring.

* * *

VETERANS AFFAIRS

REQUEST FOR INCREASE IN DISABILITY PENSION—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Jack Marshall (Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Veterans Affairs and I hope we can make more headway with him. The minister is aware of the discrepancy in the basic rate of pension under the Pension Act whereby disability pensioners are falling behind their counterparts in the public service classifications, resulting in loss of income to veterans of $536 annually. Can the minister now take this serious matter out of the "serious consideration" stage, show some action and give an indication whether or not he has been able to convince his cabinet colleagues that the legislation should be amended immediately to overcome this very serious discrepancy?

Hon. Daniel J. MacDonald (Minister of Veterans Affairs): Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member knows, this matter is under study by my department and we are aware of the discrepancy.

It will be brought before the government and I hope to have something to convey to the hon. member at a later date.

COMPENSATION FOR PRISONERS OF WAR—REQUEST FOR CHANGES

Mr. Jack Marshall (Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Turning to another glaring discrepancy having to do with the prisoners of war compensation act, the minister is well aware that there was an exclusion of first world war veterans who served as prisoners of war and escapees and evaders. These too were being discriminated against. In view of the fact that we have recalled parliament and the minister knows that we can get such an amendment to the act through in a couple of hours, would the minister prevail upon his House leader and bring these amendments in so that we can put them through and overcome these serious inequities which the government fail to realize?

Hon. Daniel J. MacDonald (Minister of Veterans Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the hon. member's question. We are also very ardently studying this and I expect to have something to offer before too long.

* * *

[*Translation*]

AIR TRANSPORT

INQUIRY WHETHER AIR SERVICES WILL BE REDUCED AT ÎLES-DE-LA-MADELEINE

Mr. Albert Béchard (Bonaventure-Îles-de-la-Madeleine): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Transport. Can the minister tell the House whether the policy of his department, specially with regard to subsidies, is inflexible to the point where they must be curtailed drastically in eastern Canada, particularly in isolated areas such as the Magdalen Islands which are not linked with the rest of the country for a considerable part of the year?

[*English*]

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, our policy attempts to look at all the needs of particular areas, but of course does so with very serious concern about the long-term financial implications.

* * *

TRANSPORT

PRAIRIE RAIL AUTHORITY—SUGGESTION DATE OF ESTABLISHMENT BE MOVED FORWARD

Mr. Les Benjamin (Regina-Lake Centre): Mr. Speaker, I have two questions for the Minister of Transport. In view of the welcome commitment that he gave to the western transport ministers to establish a prairie rail authority, and in view of the desire of those ministers and provinces that the Minister of Transport speed up the time frame, would the minister consider, upon securing the approval of his colleagues, moving the date for establishing a prairie rail authority forward from the fall of 1978 to the fall of 1977?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): First of all, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is perhaps being misled by one of his party from Saskatchewan who interpreted a statement of mine in my presence quite wrongly, and I immediately corrected him but obviously he persists in it. Our commitment was to give consideration to this whole issue. At this moment in time a great number of people in the west are very pleased with the formation of the prairie rail action committee and the deliberations we will have in connection with the problems, possibilities and powers of a prairie rail authority. I do not see those matters being solved so soon as the fall of this year, but certainly my objective is to have them solved as quickly as possible and then legislation will follow.

PROPOSED PLACING OF ORDERS FOR MATERIAL TO IMPROVE RAILWAY LINES

Mr. Les Benjamin (Regina-Lake Centre): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Regardless of whether the prairie rail authority is established this year, next year or not at all, whatever are the duties of the prairie rail action committees, in light of the fact that the minister and I and everybody else know that many hundred, in fact a few thousand, miles of railway track need to be rehabilitated and upgraded, would he in the meantime call upon the railroads and arrange whatever loans or capital funding is necessary to place orders for the manufacture of several hundred miles of steel rail and many millions of railway ties so as to deal with serious unemployment in the lumbering and steel industries, particularly in Cape Breton, and to start stocking materials which will be necessary a year or two down the road in rehabilitating those rail lines?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I presume the hon. member has noticed that this government has committed $100 million in the next year and a half or two construction seasons toward the rehabilitation program. This will indeed involve the construction of certain equipment like ballast cars and others and a good number of ties will be involved. It may not involve a great amount of rail in this particular program so much as the replacement and moving of rail from some sections to others. Development of this work has been going forward very well and we are right at the point of being able to see it beginning now, the agreements with the railways having come to a fairly final state by this point.

* * *

SEARCH AND RESCUE

REMOVAL OF WORD "RESCUE" FROM FUSELAGE OF AIRCRAFT

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of National Defence. Would the minister look into and report to me, in the event that the

House is not sitting tomorrow or the next day, regarding the order issued last week whereby the word "rescue" is being removed from the fuselage of aircraft of the search and rescue squadrons and being replaced by a new coloured configuration. The reason presumably is that a French equivalent cannot be painted on the side of the aircraft in characters large enough and of the same size so they can be seen as heretofore, although the word "rescue" has been an international symbol for 20 or 25 years, perhaps longer.

Hon. Barney Danson (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, I became aware of this situation a short time ago and I am looking into it. I understand the problem, and my colleagues and I think that we have found a quite appropriate French equivalent. I will be reporting back to the hon. member in due course.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. If the minister is at all worried about the international use of the English word "rescue", which is recognized the world over, perhaps he would look at the derivation of the word "Mayday", which has its origin in the French "M'aider". Therefore, one would be the equivalent of the other.

* * *

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

POWER OF PROVINCIAL CRIME INQUIRIES TO ISSUE SUBPOENAES VALID OUTSIDE PROVINCE—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Allan Lawrence (Northumberland-Durham): Mr. Speaker, may I direct my question to the Minister of Justice. It relates to the very admirable report filed some time ago by the Quebec crime inquiry which has as one of its most critical and important recommendations a request for federal legislation to enable provincial crime inquiries to issue subpoenaes which would be valid in provinces outside of the province of the royal commission. Are the minister and the government giving some consideration to the recommendation and if not, why not. If so, what is the decision of the government and of the minister?

● (1500)

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, the final report of the commission is being studied by my officials. I should like to note that when the final report came out, one of its principal recommendations was the immediate passage by parliament of the wiretap provisions in Bill C-51.

With regard to the extraprovincial subpoena power, we are considering that. We have made no decision. It could be accomplished in two ways, either at the federal level or by provincial agreement. I am examining further amendments to the Criminal Code for the coming session of parliament, and that will be one of the matters I will be considering.

POSSIBILITY OF EXTRADITING JOHN DOYLE AND HUBERT DUCHARME

Mr. Allan Lawrence (Northumberland-Durham): Mr. Speaker, another recommendation of that crime commission was that the federal authorities intensify their efforts to bring businessman John C. Doyle, well known to the minister and his party, and Hubert Ducharme before the courts to testify about storefront cases, even if this involved extradition. My question to the minister is along the same lines. What is he doing about that recommendation from the royal commission?

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, in terms of the federal court proceedings, they are in the nature of actions by the Department of National Revenue relating to assessments for income tax. They are being processed and proceeded with through the courts as expeditiously as possible.

With regard to extradition, it is believed that Mr. Doyle is currently in Panama. He is currently charged under the Criminal Code by the Attorney General of Newfoundland. There has been no request for his extradition made by the attorney general. I have discussed that with him and on the advice of his counsel he has not requested extradition on the basis that it is a very old treaty that we have with Panama and the prospects of any extradition hearing being successful are very slim indeed.

* * *

INCOME TAX

SUGGESTED SCRUTINY OF INCOMES OF WILLIE OBRUNT, MITCHELL BRONFMAN AND SOLLY LEVINE

Mr. Allan Lawrence (Northumberland-Durham): Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question is for the Minister of National Revenue. It is in respect of the report of the Quebec Crime Commission which recommended that the revenue departments of both the province of Quebec and the federal government once again scrutinize the incomes of prominent witnesses, such as Mr. Willie Obrunt, businessman Mitchell Bronfman and businessman Solly Levine. Are the minister and the government giving consideration to that request?

Hon. Monique Bégin (Minister of National Revenue): Mr. Speaker, we did not wait for the newspaper clippings to do our work. I would like to confirm to the House that the Department of National Revenue monitored the findings of the commission during its hearings and copies of the transcripts of all testimonies were immediately received by my officials and action was taken. However, I am in no position, because of the confidentiality clause of the Income Tax Act, to refer to any particular cases.

Mr. Baldwin: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Without prolonging the question period, I should like to point out that the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources left quite unclear in my mind, and in the minds of other hon. members, whether or not it was his intention to give consent to the release of the document referred to by my friend from

Grenville-Carleton. As it might be the last day of the session, and as this party might have to consider taking proceedings with regard to the alleged illegality under the Combines Investigation Act, I should like to know the position of the minister. Will we have his consent under order in council with respect to the particular document in question and other documents which are in our possession, to leave us free to take the criminal proceedings which we may be advised to do upon consultation with our counsel?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member seeks clarification by way of a point of order. It is a rather important and far-reaching point. It seems to me to be a direct extension of the question period. However, the minister may want to give a brief clarification.

Mr. Gillespie: Mr. Speaker, as to the legal implications of the hon. member's question, I want to seek advice from the law officers of the Crown. As to the precise question that was put to me by the hon. gentleman opposite, I would like to discuss with him precisely what he has in mind. Perhaps he and I might get together. We might be able to determine whether or not this particular piece of paper or document to which he has alluded might be made public.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL SERVICES CONTINUATION ACT

AIR TRAFFIC CONTROLLERS—MEASURE TO END STRIKE

Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of Labour) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-63, to provide for the continuation of air traffic control services.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps hon. members will understand that we can now commence to distribute copies of the bill.

When shall the bill be read the second time? By leave, now?

Mr. Peters: Mr. Speaker, this bill has just been presented. It is a serious bill. Although some of the contents of the bill are known, I suggest that we be given half an hour to examine it before the second reading debate commences.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I take it the suggestion is that second reading of the bill should be commenced later this day at a time to be agreed upon.

Mr. MacEachen: I rise on that point of order, Mr. Speaker. I understand there is agreement to giving the bill second reading. It would be agreeable to this side of the House to delay calling second reading of the bill for half an hour, as has been suggested by the hon. member. In the meantime, it would be my wish to call the two items standing under government notices of motions.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): That would be agreeable to us. It is not our wish in any way to delay action with respect to the bill just introduced dealing with air traffic controllers.

Mr. Speaker: Is there agreement to commencing second reading of the air traffic controllers bill at 3.45 this afternoon, and that in the interim the House should turn to other business as suggested by the President of the Privy Council?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

NOTICES OF MOTIONS

On the order: Government notices of motions:

August 4, 1977—The Minister of Finance:

That this House approves the canned tomato surtax order made by order in council P.C. 1977-335 dated 10th February, 1977, until the 30th day of June, 1978.

August 5, 1977—The Prime Minister:

That, in accordance with section 19 of an act respecting the status of the official languages of Canada, chapter 0-2, Revised Statutes of Canada, 1970, this House approves the appointment of Maxwell F. Yalden, Esquire, as Commissioner of Official Languages of Canada.

Mr. Speaker: Pursuant to section 2 of Standing Order 21, these government notices of motions stand transferred to and ordered for consideration under government orders later this day or at the next sitting of the House.

* * *

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, the following questions will be answered today: 3, 5, 7, 724, 1,375, 1,376, 1,377, 1,378, 1,379, 1,646, 1,810, 1,944, 2,295, 2,296, 2,297, 2,324, 2,328, 2,352, 2,353, 2,357, 2,374, 2,406, 2,412, 2,450, 2,759, 2,769, 2,770, 2,784, 2,793 and 2,878.

[*Text*]

PRIME MINISTER'S OFFICIAL RESIDENCE—BUDGET SINCE 1968

Question No. 3—**Mr. Cossitt:**

In each year since April 20, 1968, has a budget been set at the beginning of the year for renovations, alterations, construction, etc. along with purchases of new contents including antiques at the Prime Minister's official residence, 24 Sussex Drive, and (a) if so (i) what was the budget that was set (ii) what was the actual amount spent (b) if not, for what reasons?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): See reply to Question No. 6 answered this day.

ITEMS OF CANADIANA AT THE PRIME MINISTER'S RESIDENCE

Question No. 5—**Mr. Cossitt:**

With reference to the answer to Question No. 3,070 of the First Session of the 30th Parliament, what is a complete list of all items of Canadiana at the Prime Minister's residence, irrespective of date of purchase, and what is the estimated value in each case?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): See reply to Question No. 6 answered this day.

OFFICIAL RESIDENCE OF PRIME MINISTER

Question No. 6—**Mr. Cossitt:**

With reference to the answer to Question No. 2,792 of the First Session of the 30th Parliament which stated in part that "for practical reasons there must be some limit as to the detail provided in answer to questions relating to expenditures", what is a complete list and the cost, in each case, of all items over $100 in value purchased for the Prime Minister's official residence at 24 Sussex Drive during 1973-74 under the heading "supplies" totalling $89,196.53?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Since the beginning of the current session, many questions related to the Prime Minister's official residences have been placed on the Order Paper. It seems therefore appropriate to place at this time on the official record of the House of Commons some notes on measures taken by successive Parliaments to provide official residences to the holder of the office of Prime Minister of Canada. The decision of the Government of Canada to make arrangements for an official residence for Canada's Prime Minister goes back to 1949, when it was announced in the House of Commons on September 30, by the Right Hon. C. D. Howe, Minister of Trade and Commerce. In his statement, Mr. Howe, after mentioning that Canada was one of the few countries that did not have an official residence for its Prime Minister, referred to "the difficulty of a Prime Minister, coming to Ottawa for an uncertain tenure, in obtaining the type of house suitable to the high office he holds". The Government had therefore decided to ask Parliament to make it possible to renovate the Edwards property (now known as 24 Sussex Drive) by making provision for the cost of alterations, repairs and future maintenance, and that if there was no serious opposition to this program, the House would be asked, in the estimates for 1950, to provide the necessary funds for that purpose. Mr. George A. Drew, Leader of the Opposition, supported the Government's decision in the following terms: ". . . I feel sure the decision is one which will meet with the general approval of the members of this house and of citizens in every part of Canada. Members of parliament know—it may not be known generally throughout the rest of the country—the extent to which the Prime Minister of Canada is called upon to receive official visitors. Certain duties which are essential to that high office should be a part of the responsibility of the state. I am not in a position to give any opinion as to the particular residence mentioned. I wish to express our satisfaction that the Prime Minister will have the opportunity of carrying on his official duties and receiving official visitors in a manner more in keeping with Canada's present position in world affairs. . . It will assist the Prime Minister of Canada, not only in receiving those important visitors but in carrying out his own heavy personal duties, to have a permanent home, where, as the elected head of the government of Canada, he can discharge his reponsibilities in a manner that will be in keeping with the status of Canada in the world today".

The Parliamentary Leaders of both the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation and the Social Credit Party also expressed concurrence with the proposal. Mr. M. J. Coldwell said that he was glad that the Prime Minister was to be suitably housed, while Mr. Solon E. Low, after welcoming the announcement, added that the Government ". . . should consider also the question of furnishing adequate recompense for him by way of indemnity. The prime ministers of this country have been notoriously underpaid. Over the years they have been called upon to make sacrifices far beyond the measure of the services they have given to the country". It should be noted that prior to the announcement, a number of MP's among them the Member for Fort William, the Rev. Daniel McIvor, had suggested such a measure during the Address Debate. The following year, on June 7, 1950, the Government introduced the necessary legislation—"The Prime Minister's Residence Act"—which was passed the following day. The cost of renovation of the property, whether it might not have been more advisable to erect a new building, and other related matters, gave rise to debate. However, all parties supported the principle of the Bill. The consensus of the House can best be summarized by the following remarks of Mr. Coldwell. ". . . I think our country is doing the proper thing in conformity with what other countries have done in providing the first citizen of this country with a residence in which he may receive distinguished guests from at home and abroad".

Briefly, the Act provided that: (a) the Minister of Public Works would furnish, maintain heat and keep the building in repair: (b) the Federal District Commission would maintain the land and improve it as required; (c) the Governor in Council could appoint a steward or housekeeper and other employees deemed necessary for the management of the residence, and fix their rate of remuneration and conditions of employment; (d) the steward or housekeeper could from time to time engage casual employees to assist the regular staff; (e) the Prime Minister's chauffeur could be provided with lodging without charge; (f) moneys appropriated by Parliament for the operation of the residence could be used for the payment of the remuneration of the staff, for the purchase of food and other supplies required for the serving of food, for cleaning, laundering, and the ordinary maintenance of a residence and for defraying other costs of official hospitality provided by the Prime Minister; (g) the Prime Minister would pay to the Receiver General of Canada $5,000 yearly for food and lodging for himself and his family. The last provision was included at the personal insistence of the then Prime Minister, the Rt. Hon. Louis Stephen St. Laurent. Nine years after, on June 16, 1959, the Act was amended in order to bring within its scope the Harrington Lake (Lac Mousseau) Residence. Again as a

result of a consensus among all parties the Bill went through all stages in one day. In his opening remarks, its sponsor, the Hon. Howard C. Green, Minister of Public Works, referred to a question which Mr. H. W. Herridge of the CCF had asked a few weeks earlier in the following terms: ". . . In view of the general concern that the historic and beautiful Harrington Lake residence and property be preserved and used to the best advantage, will the government recognize this concern and interest by the introduction of legislation that will establish this property as an official government country residence for use by the Prime Minister, his distinguished guests and other appropriate persons?".

After mentioning that he had replied that legislation could be introduced during the current session "should it be the wish generally of hon. members that such a course be followed", Mr. Green went on to say that this proviso had been added ". . . because legislation of this kind is not the type that any government wishes to introduce, and in particular that no prime minister wishes to have introduced, unless members are agreed that such steps should be taken. I remember the reaction of Right Hon. Mr. St. Laurent when the Prime Minister's Residence Act was introduced originally, and it was just the same as the reaction of the present Prime Minister to this proposed amendment. These men, in a position of great responsibility, think of themselves last. If it were not the wish of the house generally to have the amendment which I am moving today passed, the government would not, of course, proceed with the measure. May I hasten to add that the other members of the cabinet—and I am sure the members of the last cabinet—feel very keenly that this measure is appropriate and, as a matter of fact, is badly needed in order to help ease the burdens of whoever may happen to be the prime minister of this nation."

It will be recalled that nine years earlier, in 1950, a group of citizens representing all parties and residents in all of the provinces had purchased a property called Stornoway located in the village of Rockcliffe Park as an official residence for the Leader of the Official Opposition as they felt that the holder of that office should be provided with a residence consistent with the meaning and dignity of his position. These citizens, and others who were added over the years, maintained the property until 1971 when the government introduced a Bill entitled an "Act to amend the Prime Minister's Residence Act", which provided among others for the transfer of Stornoway to the government at no cost and its maintenance in the future out of public funds as an official residence for the Leader of the Official Opposition. As stated by the sponsor of the Bill, the Hon. Allan J. MacEachen, President of the Privy Council, the trustees, whose Chairman was the Hon. Grattan O'Leary, having carried the cost and care of the administration of the property for 20 years had concluded that its ownership and administration should justly pass into the hands of the Government and, as Senator O'Leary had put it, "become a part of the parliamentary structure". The Bill also proposed to give statutory recognition to the occupation on a rent-free basis by the Speaker of the House of Commons of the building and associated grounds known as The Farm and located at Kingsmere, Quebec. Finally, in keeping with the recommendations of the Advisory Committee on Parliamentary Salaries and Expenses (Beaupré Report) it provided that neither the Prime Minister nor the Leader of the Official Opposition should be required to pay rent for publicly owned residences provided for their official use. There was however a stipulation that the financial outlay of $5,000 then payable by the Prime Minister on his residence would continue at that rate until the day after the following general election. Again, there was a large degree of support in the House for the Bill. Referring to the provisions regarding Stornoway, the spokesman for the Official Opposition noted that it underlined "the importance of the man who is the number one critic of those in power, and the number one contender for succession when the people's will is expressed in another way" and that "of all the variations of the democratic parliamentary system, the one whereby the Leader of the Opposition is made, in fact, an official part of the system is a fine move". As to the changes involving the Prime Minister's residence his comments were that they were long overdue. The spokesman for the New Democratic Party concurred in this view that the Prime Minister should not be asked to contribute $5,000 annually recalling that it had originally been included at the personal insistence of Mr. St. Laurent: ". . .A case can certainly be made for our not requiring that, for if we are going to provide the Prime Minister with a residence in which he can live and in which he must be one of the nation's hosts, it does seem proper that we take care of the cost of it. . ." ". . . However, I am interested in the fact that the proposal to discontinue the requirement that this $5,000 a year be paid by the Prime Minister does not come into effect until the end of this parliament. It comes into effect on the day of the general election following dissolution of the 28th Parliament. No one knows who will be the occupant of that house at that point, but at any rate here is a clear case of deciding that a certain monetary benefit to one of the members of this House shall not accrue to him until after the next election".

The Bill received Royal Assent on June 10, 1971. During the 26 years that have elapsed since the passage of the original legislation, the House, through the normal process of scrutiny and approval of estimates and asking of oral and written questions, has carefully watched the spending of public expenditures for official residences and did not hesitate to question some of them whenever it deemed it necessary. A study of the Official Report of the House of Commons Debates for that period, which extends over a quarter of a century, shows on the other hand that successive governments have not hesitated to provide information in reply to inquiries from Members. See for instance, among others, replies to questions No. 804, 2,598 and 2,601 of the first session of the 29th Parliament and No. 45, 86, 87, 88, and 89 of the second session; and No. 1,351, 1,666, 1,667, 1,668, 1,669, 2,307, 2,523, 2,790, 2,793, 2,794, 3,236, 3,471 and 5,203 of the first session, 30th Parliament. For the convenience of the Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Estimates, a table was prepared in May of last year

showing yearly expenditures for the official residences incurred since 1950 (Appendix "Q", issue No. 36. of the Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence of the Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Estimates). As to public expenditures for Stornoway and The Farm since passage in 1971 of the Official Residences Act, those of the Department of Public Works are as follows:

Fiscal Year	Speaker's Farm	Stornoway
1971-72	$ 2,571.64	$ 24,449.17
1972-73	23,671.91	48,328.96
1973-74	8,199.96	52,630.28
1974-75	8,464.53	25,051.46
1975-76	75,324.90	10,387.86
1976-77	23,000.00 (Est)	29,000.00 (Est)

As to the National Capital Commission the breakdown available is as follows:

Fiscal Year	Speaker's Farm	Stornoway
1973-74	$18,562	$ 9,555
1974-75	16,678	12,269
1975-76	22,500	17,318
1976-77	22,000 (Est)	17,000 (Est)

Should there be a general disposition within the parties represented in the House and within the public that the Official Residences Act should be repealed or substantially revised, then the Prime Minister would wish to consult with the Speaker and the Leader of the Official Opposition. If not, the Government proposes to answer current and future inquiries about the Prime Minister's official residences by reference to this statement and by suggesting that the Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Estimates be the proper forum for dealing with such questions.

COST OF FOOD AND DRINKS AT 24 SUSSEX DRIVE SINCE 1968

Question No. 7—**Mr. Cossitt:**

1. What has been the total cost to the taxpayer of all food and drink at 24 Sussex Drive from April 20, 1968 when the Prime Minister assumed office up to and including the last month for which figures are available?

2. Does the Prime Minister pay for any of the food or drink consumed by himself, members of his family or personal guests at 24 Sussex Drive and, if not (a) has he ever been officially advised of the practice in the United States concerning the payment for all food and drink consumed at the White House (b) how does he reconcile this with his statements on the subject of restraint and the necessity of cutting government expenditures?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): See reply to Question No. 6 tabled this day.

CONSULTANT CONTRACTS

Question No. 724—**Mr. Coates:**

1. Of the total number of persons who hold consultant contracts with the government, its agencies or Crown corporations, how many were candidates for the Liberal Party in either federal or provincial election campaigns in the past?

2. In each case, what is (a) their name (b) the amount of the contract (c) the period of time the contract has been in effect (d) the amount received to date in fees and expenses?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Requirements for awarding of contracts are merit, ability to conform to all requirements, costs and experience. Information on political affiliation and candidature for federal or provincial election are not criteria on which the contract is awarded.

RETENTION OF LAWYERS IN COUNTY OF LANARK FROM 1974 TO 1976

Question No. 1,375—**Mr. Dick:**

For the year (a) 1974 (b) 1975 (c) 1976, what law firms and/or lawyers in the County of Lanark, Ontario were (i) retained (ii) hired (iii) paid a fee for doing legal work on behalf of, or as agents for the government and, in each case, in what amount?

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Justice): In so far as the legal agents of the Minister of Justice are concerned: For the fiscal years 1973-74 and 1974-75, please see reply to Question 2,232, First Session, 30th Parliament, ordered July 18, 1975. For the fiscal year 1975-76 please see reply to Question 979, Second Session, 30th Parliament, ordered April 27, 1977. For the fiscal year 1976-77, from April 1, 1976 to December 16, 1976:

Name	Amount
Dixon, N. D.	$2,037.25
Willson, J. E.	3,150.44

RETENTION OF LAWYERS IN REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY OF OTTAWA-CARLETON FROM 1974 TO 1976

Question No. 1,376—**Mr. Dick:**

For the year (a) 1974 (b) 1975 (c) 1976, what law firms and/or lawyers in the Regional Municipality of Ottawa-Carleton were (i) retained (ii) hired (iii) paid a fee for doing legal work on behalf of, or as agents for the government and, in each case, in what amount?

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Justice): In so far as the legal agents of the Minister of Justice are concerned: For the fiscal years 1973-74 and 1974-75, please see reply to Question 2,232, First Session, 30th Parliament, ordered July 18, 1975. For the fiscal year 1975-76, please see reply to Question 979, Second Session, 30th Parliament, ordered April 27, 1977. For the fiscal year 1976-77, from April 1, 1976 to December 16, 1976:

Name	Amount
Barnes & Cannon	$ 318.50
Batt & Watt	1,282.24
Crane, Brian	17,376.80
Dent & Francis	617.75
Panet, A de L.	548.43
Roy, A.	2,742.00
Scott, David W.	3,884.98

Order Paper Questions

RETENTION OF LAWYERS IN COUNTY OF RENFREW FROM 1974 TO 1976

Question No. 1,377—**Mr. Dick:**

For the year (a) 1974 (b) 1975 (c) 1976, what law firms and/or lawyers in the County of Renfrew were (i) retained (ii) hired (iii) paid a fee for doing legal work on behalf of, or as agents for the government and, in each case, in what amount?

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Justice): In so far as the legal agents of the Minister of Justice are concerned: For the fiscal years 1973-74 and 1974-75, please see reply to Question 2,232, First Session, 30th Parliament, ordered July 18, 1975. For the fiscal year 1975-76, please see reply to Question 979, Second Session, 30th Parliament, ordered April 27, 1977. For the fiscal year 1976-77, from April 1, 1976 to December 16, 1976:

Name	Amount
Bradley, Henry J.	$1,791.10
Bradley & Millette	572.06
Cooke, G. B.	1,223.59
Dickinson, R. H.	249.00
Garreto, S. A.	509.75
McNabb, A. A.	3,062.60
Millette, E. R.	9,049.80

RETENTION OF LAWYERS IN COUNTY OF LEEDS FROM 1974 TO 1976

Question No. 1,378—**Mr. Dick:**

For the year (a) 1974 (b) 1975 (c) 1976, what law firms and/or lawyers in the County of Leeds were (i) retained (ii) hired (iii) paid a fee for doing legal work on behalf of, or as agents for the government and, in each case, in what amount?

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Justice): In so far as the legal agents of the Minister of Justice are concerned: For the fiscal years 1973-74 and 1974-75, please see reply to Question 2,232, First Session, 30th Parliament, ordered July 18, 1975. For the fiscal year 1975-76, please see reply to Question 979, Second Session, 30th Parliament, ordered April 27, 1977. For the fiscal year 1976-77, from April 1, 1976 to December 16, 1976:

Name	Amount
Hart, Hugh R.	$8,458.98
Henderson, Hart & Co.	1,544.25
Knotek, H. J.	*
Eastman, Gerald	1,242.50

* Work assigned during period in question but accounts have not yet been submitted.

RETENTION OF LAWYERS IN COUNTY OF GRENVILLE FROM 1974-76

Question No. 1,379—**Mr. Dick:**

For the year (a) 1974 (b) 1975 (c) 1976, what law firms and/or lawyers in the County of Grenville were (i) retained (ii) hired (iii) paid a fee for doing legal work on behalf of, or as agents for the government and, in each case, in what amount?

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Justice): In so far as the legal agents of the Minister of Justice are concerned: For the fiscal years 1973-74 and 1974-75, please see reply to Question 2,232, First Session, 30th Parliament, ordered July 18, 1975. For the fiscal year 1975-76, please see reply to Question 979, Second Session, 30th Parliament, ordered April 27, 1977. For the fiscal year 1976-77, from April 1, 1976 to December 16, 1976: Name: Tobin, R. M.—Amount: $1,706.49.

ASSISTANCE TO COMMUNITIES TO ASSIST IN YEAR ROUND SURFACE ACCESS

Question No. 1,646—**Mr. Marshall:**

Under the Transportation Policy "Access to and from remote areas" to assist communities that are without acceptable year round surface access, has the Government of Newfoundland submitted a proposal for funding under this programme and, if so, what is its status?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): The Province of Newfoundland has not submitted a proposal for funding of improvements in "Access to and from Remote Areas". Transport Canada will soon complete a tentative proposal for improvements in access to and from isolated communities for preliminary discussion with interested provinces through the medium of the Federal/Provincial Committees on Transportation.

ROADCRUISER SERVICE IN NEWFOUNDLAND

Question No. 1,810—**Mr. Crosbie:**

1. Did CNR increase the fares on the roadcruiser service in Newfoundland on or about June 28, 1976?

2. Did CNR file with the Board of Commissioners of Public Utilities of Newfoundland a single fare rate schedule and, if not, has CNR operated with increased bus fares that were not authorized by either the Board of Commissioners or by the Canadian Transport Commission?

3. Has legal advice been received by CNR or by the Department of Transport on the question of whether or not the increased bus fares were legal and valid and, if so, what is it?

4. Was the roadcruiser service in Newfoundland removed from the jurisdiction of the Board of Commissioners of Public Utilities by order of the Governor in Council and, if so, has CNR reduced the service in any way by eliminating certain bus runs or reducing the frequency of bus runs, or both and, if so, exactly what changes in service have occurred since July 13, 1976 and the end of January 1977?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): The Management of Canadian National Railways advises as follows: 1. Yes.

2 and 3. CNR informed the Board of Commissioners of Public Utilities of Newfoundland of its intention to implement such schedule. Previously that Board's issuance of a licence under the provincial Motor Carrier Act had been invalidated

by the Supreme Court of Canada, and therefore no authorized fare basis then existed. CNR subsequently complied with the requirements of the Canadian Transport Commission, including submission of its fare structure, and was duly licensed to operate the roadcruiser service.

4. Yes the roadcruiser service in Newfoundland was removed from the jurisdiction of the Board of Commissioners of Public Utilities by order of the Governor in Council. Yes the Railway has reduced its service, making the following changes between July 13, 1976 and January 31, 1977: Effective October 31, 1976 Runs 517, 518 daily between St. John's and Cornerbrook were dropped from the Schedule. Runs 511 and 512 which formerly operated daily between Grand Falls and Port aux Basques were changed to operate between Cornerbrook and Port aux Basques. Runs 509 and 510 which operated between St. John's and Grand Falls were replaced by Runs 519 and 520 between St John's and Grand Falls. Run 519 operates on approximately the same time schedule as former Run 509. Run 520 operates on approximately the same schedule as discontinued Run 518 between these two points.

REPORT ON SITUATION IN BRITISH COLUMBIA PENITENTIARY

Question No. 1,944—**Mr. O'Sullivan:**

1. Was there a report prepared in May 1976 by former Warden Tom Ellis on the situation in the British Columbia Penitentiary with specific suggestions in regard to the prevention of further difficulties in the Penitentiary and, if so (a) has any official notice been taken of the report and of its recommendations and what form did this official notice take (b) has any action been taken on these recommendations and, if so (i) what specific action (ii) under whose authorization?

2. Would the government consider referrring the report to the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs which has a special subcommittee studying the problems in Penitentiaries?

Hon. Francis Fox (Solicitor General): 1. Yes. (a) Official notice was taken of the report and its recommendations at the Regional and National levels of administration. (b) Yes; (i) Specific action was taken as follows: (A) The Team Concept was re-introduced and is now in operation; (B) Management is now holding regular meetings for all staff; (C) Institutional Standing Orders have been up-dated and published in sufficient numbers to meet staff requirements; (D) Commissioner's Directives and Divisional Instructions are being up-dated in keeping with institutional and staff requirements; (E) Institutional Contingency Plans have been up-dated and will be further revised to accommodate Team Concept Principles; (F) Some progress has been made in relieving supervisors of duties that can be performed by clerical staff. A further study of the total problem in this area is in progress; (G) Various supervisory courses have been developed and conducted at the local staff college emphasizing the supervisor's duties and responsibilities as spelled out in the Team Concept; (H) An effort to conduct refresher courses has been made with only limited success, due in large part to the lack of facilities and the availability of staff on a regularly scheduled basis; (I) A new Staff Training Officer is developing an organized approach to on-the-job-training. More progress is anticipated with the introduction of the Team Concept; and (J) The management of the institution is stressing the importance of adhering to the approved chain of command. (ii) The Commissioner and the Regional Director (Pacific Region) of the Penitentiary Service.

2. The recommendations contained in the report have been forwarded to the Chairman of the Sub-Committee on Penitentiaries of the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs.

JACQUES CARTIER TERMINAL, MONTREAL HARBOUR, AND PIER 55, QUEBEC HARBOUR

Question No. 2,295—**Mr. Forrestall:**

1. What is the government's best estimate of (a) tonnage to be handled at the Jacques Cartier Pier during each of the first three years of operation (b) total revenue to be obtained from the Pier by the NHB during the same years (c) return on investment or loss during the same years when all costs including interest and depreciation are considered?

2. What is the government's best estimate of (a) tonnage (b) revenue resulting from Pier 55 in Quebec City during the first three years of operation (c) return on investment or loss during the same years after all costs including depreciation and interest are considered?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): The National Harbours Board advises as follows: 1. The National Harbours Board is presently reviewing its forecast of container traffic for a possible public terminal in Montreal and reassessing the choice of the Jacques Cartier Terminal versus other possible sites within the Port of Montreal due to the following circumstances: (i) The decision to proceed with Jacques Cartier Terminal was approved by Treasury Board in June 1974. Since that time, container traffic patterns on the Atlantic Coast and in Montreal have changed due to various factors. (ii) Selection of a particular site and the existence of competing facilities within a port can influence the traffic patterns at a specific location.

2. National Harbours Board estimates (a) 3.2 million (b) $1.86 million (c) Return on investment of 11.7 per cent is projected over a twenty-year period although losses are expected during the initial three-year period.

NATIONAL HARBOURS BOARD BUDGET FOR HALIFAX

Question No. 2,296—**Mr. Forrestall:**

1. Did the National Harbours Board remove $10 million from the NHB budget for Halifax as proposed by the Halifax Port Authority for the commencement of construction of a container pier at Fairview Cove and, if so, what criteria were used to reach this decision?

2. Did Dr. S. Weyman agree with the removal of the $10 million?

3. In the best estimate of the government, what is the earliest practical completion date for a (a) one (b) two berth container facility at Fairview Cove?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): The National Harbours Board advises as follows: 1. The 1977 capital budget submitted by the Port of Halifax was amended by the National Harbours Board by deferring an amount of $10 million representing part of the construction costs of a container terminal at Fairview Cove. The amount was deferred for the following reasons: (a) Construction would not start during the year; (b) No agreement had been reached with the Province of

Nova Scotia; (c) The program had not been approved by Treasury Board; (d) Limited availability of loan funds due to budgetary constraints; (e) The Port of Halifax did not have any reserve funds.

2. Dr. S. H. Weyman is a member of the National Harbours Board and the results of individual votes on Board matters are not made public.

3. (a) The earliest possible completion date would be two and a half years after commencement of construction. (b) A two-berth facility could be completed in approximately three years after the start of construction.

REVENUE ACCRUING TO NATIONAL HARBOURS BOARD AT SAINT JOHN, HALIFAX, MONTREAL, QUEBEC AND TROIS-RIVIÈRES

Question No. 2,297—**Mr. Forrestall:**

1. What was the total revenue accruing to the National Harbours Board at (a) Saint John (b) Halifax (c) Montreal (d) Quebec City (e) Trois-Rivières in (i) 1970 (ii) 1971 (iii) 1972 (iv) 1973 (v) 1974 (vi) 1975 (vii) 1976, exclusive of revenues from the operation of bridges or grain elevators?

2. What volume of general cargo, containerized and non containerized, was shipped over the ports during the same years?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): The National Harbours Board advises as follows: 1.

Statement "A"

		(i) 1970	(ii) 1971	(iii) 1972	(iv) 1973	(v) 1974	(vi) 1975	(vii) 1976
(a)	Saint John	$ 1,569	$ 1,826	$ 2,372	$ 2,022	$ 2,353	$ 2,828	$ 3,862
(b)	Halifax	2,169	2,460	2,585	2,254	2,636	2,916	3,243
(c)	Montreal	11,918	13,247	11,126	9,909	9,770	9,904	11,147
(d)	Quebec City	3,325	3,901	3,753	4,103	3,981	3,524	4,563
(e)	Trois-Rivières	1,146	955	971	826	802	804	997

(Figures above in thousands ($000's))

2.

Statement "B"

	Containerized Cargo	Non-containerized Cargo	Total General Cargo
Saint John			
1970	89,811	1,318,159	1,407,970
1971	138,346	1,173,495	1,311,841
1972	342,673	1,376,095	1,718,768
1973	491,026	1,192,510	1,683,536
1974	450,824	1,470,869	1,921,693
1975	525,787	1,269,269	1,795,056
1976	1,069,398	1,386,936	2,456,334
Halifax			
1970	251,047	552,291	803,338
1971	695,712	544,471	1,240,183
1972	1,107,202	612,217	1,719,419
1973	1,310,955	530,016	1,840,971
1974	1,705,857	606,648	2,312,505
1975	1,384,436	669,042	2,053,478
1976	1,056,692	532,984	1,589,676
Montreal			
1970	907,132	3,613,052	4,520,184
1971	1,276,122	3,499,398	4,775,520
1972	1,248,833	2,306,526	3,555,359
1973	1,717,981	1,961,708	3,679,689
1974	1,774,008	2,262,967	4,036,975
1975	1,313,073	1,695,234	3,008,307
1976	1,700,811	1,768,944	3,469,755
Quebec			
1970	300,586	709,312	1,009,898
1971	602,649	690,139	1,292,788
1972	685,292	466,773	1,152,065
1973	850,335	249,520	1,099,855
1974	855,587	367,268	1,222,855
1975	500,543	159,020	659,563
1976	720,620	336,176	1,056,796
Trois-Rivières			
1970	—	498,414	498,414
1971	257	395,337	395,594
1972	1,640	328,311	329,951
1973	1,477	266,169	267,646
1974	695	234,769	235,464
1975	—	250,687	250,687
1976	324	280,669	280,993

[Mr. Lang.]

CMHC—RETENTION OF LAWYERS FOR HAMILTON AREA, 1972 TO 1976

Question No. 2,324—**Mr. O'Sullivan:**

What law firms in (a) Hamilton (b) Burlington (c) Stoney Creek (d) Grimsby (e) Oakville (f) Ancaster (g) Dundas, Ontario drew-up CMHC mortgages in (i) insured (ii) uninsured loans in 1972, 1973, 1974, 1975 and 1976 and, in each case, what were the amounts?

Hon. André Ouellet (Minister of State for Urban Affairs): I am advised by CMHC as follows: (i) The following lawyers were retained by CMHC to process mortgage documentation for direct loans approved under Sections 58 and 34.15 of the NHA, in the Counties of Halton and Wentworth, and the Township of Grimsby, in the years 1972-76.

Insured Loans			Number of Loans	Amount $000
1972			—	—
1973	Hamilton	N. Borkovitch	20	322
		Dino J. Tessaro	19	285
1974	Guelph	A. Braida	1	28
	Hamilton	S. Arthur Baldwin	10	321
		William J. Hubar	1	25
		Joseph Kostyk	150	4,772
		Milton J. Lewis	66	2,100
1975	Hamilton	John L. Agro, Q.C.	26	882
		N. Borkovitch	14	477
		G. William Dandie	69	2,165
		Thomas A. Hickey	150	5,160
		Dino J. Tessaro	140	4,702
1976	Hamilton	Gordon F. Morton	44	1,313
		Reno B. Violin	4	157

(ii) The following lawyers were retained by CMHC to process mortgage documentation for loans approved under Sections 15, 15.1, and 34.18 in Halton and Wentworth Counties and the Township of Grimsby in the years 1972-76.

Insured Loans			Number of Loans	Amount $000
1972	Burlington	Edward G. Ralfe	1	95
	Hamilton	Edward F. Cain, Q.C.	1	360
		Alan T. Marshal, Q.C.	1	76
1973	Oakville	Robert G. Lush	1	53
1974	Hamilton	Mary L. Dingle	1	49
		Robert B. Easterbrook	1	42
		John G. Langs, Q.C.	1	10,434
		Terence A. Whelan	1	31
1975	Burlington	William C. Hawken	1	47
	Hamilton	Thomas A. Beckett	1	121
		Robert B. Easterbrook	1	135
		William J. Luchak	1	957
		N. P. Mackesy	1	73
		C. D. McCallum, Q.C.	1	72
		N. J. Monti	1	815
		George Petrini	1	183
		Edward Tharen	1	7,189
		J. van der Woerd	2	1,759
		Norman F. Williams	1	90
		Nicholas J. Zaffiro, Q.C.	1	3,828
	Oakville	Frederick E. Leitch	1	172
1976	Hamilton	Thomas A. Beckett	4	597
		Anthony F. DeRubeis	1	814

Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation records of NHA activity are based on the geographical location of loans approved, and not on the place of business of law firms or of individuals.

CNR TOTAL REVENUE BY PROVINCE DURING PAST FISCAL YEAR

Question No. 2,328—**Mr. Lambert (Bellechasse):**

During CNR's past fiscal year, by province, what was (a) the revenue (i) from the transportation of passengers (ii) from the transportation of goods (iii) in total (b) the expenditures for the transportation of (i) passengers (ii) goods?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): The Management of Canadian National Railways advises as follows: Since the company does not maintain its records by provinces the information is not available in the form asked.

PORT PROMOTION

Question No. 2,352—**Mr. Forrestall:**

1. What amount was spent on port promotion (including salaries, travel, studies, receptions and advertising) during 1976 by the National Harbours Board and local port authorities at (a) Halifax (b) Saint John (c) Montreal?

2. Who are the current members of the (a) Port of Montreal Authority (b) Port of Saint John Authority (c) Port of Halifax Authority and, on what date was each last appointed/reappointed and for what term?

3. Does an executive council exist at each Port and, if so, on what date was it appointed and who are the members?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): The National Harbours Board advises as follows: 1. (a) $64,647; (b) $24,000; (c) $121,453.

2. (a) Roger O. Beauchemin; Aimé Désautels; Louis R. Desmarais; Yvon Lamarre; Jean-Marc St. Onge; Régis Trudeau; Richard Strauss; Ian C. Campbell; Joachim Carton; Arnold E. Masters: C. Pathy; J. L. Thom; J. P. Godin. (b) F. Gerald Elkin; A. David Case; Cecil E. Brownell; Philip W. Oland; T. C. Frink. (c) Gerald E. Simmons; F. M. Weston; D. A. Mosher; A. C. Huxtable; J. W. E. Mingo; F. H. Howard; P. C. Fralic. All members were reappointed for the period April 1 to December 31, 1977 or until establishment of a Port Commission if before that date.

3. An Executive Committee of the respective Port Authority was established as follows: Port of Montreal effective February 1, 1975: Roger O. Beauchemin; Ian C. Campbell. Port of Saint John effective May 19, 1977: F. Gerald Elkin; A. David Case; Cecil E. Brownell; Philip W. Oland; T. C. Frink. Port of Halifax effective April 14, 1977: Gerald E. Simmons; F. M. Weston; F. H. Howard.

DESTINATION OF CARGO AT PORTS OF MONTREAL, SAINT JOHN AND HALIFAX

Question No. 2,353—**Mr. Forrestall:**

For each year 1970 to 1976, what was the number of tons of general cargo loaded and unloaded at the Port of (a) Montreal (b) Saint John (c) Halifax destined for (i) Grenada (ii) St. Vincent (iii) St. Lucia (iv) Dominica (v) Antigua (vi) St. Kitts?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): The National Harbours Board advises as follows: The information requested is not readily available, and it would take an inordinate amount of clerical time and cost to search for and obtain this information.

NATIONAL HARBOURS BOARD—LEASES AT PORT OF MONTREAL

Question No. 2,357—**Mr. Forrestall:**

1. What are the names of the companies who currently have leases from the National Harbours Board on shedded and open areas at the Port of Montreal for periods in excess of two months' duration?

2. What facilities are leased by each company?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): The National Harbours Board advises as follows:

1. Name of Company	2. Facility Leased
Reliance Marine Terminals Ltd.	Shed B-1
Reliance Marine Terminals Ltd.	Shed B-2
Reliance Marine Terminals Ltd.	Shed B-3
Reliance Marine Terminals Ltd.	Shed B-4
Reliance Marine Terminals Ltd.	Shed B-5
Reliance Marine Terminals Ltd.	Shed B-6
Lapalme Transport Ltée	Shed 4—Upper
Daigle Lumber Ltée	Shed 4—Lower
Plateau Chrysler	Shed 6—Upper
Wolfe Stevedores (1968) Ltd.	Shed 7—Lower
Wolfe Stevedores (1968) Ltd.	Shed 9—Lower
Kenmont Terminals Ltd.	Shed 10—Lower
Arctec Canada Limited (Laboratory)	Shed 11—Upper

Order Paper Questions

1. Name of Company	2. Facility Leased
Lapalme Transport Ltée	Shed 13—Lower
McAllister Towing and Salvage Ltd.	Shed 22
Mount Royal Marine Repairs Ltd.	Shed 23
Wolfe Stevedores (1968) Limited	Shed 25—Lower
Chimo Shipping Limited	Shed 27
Coopérative de Transport Maritime	Shed 33
Logistec Corporation	Shed 35
Rail and Water Terminal (Quebec) Inc.	Shed 39
Brown and Ryan Limited	Shed 40
Saguenay Shipping Limited	Shed 41
Saguenay Shipping Limited	Shed 42
Rail and Water Terminal (Quebec) Inc.	Shed 46
Logistec Corporation	Shed 49
Logistec Corporation	Shed 50
Logistec Corporation	Shed 51
Logistec Corporation	Shed 52
Federal Marine Terminals Ltd.	Shed 59
Ceres Stevedoring Company	Shed 63
Ceres Stevedoring Company	Shed 64
Ceres Stevedoring Company	Shed 66 (Part)
Clarke Transportation Canada Ltd.	Shed 66 (Part)
Clarke Transportation Canada Ltd.	Shed 67
Clarke Transportation Canada Ltd.	Shed 68
Reliance Marine Terminals Ltd.	Berth B-7
Domtar Chemicals Ltd.	Berth B-8
Montreal Harbour Cruises "MISS OLYMPIA"	Berth 20
Excursions Maritimes "MISS MONTREAL"	Berth 21
Chimo Shipping Limited	Berth 28
Logistec Corporation	Berth 31
Logistec Corporation	Berth 36
Iron Ore Company of Canada Limited	Berth 37
Saguenay Shipping Limited	Berth 43
Iroquois Salt Products Limited	Berth 44
Rail and Water Terminal (Quebec) Inc.	Berth 45
Federal Marine Terminals Ltd.	Berths 57-58
Federal Marine Terminals Ltd.	Berths 60-61
Manchester Liners	Berth 70
St. Lawrence Stevedoring Company	Berth 71
Canadian Gypsum Company	Berth 72
Logistec Corporation	Berths 73-74
Task Terminals Ltd.	Berths 77-78-79

LEASES FOR FARM LAND ON FEDERAL AIRPORT PROPERTY

Question No. 2,374—**Mr. Schellenberger:**

1. What practices or policies are followed when permits or leases are granted for farm land on federal airport property?

2. Will the government consider restricting such leases to bona fide farmers who can meet certain standards such as machinery availability, nearness to locale and good farm management practices?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): 1. Agricultural land not required for current use is made available to the public by the public tender process.

2. No. The public tender process is considered to be the fairest way to make use of such land to its fullest potential. Therefore it would not be in the government's interest to limit the opportunity of a tender to any specific group or party.

CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION COVERAGE OF THE QUEBEC PROVINCIAL ELECTION

Question No. 2,406—**Mr. Roy:**

On the occasion of the Quebec provincial elections, on November 15, 1976, did the CBC invite people to attend, in its studios, the special election coverage and, if so (a) how many (b) on what basis were they selected (c) what were the travel and miscellaneous expenses incurred for the broadcast (d) what was the aim of this initiative?

Hon. John Roberts (Secretary of State): I am informed by the CBC as follows: Yes. (a) The CBC invited 80 persons to this programme but in fact only 73 came to the studios and participated in the election night coverage. (b) The CBC wanted the group chosen to be representative of the population, covering a wide range of persons according to age, sex, type of occupation, geographical distribution and, of course, interest in the political and social life of the community. In view of the size of the Montreal and Quebec regions, the CBC gave the task of choosing the guests for Montreal and the Eastern Townships to its Research Department, which used the services of an information gathering agency, l'Institut national de cueillette de l'information. At Quebec City, the job was done by a group specializing in this type of research. For the other regions of Quebec, the CBC asked its basis stations at Ottawa, Matane and Chicoutimi, as well as its affiliates at Rouyn, Trois-Rivières and Rivière-du-Loup to choose persons capable of reacting spontaneously, who met the above criteria as far as possible. (c) It has not been customary to require the CBC to supply such details of its internal management and administration as fees paid and expenses incurred to prepare its programs. The background to this custom is explained in detail in the reply to question No. 2,530, May 22, 1975. (d) The aim was to obtain public participation in the election coverage. Comments, often spontaneous, were obtained from this group as the results were announced. Those responsible for this program had previously seen an even larger operation of the same type on German TV, and the CBC thought it would be a good thing to have comments from members of the public themselves who were free to react as they pleased to the election results.

FEDERAL MONETARY POLICIES IN QUEBEC AND THE ATLANTIC PROVINCES

Question No. 2,412—**Mr. Howie:**

Is the government taking any new initiatives to ease the government's restrictive monetary policies in Quebec and the Atlantic Provinces and, if necessary, to reverse them in slow growth areas in Eastern Canada where tight money has an instant, lasting and disastrous effect?

Mr. Bob Kaplan (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Finance): The government does not have a restrictive monetary policy at the present time. Monetary policy is directed at achieving moderate growth consistent with continued progress in reducing the rate of inflation. As the rate of inflation has moderated, it has become possible to lower the bank rate, on four separate occasions since last November, to 7½ per cent where it now stands. These downward adjustments to the bank rate were necessary to push the growth of the money supply up towards the 8 to 12 per cent target range specified by the Governor of the Bank of Canada. In times of restrictive monetary policy, when money for loans is scarce, the Governor of the Bank of Canada has used moral suasion to encourage the chartered banks to have a special regard for the credit needs of the slower growth areas of the country. Nevertheless,

it is difficult to differentiate the stance of monetary policy in Quebec and the Atlantic Provinces from that in the rest of Canada. The Bank of Canada must operate in capital markets that are national in scope. If the Bank were to inject funds into Quebec and the Atlantic Provinces to lower interest rates in these regions, private funds would flow out of these regions seeking the higher interest rates in the rest of Canada. The outflow would continue until interest rates were comparable across Canada. Thus, the initial stimulus would be spread throughout the country and not retained in Quebec and the Atlantic Provinces where it was initially injected. Fiscal policy can be regionally differentiated much more satisfactorily than monetary policy. It has long been the practice of the government to distribute a significant portion of government expenditure on a basis which is favourable to higher than average unemployment areas. Some current examples of the government's use of regional differentiation of fiscal policy appear in our treatment of the investment tax credit and direct job creation in the March 31 Budget. The investment tax credit has been increased from 5 per cent to 10 per cent in the Atlantic Provinces, the Gaspé area and the Magdalen Islands; and to 7½ per cent in areas designated under the Regional Development Incentives Act in Saskatchewan, Manitoba, Northern Ontario and Quebec (other than the Gaspé Region). Of the $1.2 billion the government plans to spend on manpower programs in 1977-78, $458 million is committed to the direct employment strategy. As was stated in the last Budget, this strategy, which includes the Canada Works, Young Canada Works, and Local Initiatives Programs among others, is designed to have a greater impact in the higher unemployment areas of Canada. In addition to these two specific initiatives must be added the ongoing activities of the Departments of Regional Economic Expansion and of Industry, Trade and Commerce aimed toward improving the economic performance of regions experiencing comparatively high unemployment.

ORDER PAPER QUESTION NO. 3

Question No. 2,450—**Mr. Cossitt:**

Is the Prime Minister aware that Question No. 3, requesting information on budgeting at the Prime Minister's official residence, remains unanswered and will the Prime Minister take steps to expedite the answer and (a) if so, on what date can an answer be expected (b) if not, for what reason?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): The government takes responsibility for the answers it provides to questions and for the process involved in replying to such questions. It is not appropriate therefore to provide information about internal administrative arrangements.

MANIFESTATIONS OF FRANCOPHONES IN ANGLOPHONE COMMUNITIES FOR SEPARATE FRENCH SCHOOLS

Question No. 2,759—**Mr. Jones:**

1. Have any employees of the Department of the Secretary of State ever encouraged francophones in anglophone communities to agitate for separate French schools and, if so, what are the reasons and full details?

2. In each year 1970 to 1976, how many francophones have taken over positions in the Public Service formerly held by unilingual anglophones?

3. What effect has the government's implementation of bilingualism had on non-French speaking graduates to find employment in federal, provincial, municipal and business in Canada and, in particular, what effect have brochures distributed by the government had on employment opportunities for non-francophones?

Hon. John Roberts (Secretary of State): In so far as the Department of the Secretary of State is concerned: 1. No.

2. To be answered elsewhere.

3. The Secretary of State has not gathered data on these subjects and is, therefore, not in a position to answer this question.

In so far as the Public Service Commission is concerned: 1. To be answered elsewhere.

2. The information requested is not available from the records of the Public Service Commission.

3. To be answered elsewhere.

CBC FRENCH LANGUAGE TRANSMITTER AT PETERBOROUGH, ONTARIO

Question No. 2,769—**Mr. Matte:**

1. Did CBC construct a French language transmitter at/or near Peterborough, Ontario and, if so (a) is the station channel 44 (UHF) (b) what is the broadcasting power of channel 44 (c) on what date did construction commence and finish on the project (d) what was the approximate cost of construction (e) on what dates did broadcasting commence (f) what is the estimated radius that the broadcast signal will carry (g) is it possible for the signal of the transmitter to interfere with the broadcasting clarity of channel 29 Buffalo (UHF) and, if not, for what reason is that broadcasting signal interfered with?

2. Does CBC possess data, or has it or anyone acting on its behalf furnished surveyed figures showing (a) what the English/French population ratio is in the Peterborough channel 44 broadcasting area (b) what percentage of the population, whose mother tongue is French, speak (i) French (ii) English as their daily language?

3. What are the reasons justifying the establishment of a French television station at the expense of the taxpayer in a predominently English-speaking area?

4. Will the government discontinue other such projects in view of its announcement in the Throne Speech that certain bilingual costs be reduced?

5. Will channel 44, Peterborough cease transmitting and, if so, on what date?

6. What is the mailing address of channel 44, Peterborough?

Hon. John Roberts (Secretary of State): In so far as the Department of the Secretary of State is concerned: 1 to 3. To be answered elsewhere.

4. No.

5 to 6. To be answered elsewhere.

In so far as the CBC is concerned: 1. Yes, on the Simpson Hill Road between Cobourg and Peterborough. (a) Yes. (b) 4 kw from the transmitter. (c) Commenced approximately June 1976, completed approximately March 1977. (d) $835,000. (e) May 1, 1977. (f) The Grade "B" contour extends to a 28-mile radius. (g) CBC is not aware of any mechanism that would cuse interference with channel 29 and has heard of no complaints regarding interference caused by the CBC station.

2. Yes. (a) Mother tongue: English, 172,000; French, 2,300 (1971 Census). (b) According to language data in the 1971

Census, approximately 26 per cent of the people whose mother tongue is French use French "most frequently in the home". Census figures are not readily available showing the language used by the remainder or for "daily language" use, but it can be presumed that the majority of the remainder speak English "most frequently in the home".

3. The 1968 Broadcasting Act states that "all Canadians are entitled to broadcasting service in English and French as public funds become available" and requires that the national broadcasting service "be extended to all parts of Canada, as public funds become available".

4. To be answered elsewhere.

5. No.

6. CBC-TV Transmitter Site, P.O. Box 100, Cobourg, Ontario.

CBC FRENCH LANGUAGE TRANSMITTER AT TORONTO, ONT.

Question No. 2,770—**Mr. Matte:**

1. Did CBC construct a French language transmitter at/or near Toronto, Ontario and, if so (a) is the station channel 25 (UHF) (b) what is the broadcasting power of channel 25 (c) on what dates did construction commence and finish on the project (d) what was the approximate cost of construction (e) on what date did broadcasting commence (f) what is the estimated radius that the broadcast signal will carry (g) is it possible for the signal of the transmitter to interfere with the broadcasting clarity of channel 29 Buffalo (UHF) and, if not, for what reason is that broadcasting signal interfered with?

2. Does CBC possess data, or has it or anyone acting on its behalf furnished surveyed figures showing (a) what the English/French population ratio is in the Toronto channel 25 broadcasting area (b) what percentage of the population, whose mother tongue is French, speak (i) French (ii) English as their daily language?

3. What are the reasons justifying the establishment of a French television station at the expense of the taxpayer in a predominently English-speaking area?

4. Will the government discontinue other such projects in view of its announcement in the Throne Speech that certain bilingual costs be reduced?

5. Will channel 25, Toronto cease transmitting and, if so, on what date?

6. What is the mailing address of channel 25, Toronto?

Hon. John Roberts (Secretary of State): In so far as the Department of the Secretary of State is concerned: 1 to 3. To be answered elsewhere.

4. No.

5 to 6. To be answered elsewhere.

In so far as the CBC is concerned: 1. Yes, on the CN Tower in Toronto. (a) Yes. (b) 110 kW from the transmitter. (c) Commenced August 1975, will be completed July 1977. (d) $1,600,000. (e) May 31, 1976 (from original transmitter). (f) The Grade "B" contour will extend to a 58-mile average radius. (g) CBC is not aware of any mechanism that would cause interference to channel 29 and has heard of no complaints regarding interference caused by the CBC station.

2. Yes. (a) Mother tongue: English, 3,131,000; French, 81,800 (b) According to language data in the 1971 Census, approximately 50 per cent of the people whose mother tongue is French use French "most frequently in the home". Census figures are not readily available showing the language used by the remainder or for "daily language" use, but it can be presumed that the priority of the remainder speak English "most frequently in the home".

3. The 1968 Broadcasting Act states that "all Canadians are entitled to broadcasting service in English and French as public funds become available", and requires that the national broadcasting service "be extended to all parts of Canada as public funds become available".

4. To be answered elsewhere.

5. No.

6. CBC, Box 500, Terminal "A", Toronto, Ontario.

TRIPS OUTSIDE CANADA BY MR. W. TERON

Question No. 2,784—**Mr. Oberle:**

1. How many trips outside of Canada were made by Mr. W. Teron in (a) 1975 (b) 1976 (c) 1977 to date in his capacity as (i) Chairman of the Board of Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation (ii) Secretary of Urban Affairs and, in each case, what was its purpose and the cost to the taxpayer?

2. How many trips outside of Canada were made by Mrs. H. Carmanico in (a) 1975 (b) 1976 (c) 1977 to date in her capacity as secretary to Mr. W. Teron and, in each case, what was its purpose and the cost to the taxpayer?

Hon. André Ouellet (Minister of State for Urban Affairs): I am informed by Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation and the Ministry of State for Urban Affairs as follows: 1. (a), (b) and (c) Mr. W. Teron has not made any trips outside Canada in his capacity as Chairman of the Board to Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation in the years 1975, 1976 and 1977 to date. 1. (a), (b) (ii) Nil. 1. (c) (ii) One. Purposes: To accompany the Minister on a trip to Europe, the purposes of which were: 1. To meet ministers and key officials responsible for housing and urban affairs in each country visited. 2. To have a frank exchange of views on the housing and urban problems of each country visited. 3. To identify and discuss areas of common concern that could be pursued bilaterally or through key international organizations. 4. To discuss matters relating to Habitat follow-up. Cost: $2,177.

2. Mrs. H. Carmanico has not made any trips outside Canada in her capacity as Secretary to Mr. W. Teron in the years 1975, 1976 and 1977 to date.

MEMBERS OF NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL (NACMT)

Question No. 2,793—**Mr. Marshall:**

What are the names of the members of the (a) Executive Committee (b) Regional Committee, Newfoundland, of the National Advisory Council on Marine Training (NACMT)?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): As per following lists: (a) Members of the Executive Committee of the National Advisory Council on Marine Training (NACMT). (b) Members of the Newfoundland Regional Committee of the National Advisory Council on Marine Training (NACMT). National Advisory Council on Marine Training Executive Committee Members: W. O'Neil, Chairman, Transport Canada; R. Charron, Vice Chairman, Manpower & Immigration; C. R. Levelton, Fisheries & Environment; L.Cdr. P. T. Haydon, National Defence. Department of Education: H. P.

Timmons, Nova Scotia; W. B. Thompson, New Brunswick; P. P. Chaussé, Québec; R. B. Butler, Newfoundland, J. F. Newberry, British Columbia. Department of Labour: J. E. MacCallum, Prince Edward Island. Department of Fisheries: G. Saint Cyr, New Brunswick. Fisheries-Management: J. W. Mahon, Fisheries Assoc., Newfoundland & Labrador; P. Bangay, Fisheries Council of Canada; F. Gale, Fishing Vessel Owners Assoc. Fisheries—Labour: R. Cashin, NFLD Fishermen Food & Allied Workers Union; L. K. Abbott, CBRT & GW; P. Coté, L'Assoc. des Pêcheurs Unis du Québec; J. Corbett, Ontario Council of Commercial Fishermen. Shipping—Management: J. J. Burke,, Canadian Chamber of Shipping; H. R. Lake, Newfoundland Shipowners Assoc.; L. M. Bouvier, Dominion Marine Assoc.; R. J. Tingley, East Coast Marine and Ferry Service. Shipping—Labour: R. Gralewicz, Seafarers International Union; R. F. Cook, Canadian Merchant Service Guild; W. Doherty, Public Service Alliance of Canada. Advisors, Shipping—Management: Adm. R. W. Timbrell, Dominion Marine Assoc.; J. Hartford, Dominion Marine Assoc.; R. Gunston, Canadian Shipowners Assoc.; H. W. Plant, Coast Guard Colleges, Director. Regional Chairmen: Newfoundland: C. R. Barret, College of Fisheries, Navigation, Marine Engineering, and Electronics; Maritime: H. F. Muggah, Past Chairman (post now vacant), Council of Marine Premiers; Laurentian: R. Gaudreau, St. Lawrence Shipowners Assoc.; Central: E. W. Gordius, Ministry of Colleges and Universities; Western: R. Barry, Canadian Merchant Service Guild.

National Advisory Council on Marine Training Newfoundland Regional Committee members. Dr. R. Barrett, Chairman President College of Fisheries, Navigation, Marine Engineering and Electronics. Mr. B. Kenny, Secretary. Mr. J. Anderson, Regional Manager Ships & Safety, Canadian Coast Guard, Ministry of Transport. Mr. M. Barnes, Chief Industrial Development Branch, Fisheries and Environment Canada. Mr. R. Butler, Vice-President, College of Fisheries, Navigation, Marine Engineering and Electronics. Mr. P. Field, A/Manager, Manpower Training, Department of Manpower and Immigration. Mr. R. Lake, Director, Lake and Lake Limited. Mr. R. Langdon, Assistant Deputy Minister Department of Manpower and Industrial Relations. Mr. J. Mahon, Director Bonavista Cold Storage Company Limited. Mr. D. McKinnon (or Mr. W. Short), NFLD Fishermen Food & Allied Workers Union. Mr. L. Shirley, Director, Field Services Department of Fisheries. Mr. K. Singleton, Manpower Needs Economist Department of Manpower and Immigration.

LETTER DATED JUNE 15, 1971 FROM THE SOLICITOR GENERAL AT THAT TIME

Question No. 2,878—**Mr. Cossitt:**

1. Was the name of Maureen O'Nell, Walter Rudnicki, Joe MacDonald, Keith Carruthers, Marvin Lipman, Farrell Toombs, Sue Findlay, Peter Chesson, Terry Sulyma, Alison Black, Missy (Mary) Powell, Daphne Kelgard, Dave Crenna, Tom Phillbrook, Robert Rabinovitch, Hugh Armstrong, Pat Armstrong, David Hunter, Ken McKay, David MacGregor and Sharon Vance attached to a letter dated June 15, 1971 from the Solicitor General at that time, the hon. member for Dollard and, if so, for what reason?

2. Did the letter refer to "the concept of Extra Parliamentary Opposition" and that concerning such persons "their activities be watched with more than normal care"?

3. Which of the persons mentioned in Part 1 are (a) in the government's employ and, in each case (i) in which department (ii) at what salary (iii) what is his/her job designation (b) no longer in the government's employ and, in each case (i) on what date did he/she leave (ii) was he/she dismissed and, if so, for what reason (iii) did he/she leave voluntarily?

Hon. Francis Fox (Solicitor General): The matter to which the hon. member refers involves an exchange of private and classified correspondence between one Queen's Privy Councillor and several of his colleagues. As the hon. member will be aware, absolute privilege attaches to such correspondence when production is sought in legal proceedings. This is so by reason of subsection 41(2) of the Federal Court Act. Not to allow such privilege, except with the terms of archival production, would immediately render open all correspondence between Queen's Privy Councillors of this and previous governments. It has long been recognized that such a development is not in the public interest. In thus following both the law and tradition the Ministry of the Solicitor General is not prepared to comment further on either the nature or substance of the correspondence referred to.

* * *

[*English*]

● (1510)

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, if questions Nos. 6 and 1,338 could be made orders for return, these returns would be tabled immediately. Once again, the reason is the lengthy nature of the answer in each case.

Mr. Cossitt: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. It has to do with question No. 6 which the parliamentary secretary has requested be tabled rather than answered in the usual way so that it would appear in *Hansard*. This question has been on the order paper for at least seven or eight months; I am not sure of the exact time.

The question concerns the admission by the government that in a specific year it bought $89,000 worth of what were called supplies for the residence of the Prime Minister at 24 Sussex Drive. In my question I asked if we could have a list of those supplies valued at over $100, because I realize that no one wants to read small incidentals. The parliamentary secretary has said that the answer is lengthy. I do not doubt that it is, because in the past the Prime Minister has purchased a great many things. I expect the answer to be lengthy. But if $89,000 was spent on supplies only, I think the Canadian people have a right to know what they were. The answer should be inserted in *Hansard* in the usual way. If the answer is tabled, it becomes public only if someone takes the trouble to obtain a copy from the Privy Council office, which usually is not very likely.

I think the excuse that the answer is long is invalid in this case, because I think the Canadian people have a right to know what the $89,000 was for. Would the parliamentary secretary consider having this question answered in the usual way, or would he consider having it inserted as an appendix to *Hansard*?

Mr. Goodale: Mr. Speaker, answering such a question by tabling it is the usual way. If hon. members examine the record of proceedings in this session to see how orders for returns have been handled, I think they will find there has not in any way been any abuse of that method of answering questions. I invite hon. members to examine the record in this regard. In each case the reason for answering in that fashion has been the long and complicated nature of the answer.

In no way is there an attempt to hide or conceal information or to make that information relatively unavailable. As Your Honour knows, and as the hon. member for Leeds knows, such lengthy answers are tabled in the House. They are public documents, and at the proper time the House can debate such matters along with the estimates.

Mr. Cossitt: Would the Prime Minister agree to having this question answered in the usual way, rather than having it tabled?

Mr. Trudeau: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would agree to that, without saying whether it is the usual way. If the hon. member would like the answer in *Hansard*, I would like it there, and I hope it will be on the front page of every newspaper in the land.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. It has been requested that questions Nos. 6 and 1,388 be deemed to have been made orders for returns. That agreement is not forthcoming with respect to question No. 6. Is it the pleasure of the House that question No. 1,388 be deemed to be made an order for return, with the return being tabled forthwith?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: It is so ordered.

[*Text*]

OFFICIAL TRIPS MADE BY OFFICIALS OF STATISTICS CANADA

Question No. 1,388—**Mr. MacKay:**

1. (a) What official trips outside Canada were made by officials of Statistics Canada since April 1, 1972 (b) in each case, what was the name, rank and salary range of the official (c) in each case, what were the departure and return dates (d) in each case, what cities were visited and what was the purpose of each trip (e) in each case, what was the cost to the federal treasury (f) did any of the officials involved claim any annual leave with pay for days immediately preceding and/or immediately following such trips outside Canada and, if so, in each case, (i) what were the names of the officials (ii) what were the official trips involved (date of departure from Canada and destination (iii) how many days of annual leave with pay were claimed (iv) was the official involved accompanied by any relative and, if so, what was the relationship?

2. (a) What are the names, ranks and salary ranges of officials of Statistics Canada who since April 1, 1968 obtained educational leave (b) in each case, what were the dates of authorization, durations of such leaves, purposes of such leaves, the subject matters and the levels of study, the cost to the federal treasury?

3. (a) What are the names, ranks and salary ranges of officials of Statistics Canada who were chosen for the Career Assignment Program (CAP) since the inception of this programme (b) in each case, what were the dates of authorization and what is the present employment status (name of agency, salary range, rank) of each person involved?

4. How many employees of Statistics Canada filed statements concerning potential conflict of interest, during the months of June and July, 1974?

Return tabled.

[*English*]

Mr. Cossitt: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege. Just a moment ago the Prime Minister agreed that this answer should be inserted in *Hansard*. Would Your Honour clarify this, for the benefit of the House and for my own benefit? Are we now proceeding to put this answer into *Hansard*?

Mr. Speaker: A request has been made that the question be answered in the usual way. A request has been made by the parliamentary secretary that it be treated as an order for return. At the moment, agreement to do that is not forthcoming. Therefore, I refer hon. members to Standing Order 39(5). In the final analysis, the Chair must exercise some opinion with respect to the length of the answer and with respect to whether it is feasible to print it and make it part of *Hansard*. I have not seen the reply and I am not able to exercise any opinion in that regard. Therefore, perhaps I will be given time to examine it and at a later date decide whether to proceed in this way or not. Shall the remaining questions be allowed to stand?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

* * *

FINANCE

CANNED TOMATO SURTAX ORDER

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance) moved:

That this House approves the Canned Tomato Surtax Order made by order in council P.C. 1977-335 dated 10th February, 1977, until the 30th day of June, 1978.

He said: Mr. Speaker, there have been some discussions with the representatives of the parties and with the hon. member for Moncton, and I understand there is general agreement that it would be in the national interest to pass this motion at this time.

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to.

OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

APPOINTMENT OF COMMISSIONER OF OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

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

That, in accordance with section 19 of an act respecting the status of the official languages of Canada, chapter O-2, Revised Statutes of Canada, 1970, this House approves the appointment of Maxwell F. Yalden, Esquire, as Commissioner of Official Languages of Canada.

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Jones: On division.

Motion agreed to.

* * *

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Speaker, in accordance with the understanding reached earlier, and in view of the fact that both items standing under government notices of motions have now been adopted by the House, I should like to move the adjournment of the House until—

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Adjournment?

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps it might be simpler if I were to suggest to hon. members that we take a 25-minute break and resume at 3.45 this afternoon.

At 3.21 p.m. the sitting was suspended.

SITTING RESUMED

The House resumed at 3.45 p.m.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL SERVICES CONTINUATION ACT

AIR TRAFFIC CONTROLLERS—MEASURE TO END STRIKE

Mr. Munro (Hamilton East): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order to ask unanimous consent for the second reading motion to be amended so that it will provide for consideration of the bill to be conducted in committee of the whole.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The Standing Orders envisage that motions for the referral of a bill on second reading are to a standing committee of the House rather than to committee

of the whole. Is it in order, in the motion, to call for the bill to be referred to committee of the whole House?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Cossitt: Mr. Speaker, I, too, rise on a point of order. I understood from conversations conducted within the last half-hour that a statement would be made at 3.45 about question No. 6 concerning which there is some dispute. I hope the parliamentary secretary will say something about it.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member is absolutely right. During the recess I had the opportunity to examine the reply to question No. 6. In my opinion, it is feasible to print it. Would the parliamentary secretary prefer to include that question in the list of questions answered today, or deal with it as a document to be tabled and then printed as if tabled? It seems to me that it would be more expeditious to deal with it as an ordinarily answered question.

Mr. Goodale: Mr. Speaker, it is my intention to include it in the list I read earlier, if that is acceptable procedurally.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Question No. 6 will therefore be included in the list of questions answered earlier this day.

Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of Labour) moved that Bill C-63, to provide for the continuation of air traffic control services, be read the second time and referred to committee of the whole House.

He said: Mr. Speaker, it gives me no great pleasure to introduce this bill today. To ask parliament to approve a bill to end a legal strike is something which this government and which I, as Minister of Labour, do not welcome. Collective bargaining is part of our democratic way of life. It is the best system that has been devised for the voluntary regulation of the demands of employers and workers. It is not a perfect system, but in most situations it works, and it works well. Under collective bargaining, employers can anticipate with great certainty their labour costs and they can anticipate prolonged periods of labour peace. On the other hand, organized workers have been able to establish a fair return for their labour and they have improved their working conditions, largely as a result of their efforts at the bargaining table. Unorganized workers, to a considerable extent, have received improved wages and conditions that are influenced by improvements negotiated in the organized sector.

There has been considerable public comment of late about the incidence of strikes in this country. Canada's reputation in this regard has lately been greatly distorted, but the situation recently has improved greatly: strikes and lock-outs have not been resorted to frequently. Canada's record is not a record of numerous strikes and lock-outs, but of strikes and lock-outs which continue for a long period. Losses due to strikes and lock-outs in Canada this year are showing a sharp improvement over last year and recent years. I believe the anti-inflation program can be given much of the credit for this improvement.

Mr. Trudeau: Hear, hear!

Miss MacDonald: Even the minister laughs.

Mr. Munro (Hamilton East): The hon. member will not laugh when she hears the figures. In the first four months of this year man-day losses went down 63 per cent from the similar period in 1976. In percentage terms, strikes cost Canada 0.55 man-days for every 10,000 days worked during all of 1976—a higher percentage than in any year since 1919.

Mr. Stanfield: This is very interesting, but let us deal with the bill.

Mr. Munro (Hamilton East): For the first four months of this year, the loss in man-days was only 0.18 for every 10,000 days worked. In federal industries and in the federal public service man-day losses have been insignificant.

This government has recognized the importance of improving labour relations in this country. Last October, in the Speech from the Throne, improved labour relations was one of the three or four matters which we said deserved priority attention of parliament. The others included national unity and human rights. In the debate on the Speech from the Throne I summarized a 14-point program for improving our labour relations system. Since that time I have met with representatives of labour and industry to enlist their co-operation in putting some of these programs into effect. As the basis of many of these programs is our determination to find a better way to diminish the adversarial approach by employers and trade unions at the bargaining table and create a better environment in which collective bargaining can occur. This can be done if we move away from the confrontation that characterizes so many of our negotiations. We also want to improve working conditions, including health and safety, for all Canadian workers.

• (1550)

Mr. Speaker, in the situation which has caused you to call all members back to the House we have a strike by the Canadian Air Traffic Controllers Association against the government. CATCA called this strike because it saw no other way to resolve its differences with the government negotiators at the bargaining table.

We have to ask ourselves who is bearing the brunt of this action. We have to recognize the right to strike. With ad hoc legislation of this kind it is always a value judgment of any government of the day to weigh whether it should permit a strike to continue for a prolonged period of time or whether, in the circumstances, the interests of parties not party to the negotiations and not at the bargaining table should assume paramountcy in terms of responsibility of the government and parliament of the day. We believe that in terms of the judgment we are exercising, the interests of those not at the table are paramount and we should consider the interests of those Canadians injuriously affected by a prolongation of this strike.

We know there are many innocent third parties to this dispute. It falls on members of the travelling public who are caught by surprise and who will have great difficulty in changing their vacations and completing their travel plans while this strike continues. One estimate shows that 35,000 to 40,000 Canadians are travelling by air each day at this time of the year. This is a serious inconvenience when you consider not only these Canadians but the tens of thousands of others they were intending to meet at the end of their flight.

Second, the burden falls on others who are not at the bargaining table. It falls on the airlines, which last year experienced difficult business conditions and have been operating at a loss. Some estimates show the airlines could lose as much as $5 million to $6 million a day while the strike continues. This situation could have serious repercussions for all air carriers. Other airline employees are also affected. The ground crews which service the aircraft, the baggage handlers, and sales and reservation clerks, the airline crews—these workers are all covered by collective agreements and they are affected.

It is hard to think of a business or a town or city in Canada which is not affected by this work stoppage. Every hour of every day that this strike continues is causing severe inconvenience to the travelling public and interrupting business and industry with their hundreds and thousands of employees which depend on the delivery of goods by air.

It is not the purpose of this legislation to take away the right to strike from CATCA. But it is the purpose of this bill to end this strike as soon as possible. CATCA was given the right to strike from the day it was certified as an employee association more than ten years ago under the Public Service Staff Relations Acts. The government did not pre-empt the right to strike. This bill does not take away that right; rather, it is a value judgment for the reasons I have outlined. As one of the unions in the public service, CATCA has enjoyed the right to strike since 1967. But it must use the right wisely and responsibly. Like few other unions in the public sector or the private sector, it holds a juggernaut position in its industry. It is in a position to impose sanctions of the most severe kind on the whole country. When the air traffic controllers served notice last week that they would institute a series of rotating strikes, and later a total strike, they knew they were exerting a monopoly power which could bring a vital national industry to its knees.

I might very briefly refer to the history of this dispute. The essence of the dispute is the difference between the union and the employer over the money clause. The parties were assisted in their attempts to reach a settlement by a three-man conciliation board, one nominated by the union, one by the employer, and a chairman agreed on by the parties. All three members of the conciliation board concurred in recommending an 8 per cent increase in total compensation. This unanimous recommendation was made after giving due consideration to AIB guidelines.

It has been an accepted procedure in our attempts to reach a settlement in a dispute to go along with a conciliation board report. There is added justification when the board report on the major item at issue is unanimous, as this one in the air traffic controllers' dispute was. Hon. members will recall that

we proceeded to a settlement on the basis of Commissioner Perry's report in the west coast grain industry dispute, and on the basis of the report of Judge Gold, acting as a commissioner in the St. Lawrence River longshoring dispute.

Two major obstacles to a settlement relate to rates of pay before conversion and rates of pay resulting from conversion with respect to reclassification of jobs. The content of the revised classification standard has been essentially agreed to, although there is disagreement as to the slotting of some jobs within the new standard.

Dealing with the rates of pay before conversion, it is clear from the record that what Treasury Board negotiators agreed to was the maximum permissible level under the guidelines in terms of 8 per cent total compensation. On the rates of pay applicable after conversion, that is, the cost of conversion, CATCA says the cost is to be excluded from the application of the AIB guidelines. The employer says it must be included in the guidelines allowable. This is consistent with AIB guidelines. In essence, CATCA demanded an increase of more than 12.6 per cent, when the guidelines would allow a maximum of 8 per cent.

If the employer were to capitulate to the CATCA demand in the face of a strike threat, or now an existing strike, the government would be condoning a settlement in excess of the AIB guidelines. Such a solution is clearly unacceptable. The government could then be accused, with justification, of asking for restraint from business and labour in the private sector and not practising restraint in negotiations with its own employees.

● (1600)

The government could allow the strike, now that it has been called, to run its course. That is one alternative. This might be seen by some as being compatible with free collective bargaining. But should the strike last for a considerable period, or even for a few more days, the public would be held for ransom and the airlines subjected to punishing damage. The government, then, has introduced this bill to end a dispute which can only, unfortunately, go from bad to worse, by requiring the air traffic controllers to return to work immediately.

It is with great reluctance that we have called upon Your Honour to bring back the House to deal with this emergency bill, but it is the view of the government that it is in the national interest that parliament should give this measure its unanimous approval.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. John A. Fraser (Vancouver South): Mr. Speaker, I want to say first of all, through you, to all members of the House and to the government that this party is prepared to support the intent of the legislation and address itself to the most vital issue before us today, which is the need for the resumption of air traffic in Canada.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Fraser: I say this because we are acutely aware of the damage, inconvenience and unfair effects of a strike like this upon innocent members of the public. But we are also aware that this is a strike which ought never to have taken place. Indeed, it would never have taken place if the Minister of Transport (Mr. Lang) had conducted the negotiations on some other basis than bullying, confrontation and sheer stubbornness.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Fraser: It is all very well for hon. members and for people in the media and in other places to decide that because a strike has now occurred, all the blame lies with the union. I do not even think the Minister of Labour (Mr. Munro) would go that far. But that suggestion lies under the surface in this chamber and in other places. The fact is, the blame does not all lie with the union.

For many years the government has constantly talked about the right to strike, yet has consistently refused to act in accordance with our insistence that some mechanism be provided to do two things—to deal with those areas which involve essential services and where the government knows it will bring in legislation to end a strike in any event, and other cases where a strike might not begin as an "essential service" strike but the ultimate effect of which upon the economy might be such as to justify its conclusion, in the public interest.

The Minister of Labour says, "Don't take away the right to strike; don't have compulsory arbitration", and so on. There is nothing more compulsory than that which is being done here today. The Minister of Labour gave us all the reasons why this lawful strike should not be taking place. Then he says, "This does not mean we do not think the right to strike should exist in this particular area". He cannot have it both ways. The Minister of Labour is trying to say, "Don't, whatever you do, think we would restrain the right to strike under any circumstances at all except those circumstances under which we think it should not be exercised".

If we are to find a way by which in certain areas the country is not, to quote the minister's words, to be held up to ransom, we must find a way to deal with situations such as this. If Your Honour would read the speeches I have made on various occasions on behalf of my party when strikes have been settled by legislation, you would find I have repeatedly urged the government to devise a mechanism which would solve this difficulty. What happened to the Woods report? The minister will no doubt say that the Woods report was handed down a long time ago. It certainly was. But it did deal with this problem, and whatever the defects in its recommendations may have been, it certainly recognized the nature of the difficulty we face.

The minister began by seeking the general sympathy of the nation by describing the inconvenience, familiar to everyone, which a lot of people are suffering. Then he tried to persuade us, by strange logic, that it did not matter because the collective bargaining system was working in cases of this kind. It is too laughable for words. Nothing will be done, Mr.

Speaker, until the Minister of Labour and others on the government side admit that in certain cases the right to strike, though it may be *de jure*, is not *de facto*. Hon. members opposite know this to be a true statement of the position. It was said during the railway strike some years ago by the negotiators for the railway unions that the right to strike was a myth, that it existed only provided it was not used or was ineffective.

What has happened in this case? Under the Public Service Staff Relations Act, CATCA elected to take the conciliation strike route which was laid out by the government in legislation years ago. What has the Minister of Transport done? He has said to CATCA, "I intend to make up my mind as to what you should get, and if you don't agree with me I shall legislate what I think you should get and legislate you back to work if you go on strike". Where is the arbitrator in all this, the other side of the public service staff relations procedure? Mr. Speaker, if a union does not wish to take the strike route, it chooses the arbitration route and accepts binding arbitration.

What the government has done is this: it set up legislation and told the union it could take its choice. The strike route was chosen. Then the government told them it was not acceptable and declined even to substitute an arbitrator. The arbitrator is the Minister of Transport, with his notion of what the settlement ought to be. I ask you, Mr. Speaker, what would you do if this were not a public service union? What would you do if it were a union which came under the federal government, under the Canada Labour Code, and got into difficulties. Suppose it were the CNR or a public owned railway such as the CNR which came to parliament and said, "Our fellows will not settle on anything reasonable. We have our own views as to what the settlement should be, and we want the House of Commons to legislate them back to work on terms agreeable to us". Would that be fair? Would this House accept such a proposal? No. Yet this is what has happened today.

We agree that the strike should not have taken place, but we say a good deal of the blame for it lies right over there in the seat of the Minister of Transport.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Fraser: Lest hon. members think I am being too hard on the hon. gentleman—

Mr. Lang: You do not even get one fact right.

Mr. Fraser: The fact that I have got right is that there is no way of getting to the Minister of Transport. Logic does not do it; facts will not do it. The minister said to CATCA, "We have a disagreement here as to what the level of compensation should be". So what did he suggest to them? "If you put your 12.6 per cent up in the agreement, we will put our 7.4 per cent up in the same agreement and put it before the Anti-Inflation Board and let them take their choice." Mr. Speaker, the board is not there to act as an arbitrator, but as the determinator of its own rules and guidelines. The minister said, " If the AIB agrees to 12.6 per cent, I will accept it." This is the kind of talk which was going on before the strike.

There is another matter which has to be considered. If the Minister of Transport intended to take the step of seeking the legislation which the Minister of Labour has brought down, why was the bill not brought down last week? Why was it delayed? The point is this: we have said for years that this kind of situation has to be faced openly and frankly by members of this House. I do not have to tell anyone that the public will not put up with it any longer. That is why the legislation has come in, and the Minister of Labour is aware of that.

• (1610)

Mr. Stanfield: He is not interfering with the right to strike.

Mr. Fraser: Not at all. He is just eliminating it, and he is not even substituting arbitration. How much longer do we have to contend with the Minister of Labour making the same speech? It is not difficult for him to make his speech, because it has a familiar ring to it. We have all heard it before. It is all down in *Hansard*.

Mr. Munro (Hamilton East): Not that often.

Mr. Fraser: We will see about that. Just before the election in 1972—

Mr. Munro (Hamilton East): That was five years ago.

Mr. Fraser: That is right. It occurred in 1973, once again. Following that there was the grain handlers' strike and the legislation which was introduced. In 1975 there was the longshoremens' legislation. Then there was the Halifax settlement, others—

Mr. Gillies: Once a year.

Mr. Fraser: Yet the Minister of Labour sits in his place and says, "Not that often".

Mr. Munro (Hamilton East): Once a year.

Mr. Fraser: It is always the same thing.

Mr. Stanfield: Set a record.

Mr. Fraser: The hon. minister does not have to get new speechwriters; he can merely pick up an old speech. But it does not sound any better today than it did in the past. The Minister of Labour said there were fewer strikes in Canada today, based on statistics. This is a fact most of us are aware of and are pleased about. But those statistics do not relate to this kind of difficulty. The difficulty has to be faced squarely. It has been almost ludicrous to watch the government party over the last number of days completely divide on what its position really is.

An hon. Member: Horizontal.

Mr. Fraser: I am referring to its position in respect of the entire labour relations problem. The Minister of Transport got out in full flight—which he has done before at public expense—over the weekend, putting forth his utterances as to

how the world should unfold. The right hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) made short work of those utterances today. If one can allude to a rug or a flying carpet being under the hon. Minister of Transport, it was pulled out from under him.

An hon. Member: We hope so.

Mr. Fraser: The Prime Minister made it quite clear that he was not going along with anything the Minister of Transport said or was reported as having said. There were things he did not remember saying, but someone finally got them down straight and he remembered saying them. As recently as yesterday the Minister of Labour made it clear that he did not want anyone to think he agreed with the Minister of Transport.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Very convenient.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: I read that in the paper this morning.

Mr. Paproski: Even Horner could have done a better job.

Mr. Fraser: I am not suggesting that everything about labour relations in Europe is necessarily better or applicable in this country. I would be the last person to suggest—and the Minister of Labour is aware of this—that you can take situations which happen in other countries and transplant them into our milieu. But in a number of countries, air traffic controllers are operating basically within the same technical range of problems, with the same basic sophistication of equipment and the same responsibility. However, their record of continuance of service is amazingly better than in this country. I am referring to nations such as the United States, Great Britain, West Germany, France, Sweden, Holland, Belgium and others.

Is it beyond the measure of this House to suggest we find out why it works elsewhere, and not here? Is it beyond the measure of this House to put aside the rhetoric of the right to strike and decide to figure out proper settlements, fair settlements, settlements which will confirm an even number of highly qualified people to serve the public, without always getting into a confrontation and strike action? What will happen at the end of December of this year? The whole thing will start again.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: At the same time as a mail strike.

Mr. Fraser: We may well have another strike, and we will receive the same speech from the Minister of Labour.

Mr. Paproski: Use pony express.

Mr. Fraser: The bill before us has been changed in one substantive area, which is that clause 6 has been deleted because of discussions between myself, on behalf of this party, and the Minister of Labour. The Minister of Transport put those clauses in and he would have had us say to this particular union, "If you break the law we will increase the penalties against you. We will amend the Public Service Staff Relations Act to apply against your union and take away the provision whereby you have to go before the Public Service Staff Relations Board for consent to prosecute".

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): That was Otto's idea.

Mr. Fraser: What kind of discrimination is that? Has the Minister of Transport an ongoing war with CATCA? Is he suggesting that one sector of the public service ought to be treated differently from others? Good sense prevailed, and the clause is not there now.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Otto Lang lost another one.

Mr. Fraser: I compliment the Minister of Labour for that. There is a clause we cannot support in its present form. I am referring to clause 5(4) which indicates that the schedule of remuneration as determined by the Minister of Transport will be the schedule of remuneration unless notice is given and the Public Service Staff Relations Board provides an arbitrator to vary any one of those particular payments or rates of income. That is, provided it does not exceed, in the aggregate, what the Minister of Transport thinks the Anti-Inflation Board rules are.

In the last 18 months there have been ten cases of agreements reached between the government and public service unions. In eight of those ten cases, for different reasons the Anti-Inflation Board accepted a level of compensation higher than that which the government had been insisting upon in negotiations. It is not something which has never happened before, as the Minister of Transport indicates. This form of legislation, where the Minister of Transport will say, "This will be your settlement, and that is the end of it", is completely wrong. If it is necessary to legislate back-to-work legislation, that is completely the wrong way of doing it.

An hon. Member: Right on.

Mr. Fraser: We have said repeatedly that the correct procedure is to order people back to work and then put the issue before arbitration in order for the matter of compensation and terms to be argued.

Mr. Munro (Hamilton East): It is not Otto; it is the unanimous reports of conciliators.

Mr. Fraser: I hear the Minister of Labour referring to unanimous reports of conciliators. He referred to a report on the west coast where there was one conciliator. It was unanimous, but the employers did not agree with it. The minister should refer to the Gold report concerning the three-port strike on the river. We approved of that, but we said then that it was a dangerous precedent. It is a dangerous precedent today because if working people in this country are going to accept a settlement, then we cannot impose it upon them; it must go to a tribunal independent of this chamber.

● (1620)

There is another reason, Mr. Speaker. Hon. members are not prepared and trained, and do not have the necessary

knowledge, to deal with the complexities of actually negotiating a settlement. That point has been accepted by all hon. members. Yet this piece of legislation flies in the teeth of that belief. The proper thing to do under these circumstances is to amend the legislation so that CATCA is ordered back to work on the basis of the new schedule I as set out by the minister, which I am informed they will accept, with the right to go to arbitration to resolve the other issues. They will then accept the arbitrator's decision. That is the proper and fair way to handle the matter. We will be moving a motion to that effect this afternoon.

I want to emphasize that this party supports the objective of the legislation. The matter before the House is, first and foremost, the resumption of air traffic in this country. This party is prepared, subject to the amendments I have suggested—which need not take a great deal of time—to support this legislation; and whether or not we are successful in our amendments, we will support the legislation in the interest of resuming air traffic in Canada.

Mr. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby): Mr. Speaker, the government, these masters of mendacity, have done it again. The Minister of Labour (Mr. Munro) opened the debate, and in my notes I have a series of observations to the effect that this is bad legislation connected to an unnecessary strike produced by an incompetent government. I will add another little phrase, "not only an incompetent, but a dishonest government".

I listened with very great interest to the minister's opening remarks and I was particularly touched by his moving description of the relative improvement in strike situations in Canada. I think he said that we had a 67 per cent improvement—

Mr. Fraser: Sixty-three per cent.

Mr. Broadbent: Yes, a 63 per cent improvement in terms of reduced strikes. Obviously, the minister did not make any direct connection with the controls program, with the fact that it did not make much sense for workers to go on strike, if they contravened the law of Canada. Being law-abiding citizens, most workers do not do that sort of thing. I would have thought there was some connection between that improvement and the controls program, which some people have, not inappropriately, described as fascism with a human face. If the minister is really concerned about the record of labour in Canada this year, he would have been more concerned with another statistic which the government has produced, to the effect that some two billion man-hours have been lost because of unemployment. That is the record of the government so far in 1977.

Let me come to the point about mendacity. The minister got to his feet and said that it moved him to tears almost to bring in such legislation, because workers in this great, free society do have the right to strike. I do agree that at some point, even when there is a right to strike, a government which is responsible has to move in and say that in the public good this right has to be sacrificed. I do not think there is a contradiction there. In a free society you often have conflicts in rights, liberties and obligations and you have to choose. But it is a phony argument to give the right to strike to a group of workers and then to tell them, before they even act upon the right to strike, that the government will bring in legislation. That, to me, is hypocritical. You cannot have that argument. I agree with the Conservative party on this: logically, you cannot have it both ways. If you give the right to strike to a particular sector, then the workers must exercise that right, if it is to mean anything at all. That is my first point.

More significantly, Mr. Speaker, the minister said that a conciliation board report was made. He said that the conciliation board made a unanimous recommendation which the government was acting on. Implicitly, the minister said, "Therefore, how can any reasonable person not accept this conciliation board report presented by representatives of labour as well as 'the bad guys'"? I wondered what the minister was talking about, so I checked. As the minister knows very well, the reclassification issue, which is the essence of this strike, was beyond the terms of reference of the conciliation board. The minister knows full well that when the conciliation board recommended solutions to the government and the union, it said in its report that the reclassification issue was something that the government had to work out with the union.

Did the minister tell the House that the conciliation board had looked at the 8 per cent package and had made a unanimous recommendation? Did he say that they had examined the issue which this strike is all about? He did not tell us that at all. He deliberately tried to leave the impression with the House and with the people of Canada that the union involved was going against a conciliation board report that was unanimous. In that respect I say he misled the House and he was trying to mislead the people of Canada.

● (1630)

I want to come to what I think the strike is all about. I say at the outset that if you look at the half-dozen pieces of back-to-work legislation which have been brought before the House of Commons, you will see that my party has supported more than half of them. We have not taken the position, under all the circumstances, that the right to strike is sacred and can never be sacrificed at all. That is not the case. Sometimes, as I said at the outset, the public interest will require a shift and will require that some rights be traded-off against others. But what we object to, and why we are opposed to this bill—and not only state our opposition, as have the Conservatives, but will vote against it unless there is some change—is that the government produced this strike It was not CATCA. It was not a group of working people in Canada who produced this strike. The government of Canada and the Minister of Transport (Mr. Lang) are responsible.

The reason I reached this conclusion is that there is one point of substance that distinguishes the position of the government from that of the union. The point of substance concerns reclassification. As we all know from public statements made

by Treasury Board officials, by ministers, by the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) himself, and from private conversations I have had in the past 24 hours with the ministers and with the Prime Minister, the issue revolves around two different approaches. The government has said that they will not go beyond the 8 per cent. Their analysis of CATCA's proposals, their reading of the ideas presented by the union, was that by including the reclassification proposal of CATCA, the guidelines of the AIB would be broken; therefore, they would not go beyond 8 per cent.

I say that the government can make at least a reasonable case for its interpretation; I agree with that. What the union has said is that if you look at the regulations which flow from the AIB, you can make a good case for saying that in addition to the 8 per cent there is roughly another 4.5 per cent to which the workers are entitled because of the reclassification that has been accepted by the government.

I want to get back to the cause of the strike. For once, I share the Prime Minister's view of the media. I say to those ladies and gentleman in the press gallery, "You have some obligation for once to convey the honest and accurate position of a group of workers in Canada to the people of Canada, so that they will understand that this government is responsible for the strike".

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Broadbent: What the union has said is, "Don't accept our position as a condition of agreement for keeping the planes flying. Simply submit our submission to the AIB for decision, and we will abide by it". They said, "We will not go out on strike if you give us a contract which says we will receive 8 per cent now, and beyond the 8 per cent the AIB make a decision. We think we are justified in getting that". The union can point to letters which go back over two years when the government indicated they favoured investigating reclassification, and they can point to all kinds of data to support their case. All they are saying is, "Don't accept our position; but you, the government, could have the honesty and decency to put the package to the AIB. We will abide by the results, and we will not go out on strike if you do that".

What did the government do? Hypocritically, I think, they tried to have it both ways. They said, "All right; we will submit the two approaches to the AIB, the 8 per cent with which we agree and the 12.5 per cent with which we do not agree, and we will accept the recommendations of AIB". As recently as yesterday—I quote verbatim what the Prime Minister said at the press conference with reference to CATCA—the Prime Minister said:

> CATCA rejected the possibility of signing within the guidelines as we see them and as we think AIB will see them, with the possibility that if AIB says more would be possible, they would get more.

The Prime Minister is saying that the government would accept the 12 per cent if the AIB so ruled. I ask, why were they so hypocritical in their approach, or at least not serious in their bargaining with the CATCA people, when they said, "Submit the two approaches to AIB"? What the government is saying to the union is that the AIB should become the arbitration board, which it is not. It is a misuse of the AIB to follow that approach.

Second, from the union's point of view they were saying to the workers in Canada, "Why don't you submit this bargaining item to the AIB and hope that they will choose the richer package?" They are saying that if the two are submitted, the AIB may come down and choose the richer. Surely at this point in our history, when Canadians are so concerned about inflation and unemployment, it was reasonable for the union to say that it did not make sense for them to submit a richer and a poorer package because, quite plausibly, it is more likely the AIB would accept the poorer package. So the union, quite correctly, rejected this approach. They said, "Let us not, because the AIB is not an arbitration board, have them solve the dispute between us and the government; and let us not, on behalf of our members, take the chance that they will opt for the poorer package when we think we are entitled to the richer package".

I think that is a responsible approach. But beyond that—this is the message I want to give, through you, Mr. Speaker, to the people of Canada—this union was not insisting that the government accept the richer package. All the union said was, "If you submit that particular package to the AIB, we will accept their decision." I repeat that Treasury Board had indicated they would accept the richer package if the AIB ruled on it. If that had been done, there would have been no strike, parliament would not be sitting now, and thousands of Canadians from coast to coast who have been inconvenienced would not have suffered the consequences of the strike.

As recently as yesterday I consulted the union to clarify this approach in order to make sure that that is what they had in mind. I read the reports during the weekend. They spoke to our party and to other parties in the House of Commons. It became clear that that was the issue. Following that, I spoke with the Prime Minister twice and said to him, "The union has said that the country would be back to normal within six hours, its members back to work, and the planes could be flying if you modify your approach. You said the richer package is acceptable if the AIB rules on it. Why don't you submit it to the AIB and let them decide?" If the government had done that, CATCA says that planes would have been flying within six hours. But the government said no because, I suspect, a guy named Otto Lang locked them, again, into a stupid position, an arbitrary position.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Broadbent: He locked them into an unfair position, one that totally vitiated the whole rationale of reasonable bargaining procedures. It is for that reason my party will have nothing to do with this law. We think it is unfair and discriminating, and that it does not even follow past government respecting the AIB.

Let me add a footnote to that. I have a whole list, with which I will not bore the House, of previous contracts the government submitted to the AIB which went beyond the

arithmetical guidelines, and the government took the position that the AIB would accept some and reject others. That is exactly what happened. I could read into the record a list of contracts with the government's own employees, in some of which arithmetical guidelines have been acceded to and others ruled employees back to work. If the government had persisted with its own procedures with the AIB, and if it were consistent, it would have done for CATCA what it did for discriminating, unfair practices. Therefore, unless the government makes a change that we will be proposing in committee, we will be voting against this bill.

We realize that the public interest is a very real thing. We realize that Air Canada is losing millions of dollars, and that other companies are losing money. We realize that the public is in jeopardy. Therefore, public interest does weigh on our minds as well. But it is very important, when we are sacrificing rights, that we do so in the knowledge of what is going on, particularly in the knowledge of who is to blame. I say it is wrong in this instance to blame a group of Canadian men and women who are working from coast to coast for the kind of action that this government put on the country.

So we will be proposing, at committee stage of the bill, an amendment—which I will not read out now—which will have the effect of creating an arbitrator, which has been the past practice, I might add, of the back-to-work legislation proposed by the government, whose function will be to decide whether the richer package proposed by CATCA is, or is not, within the guidelines, and if it is within, that they would be entitled to receive the financial benefits of that package, subject of course to AIB approval.

I appeal in a sombre and serious note to the Minister of Labour and say to him, "If the government wants to be consistent with its own previous back-to-work legislation"—I am now going by memory—"which included the appointment of an arbitrator who would not have", as he has in this bill, "a ceiling beyond which he cannot go, it should accept my amendment". On first analysis there is some reason for the inclusion of the ceiling under the controls program, but I submit that a crucial part of the negotiations hinge on the interpretation of the controls program and therefore that it is wrong to put in that ceiling. The AIB will ensure the guidelines are enforced.

● (1640)

I appeal to the Minister of Labour to consider accepting this amendment, which would entail having an arbitrator look at the government's proposal and at what CATCA says is legitimate, and then decide one way or the other. If the CATCA proposal is deemed by an independent arbitrator to be consistent with the guidelines, the government should live up to its earlier statements and give the workers what they would get from that richer package. That is the kind of amendment we will propose, and I submit that that is fully consistent with the government's own past back-to-work legislation. It is fully consistent with its own philosophy, and if implemented it would bring some degree of justice to workers who in this circumstance have been very unfairly treated.

[Mr. Broadbent.]

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[*English*]

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 40, to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles)—Labour Conditions—Pensions for retired railway employees—Government action; the hon. member for Simcoe North (Mr. Rynard)—Environmental Affairs—Pollution of Great Lakes—Possibility of changing timetable for corrective action by industry; the hon. member for Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe (Mr. Marshall)—Veterans Affairs—Request for Increase in disability pension—Government position.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*Translation*]

AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL SERVICES CONTINUATION ACT

AIR TRAFFIC CONTROLLERS—MEASURE TO END STRIKE

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Munro (Hamilton East): That Bill C-63, to provide for the continuation of air traffic control services, be read the second time and referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. Charles-Eugène Dionne (Kamouraska): Mr. Speaker, once again the members of the House of Commons have been recalled to pass back-to-work legislation for hundreds of workers who have seen fit to strike as a result of a misunderstanding with the authorities of air transport services. It is not the first time that such a thing has happened. A few years ago, we were recalled in similar circumstances in connection with the CN employees and longshoremen. It should be normal as a result of such cases for the government to pass more flexible legislation to avoid such conflicts. The labour legislation must be designed to maintain some balance between the just demands of workers and the requirement of the common good.

In public services, the economic powers proceeding from the right to strike should be replaced by a proper mechanism to adjust wages according to the cost of living index.

I understand that it becomes rather difficult in a control period but we are now at least approaching a decontrol period. After controlling, they are now trying to decontrol. Obviously,

under such circumstances, it becomes more difficult to adjust the wages of a team of air services employees.

We should stop thinking in terms of compulsory contributions or conciliation and consider instead a fairer distribution of the enterprise's profits and the workers' wages. With all the inquiry commissions that have been created, with all the civil servants getting various wages, and some of them are quite high, with all those people conducting on-going studies on the ways to improve the employees' working conditions in Canada, it seems to me that it should be possible to find a just solution. Obviously, this solution will not be found without efforts, but the present situation teaches us that we must take the appropriate means if we really want to avoid anarchy.

There are important factors to be considered when establishing an employee's working conditions. We must not forget that the employee is a human being, not a machine, and that he is looking for security and stability. In general terms, he wants his working place to be well organized and well managed. It is normal that he should be treated with justice. The employee also wants to be informed on his employer's business situation so as to know he may get a fair income. Those are basic realities. In no circumstances should an employee endanger his life to earn a living. Workers are the first naturally entitled to know clearly and fully their specific working conditions. They should also have the possibility to refuse, without any salary loss, to do a work they consider dangerous for their health and security till a decision is made by an authorized committee.

Workers' health and security must be fully secured, regardless of any ideology which in any case could not disturb with impunity the scientific data more and more verifiable by both parties. It is important to emphasize that man, not profit, should be the central point of any social project if we want to have the privilege of being part of the establishment of the new economic order which is more and more referred to by the most thoughtful people.

Basically this implies a new moral order or a new scale of values. Workers, through their organizations are and remain the main factors of change as far as their whole collective development and progress are concerned. All workers should understand that unionism is not an end in itself but a means of ensuring the promotion and the progress of workers in general. Considering that this means is limited they must seek and accept the methods which can help them meet the objectives of unionism.

In this age of automation, the worker is a man or a woman who is concerned about the future and anxious to take full advantage of technological progress. The worker's concern stems from the fact that he is aware that our society is not organized to distribute fairly this new wealth produced by science, technology and machine with a minimum of human participation. The worker lives in a society which is unable to adapt itself properly to progress.

On July 5, 1972, during a debate on the longshoremen's strike, I told the House that we were living in a system so unbalanced that citizens have concluded that certain grievances can be settled only by striking. However, we must logically recognize that everything that has been accomplished in the world is the result of work. No one can deny this. How is it that thousands of workers decide that their problems can be solved by a work stoppage? A strike is simply illogical. It is a phenomenon related to various generalized illnesses and which becomes a hypothetical means of pressure since the decision to strike must be submitted to a vote and since decisions are often made by only a percentage of the workers involved.

In general, strikes are aimed against those who pay instead of those who deprive. I am surprised to see that in the many strikes that occur in Canada, the workers have a tendency to strike against those who pay them instead of organizing a true general strike, as they should, against the financial system which is depriving everyone. This would be somewhat more logical in my opinion.

You need to have very little imagination or to refuse to see the disastrous results of a financial system divorced from current economic realities not to conclude that strikes are most often the result of demands for salary readjustment or increases. Why? It is very easy to find an answer. Successive wage increases cannot catch up with the increase in the cost of living, and metaphorically speaking, we could say that wages go up by the stairs while consumer prices go up by the elevator.

The evolution of automation, which should be beneficial, has become the nightmare of thousands of workers in the present system.

The various employee associations seem to want the industry or the employer to absorb all the expenses that result from mechanized installation, as well as wage readjustments and all the demands brought about by a sick financial system.

I have often underlined the delays caused by ever more strikes and I added that sometimes it was a necessary evil which we should avoid spreading.

One of the well known leader of the American labour movement, Mr. George Meany, once pointed out that in unduly protracted conflicts employees bear a financial burden disproportionate to the advantages they could gain from a confrontation and it is actually a fact.

Given the present situation and the lack of provisions in a legislation which is not adopted to the circumstances, we wonder if some solution other than a settlement imposed by Parliament could not be found under the present circumstances.

Unfortunately, we come to the conclusion that the answer is no. There is no alternative to settling that problem other than ordering a return to work through government legislation. It is to be hoped that this legislation will be adopted and that strikers will realize their responsibilities.

The strikers should go back to work without waiting for the adoption of lengthy procedures which do not solve the problems. We already have too many examples of settlements against the workers. We need but mention the case of the employees of G. Lapalme Inc. working for the Post Office

department. We have suggested repeatedly, and we are not the only ones to have done so, many authorities in the field of labour have as well, the possibility of setting up labour tribunals, real ones. Of the proposals we made in this House, let me quote this one, section 3 which reads as follows:

(3) to make an adequate evaluation of the viability of the undertaking or service, taking into consideration the risks, the cash reserves required to ensure its operations, tax deductions and such formalities as result from tax regulations;

Many things must be taken into account.

A labour court made up of government, business and workers' representatives to consider regularly questions of relations between workers and management, which would not wait six months after the expiration of contracts to begin negotiations. At the time of contract renewal, on-going negotiations should take place and every interested party should be made aware of the proposals, because worthy investigations would have been made by representatives of all parties concerned. At that time, I have good reason to believe that the workers, who are as intelligent as anybody else of any other class of people, would understand that, due to circumstances, this offer would be acceptable. I am wondering whether those responsible for air services did not hesitate too much. I have here an article written by Michel Roy of *Le Devoir* who is certainly aware of a number of things, because he writes, and I quote:

CATCA proposed to the government to conclude the agreement and submit the whole thing to the Anti-Inflation Board, feeling that it would have to make the distinction in its analyses between a wage increase benefiting all controllers and a wage increase resulting from a reclassification. The union representatives are even prepared to give the undertaking and abide by the decision of the board when it is made.

I believe this unfortunate conflict could have been avoided.

The government, for its part, refused to refer a wage settlement to the board—

But why did we set up that famous board? For a year and a half we discussed in committee the possibility of setting up a board. It seems to me to be inoperative at this time.

And that is why all commercial aviation in this country has been paralyzed for the past 48 hours, with daily losses to air carriers being estimated at more than $5 million without counting opportunities lost by industries that depend on air transport or the hard-to-assess inconveniences of all kinds that thousands of users must undergo.

I think that if there had been a little more goodwill from those in charge that conflict could have been avoided.

I conclude by mentioning the suggestion we made and we continue to make because we have excellent reason to believe it could be right—the formation of a labour court with the responsibilities and the power to decide something. At that time, as I say, I have excellent reason to believe that we would avoid conflicts such as the one we are now faced with.

However, we are not short of examples on which the government could meditate. I have here an article from the newspaper *Le Droit* of August 31, 1973, under the following heading, and I quote:

Strikers Storm Parliament.

It seems to me that this should be reason enough for government members to make up their minds and put forward an adequate labour legislation that would meet the needs of the majority of the people. I know full well it is easier to criticize than to govern. But we are really looking for something in the government's proposals that would give a way out. If we had the labour court that would be needed in various regions, with representatives from all interested parties, it would investigate and suggest practical solutions to the parties before a labour agreement had come to an end, and this should be a settlement. I submit the government should do this.

[Mr. Dionne (Kamouraska).]

● (1650)

[*English*]

Hon. Robert K. Andras (President of the Treasury Board): Mr. Speaker, at the outset of my comments I want to outline the four major unresolved areas, areas outstanding when negotiations broke off, in order that the government's position will be known and understood. The first concerns money. In changing the system by which air traffic controllers' jobs are classified, there are, of course, assumed automatic increases in pay. It is the government's position that the total compensation received as a result of job reclassification, as well as the negotiated increase in the basic negotiations, is subject to the maximum allowable compensation increase, as set out in the AIB arithmetic guidelines, of 8 per cent. CATCA, on the other hand, is demanding that pay increases which come as a result of the reclassification should be treated separately from those which are negotiated under the collective agreement. Adoption of their version would have meant, in the first year alone, an additional 4.6 per cent compensation increase beyond the arithmetic 8 per cent guidelines.

The government proposed a conversion cost of less than one-half of 1 per cent which, of course, was within the over-all guideline limit of 8 per cent. CATCA, however, rejected that. I shall return to the point of classification pay in a few minutes. As the leader of the NDP indicated, when you boil it down, that is one of the basic issues in this matter.

The second issue is vacations. CATCA wanted to provide its members with five weeks vacation after 20 years of service. At present, only CATCA and one other union have a contract which provides five weeks vacation after 25 years of service. All other federal public service collective agreements provide for five weeks vacation after 27 years of service or more. The third issue deals with management rights. CATCA is demanding at present that a minimum of two controllers be on duty at all airports at certain times. CATCA also wanted a change of work hours for non-operating controllers. To accede to these two latter demands would increase the number of controllers over-all and increase the cost of operations. More important, it is management's view and management's right to say that it is not necessary from an operational standpoint.

The fourth issue is classification. CATCA was demanding that some 100 jobs be put in a higher classification than the job responsibilities merit.

Mr. Benjamin: There was also the pension issue, was there not?

● (1700)

Mr. Andras: I am trying to deal with the major outstanding ones, not one where there is a possibility of resolution.

CATCA also wanted a change of work hours for non-operating controllers. Of course, that—as I have already indicated—would be an additional cost. Realistically—this was pointed out by a previous speaker—the most significant and controversial of these issues is the total increase in compensation payable under the anti-inflation guidelines.

The government is absolutely convinced that 8 per cent is the absolute maximum increase allowable under the Anti-Inflation Act, and that should include the basic increase and the conversion cost of reclassification for CATCA. The government is not prepared deliberately to sign an agreement which includes and supports or implies support for an increase larger than permissible under the Anti-Inflation Act and its regulations, leaving the onus on the AIB to roll back that excess. The anti-inflation guidelines do provide several conditions under which compensation increases for a group may be exempt from the maximum arithmetic increase permitted under the guidelines, the six plus two in this particular case. The most important of those conditions for exemptions are as follows: first, the historical relationship with another group; second, where there has been persistent and serious recruiting difficulties, as was the case with the prison guards; third, permission to achieve a minimum wage of $3.75 an hour, or $600 per year, whichever is the highest. The fourth would deal with a commitment prior to October 14, 1975, to provide compensation increases to a group.

Obviously, none of the first three conditions apply in the current air traffic controllers' dispute. Nor does the fourth—that is, prior commitment—although I think in some peoples minds they considered that possibility. The fourth condition, that of prior commitment, was designed to apply to collective agreements signed before October 14, 1975, which provided increases in the period following that date. Also, it was designed to apply to commitments made, but where contracts had not been formally signed to increase a group's compensation after October 14, 1975.

The Anti-Inflation Board has made it absolutely clear in its regulations and in its pattern of settlements and its decisions that to qualify as an allowable exemption such priority cannot be a simple expression of intent to increase compensation. That commitment must be thoroughly identifiable and capable of quantification in terms of cost.

There is a pattern to this that is absolutely clear. When it is boiled down, as the leader of the NDP has said, the major issue between the Canadian Air Traffic Control Association, Treasury Board and the government is the status of the cost of converting air traffic controllers to the new classification plan. Both time and the terms of reference of the work on that new classification plan disqualified such costs from exemption under the anti-inflation guidelines.

It is very important that I set before hon. members the sequence of events relating to the work of the new classification plan for the air traffic control group. In early 1975, the Ministry of Transport decided to undertake an internal study of the air traffic control classification standard. In June, 1975, CATCA responded positively to an invitation to take part in that project. The terms of reference of that study were to examine the classification standard for the group, with the objective of determining its strengths and its weaknesses. Following that first phase, a second study was foreseen to look at the causes of problems, to design alternatives and to recommend specific courses of action.

On October 1, 1975, the Ministry of Transport sent a copy of the phase one report to the president of CATCA. In the letter which accompanied this report, the ministry indicated that it was studying the report to determine what steps should be taken to remedy some of the problems. It indicated that "one possibility"—I repeat, "one possibility"—under active consideration could be a full-scale revision to the classification standard. The letter indicated that it would seek CATCA's participation in a second phase of the study. Clearly, this report does not indicate any particular course of action. On January 13, 1976, the ministry wrote to the president of CATCA informing him that the conduct of the second phase of the internal study had been approved, and confirmed earlier participation of an executive member of CATCA. That is after the AIB regulations came into effect.

The date, terms of reference and directions are particularly significant in terms of the current disagreement. The terms of reference were to develop a new classification standard for the air traffic control occupational group which would to the greatest extent possible satisfy the following requirements: resolve the problem issues, provide a basis for ensuring equitable salary, and be acceptable to the employer. The committee was also to re-examine the point-rating method of re-evaluation. I want to stress that this was an internal study, because the leader of the NDP, quite rightly, focused on this area of possible prior commitment in some of his comments. When a final proposal was developed, it was to be subject to approval by Treasury Board which, of course, is responsible under the Financial Administration Act.

Consequently, in terms of the Anti-Inflation Board compensation bulletin I, and that board's ruling on what constitutes a commitment made prior to October 14, 1975, Treasury Board is convinced that nothing in the actions taken prior to October 14, 1975, constitutes a prior commitment that would exempt the cost of introducing a new classification plan from the application of the anti-inflation guidelines.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, in June, 1976, CATCA signed its first collective agreement after the anti-inflation program was in effect. There was no demand for a new classification plan when they signed that agreement, and no claim for exemption of resultant costs from anti-inflation guidelines. CATCA clearly does not have a case of prior commitment in terms of a classification program. If they had had a belief in that prior commitment, they certainly would not have turned down the government's offer to include CATCA's position in a signed agreement to be sent to the AIB. With the permission of the

House, I am quite prepared to table the letters to support the government's contention in that argument. I am prepared to table the two letters referred to, as well as the terms of reference of phase two of the study. I am in the hands of hon. members.

I am satisfied that a case has been established that in the most crucial aspect of this dispute, that is, the classification area, there was no prior commitment. Therefore, there is no justification to include it within the exemptions to the guidelines, which would have been the only alternative the government would have supported.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I am sorry to interrupt the hon. minister, but I should seek the consent of the House to table the documents. Is there consent for the minister to table the documents?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Orlikow: Mr. Speaker, would the minister permit a question?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Winnipeg North (Mr. Orlikow) wishes to ask a question of the minister. Does the minister accept a question?

Mr. Andras: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Orlikow: If it was as clear as the minister suggested, that implementation of the classification and the rates of pay required under that classification would breach the arithmetic guidelines as established by the anti-inflation legislation and the board, why was the government not prepared to submit that agreement to the Anti-Inflation Board? And if it is as clear as the minister says, that it would breach the guidelines of the Anti-Inflation Board, would they not scale down the rates as they have in respect of so many other agreements?

• (1710)

Mr. Andras: That gives rise to the question of the method of submitting it. I have said we are not going to sign an agreement when we clearly believe that it implies support for an increase above the maximum AIB guidelines. We did say we totally disagreed with CATCA's position, and we clearly set forth our position that 8 per cent was the maximum. But in the final moments of the negotiation we said they could test that 12.6 which included 4.6 due to the classification pay conversion which we were satisfied would not be accepted by the AIB. There was an opportunity for them to test it.

Mr. Broadbent: Would the minister permit a further question? I apologize for having been out of the House for a few minutes, as I had to be, but I believe I caught the gist of the hon. gentleman's argument, which was that there was no prior commitment on the question of reclassification. I have a series of letters, going back some 2½ years, between the Ministry of Transport and the union about making it clear that the government and the union were interested in discussing the reclassification issue.

I am asking the minister whether he disputes this, and if he does not, whether he would not agree there is nothing in the anti-inflation law, and nothing in the regulations issued in pursuance of that law, which says that for workers to get benefits as a result of reclassification there has to be a written prior agreement in principle. The minister nods. He is now telling us there is such a regulation. I have looked for such a regulation but have not found it. To save time, could he tell the House where we can find this regulation which says there has to be prior agreement, in principle, on reclassification?

Mr. Andras: Mr. Speaker, I used the expression "pattern of settlement" or "pattern of decision" in relation to the Anti-Inflation Board. They have not accepted anything but a clear and quantifiably accountable commitment.

Mr. Broadbent: In how many cases?

Mr. Andras: I cannot give the hon. member that information off the top of my head, but I do not know of any cases where there has not been a clearly established prior commitment. I think the letters I have tabled may be the same as those to which the hon. member has referred, and they come nowhere close to the question of a quantifiable increase due to reclassification, or even imply that such a decision had finally been taken. The point which the hon. member has raised is an important one.

Mr. Broadbent: My information is that there is only one case. There may well be many more where there has been a prior commitment. If that is the situation, it is going very far if one generalizes from a single incident. Apart from that, there is another question I should like to ask the minister. Just because the board decided that in its opinion a written prior commitment was essential in cases upon which a favourable ruling could be made, is the board precluded, in terms of the law or the regulations or even of its own practices, from deciding that in this particular case—

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. I believe the hon. member is abusing the rules. In asking these questions and intervening in this way, he is intruding upon the time available to other members who wish to take part in the debate on second reading of the bill.

Mr. Broadbent: We shall do it in committee, then.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: In due course, in committee, the hon. member will have all the time he needs.

Mr. Les Benjamin (Regina-Lake Centre): Mr. Speaker, at the outset of my intervention in this debate may I say I agree with my leader and with the position taken by my party, that while the right to strike and the collective bargaining process are a necessary and worth-while part of the structure of our society, there are occasions on which in certain circumstances the public right may exceed the smaller right, in this instance

the right to withhold services. That smaller right must sometimes be sacrificed.

Surely, though, on such occasions the people whose particular right is being sacrificed for the greater good of the public must be dealt with reasonably, responsibly and in good faith. It is my opinion that in this instance, thanks to the Minister of Transport (Mr. Lang) and the people of Treasury Board, the whole process has been handled in a manner which is irresponsible and which amounts, in my opinion, to nothing more than double-dealing.

This strike was unnecessary in the first place. I repeat what my leader said: The government, and in particular the Minister of Transport, caused this strike—and nobody else—and I hope the media will make sure that the people of Canada know who caused the strike, who brought it about. Not only was the strike unnecessary, but it could have been ended as recently as yesterday. I have no hesitation in complimenting my leader upon his activities yesterday. In a positive, responsible manner he met with members of the union and discussed the situation with members of the government, including the Prime Minister, on two occasions with respect to means for bringing the dispute to an end. The planes could have been flying last night. This sitting of parliament was totally unnecessary and would have been even less necessary had the government been willing to make one relatively minor change of heart.

I agree the strike must be brought to an end; there is no argument on that score from any corner of the House. But we in the NDP disagree with the terms and conditions laid down in the bill. I say this bearing in mind particularly the precedents set in back-to-work legislation in the past nine years. Some half dozen bills of this nature, at least, have been passed in my experience during that time. On each occasion there has been a genuine attempt by all concerned in the House to make sure that the rights of the individual workers which were to be sacrificed for the benefit of the public as a whole were borne in mind in the shape of legislation which is clear, responsible and straightforward.

The government must legislate to end the strike, but only in a manner which is fair and consistent. Mr. Speaker, this bill is not consistent with the practices we have followed in the past, let alone with the feelings of members on the opposition side. This is the first time we have departed from the principles I have mentioned, and it is not a good precedent. Surely, parliament should not be dictating the pay package when dealing with its own employees.

● (1720)

In light of the precedents and in light of the practices of the government, let alone proposals by members opposite, the appointment of an arbitrator to decide on what the pay package shall be is surely the least that needs to be done. We understand air traffic controllers would be willing to accept and abide by the appointment of an arbitrator. On other occasions parliament legislated pay packages when it was dealing with employees in the private sector. At no time has parliament legislated a pay package for some of its own employees. Invariably the provision was included in the legislation that it would be decided by an independent arbitrator.

This particular group of employees comes under the aegis of the Public Service Staff Relations Act, which is under the jurisdiction of the government House leader. As I understand it, this bill should have been brought in by him, because the Minister of Labour (Mr. Munro) brings in legislation for people affected by the Canada Labour Code. Perhaps the government House leader did not want to touch this with a ten-foot pole. Perhaps the President of the Treasury Board (Mr. Andras) was not anxious to introduce it either, and thus the Minister of Labour was stuck with a bad case.

There has been agreement that the crucial item which brought about the breakdown ending in a strike situation was the refusal of the government to do something logical and fair which would have ended, once and for all, any disagreement between the government and the Canadian Air Traffic Control Association as to what was proper under Anti-Inflation Board laws and regulations. The government's refusal to put together a single package which the employees felt had an excellent opportunity of being approved by the Anti-Inflation Board, with the exceptions, conditions and regulations under which they operate, is what caused this strike.

As the President of the Treasury Board mentioned, the issue of reclassification started over 2½ years ago. The Minister of Transport and the air traffic controllers agreed that there needed to be a reclassification because there has not been one since 1966. Improvements in technology, training, competence and techniques in that particular occupation have been such that reclassification is warranted and justified. In the entire history of labour relations, reclassification automatically results in pay adjustments which will affect the total wage package under contract.

The President of the Treasury Board cannot kid me and the workers of this country that because there was no signed agreement prior to October 14, 1974, there is no provision for approval by the AIB for wage adjustments after reclassification. Over the long history of management-worker negotiations, whenever there has been reclassification in an occupation there has been an upward wage adjustment. It is automatic. Anyone would know that, except the President of Treasury Board, the Minister of Transport and the Minister of Labour. That is one of the reasons people associated with the air traffic controllers' union were confident that AIB, in looking at the package, would take that into consideration when deciding whether the employees' package was within the guidelines.

Air traffic controllers were asking for a package to be sent, even without a signed contract. The President of the Treasury Board referred to a signed contract. There could have been agreement to send the package over to the AIB, wait for a ruling and then sit down and sign a contract based on the ruling. That is all the air traffic controllers wanted. They said repeatedly, before and during this strike, that whatever the AIB ruled, they would accept and abide by. If the government is correct, that 8 per cent was all that could be awarded, the

AIB would have confirmed that, the air traffic controllers would have agreed and accepted their decision, and there would have been no strike.

If the government is incorrect, and the AIB set a 10 per cent, 10.7 per cent or a 12.44 per cent increase, the air traffic controllers would have accepted that. Treasury Board let it be known that it would accept any kind of decision by the AIB which applied to a money package including rates of pay after reclassification. Thus, there was no problem concerning reaching a settlement. Instead of that, the government got involved in double-dealing. They agreed to send the employees' package, but they would be sending their own package as well.

Since the mandate of the Anti-Inflation Board is to control wages and hold down inflation, I would be surprised if the AIB had taken the higher package after looking at the 7.5 per cent, 8 per cent and 12 per cent packages. If it is faced with a choice, it will pick the lower one. With that deliberate design by the government of sending two packages to the AIB, it was aware that the Anti-Inflation Board would choose the lowest package and there would be no decision as to whether the approximate 4 per cent would be ruled on by the AIB. Thus, it would be out in limbo somewhere.

On two or three occasions the conciliation board indicated that it was not in their mandate to make any recommendations on reclassifications and pensions, but in their reports they indicated that these two issues were pivotal and must be negotiated by the government and the air traffic controllers. That is as far as the conciliation board would go, because of their mandate. In fact, to make any recommendation regarding reclassification was specifically excluded from their mandate by the Public Service Staff Relations Board.

Why did the government indicate that it would send two packages over to the AIB? If I am wrong, I stand to be corrected, but I do not believe there is another instance where this has happened. In fact, in every instance where the government reached agreement with employees, or where there was a settlement by arbitration, only one package was sent to the AIB for their review. However, in this particular instance two packages were to be sent. If that is not designed to double-deal and not bargain in good faith, I do not know what is. This strike was caused by that fact, by the President of the Treasury Board, the Minister of Transport and this government—and by no one else. Even as late as yesterday that is all that would have been needed.

● (1730)

The Prime Minister could have sent a letter over to the Anti-Inflation Board along with the employees' pay package, including the reclassification, and asked for a ruling. I predict that the controllers would have been back to work and the planes flying yesterday if he had done that. It is this irresponsible and stubborn position taken by the government, which is unprecedented, which has caused the strike and which has not allowed it to end sooner.

I have a list of some 24 agreements reached between the government and different groups of its employees, either by collective bargaining and voluntary agreement, or by arbitration. I would be very surprised if there was not one single instance in these 24 in which the employees wanted one amount and the government offered some other amount. There is not a single instance in these 24 agreements that we have been informed about, reached between February 25 and July 14 of this year, of two packages being sent over to the AIB for review. In every instance, according to the government's own news release, the monetary aspects of the collective agreements were subject to review by the Anti-Inflation Board. This was the case in all of the 24 that I have on my desk, and no doubt there are many others. The agreements involved groups of employees of one hundred or two hundred workers to as many as 14,000, and the increases ranged anywhere from 6½ per cent to a total of 17 per cent over two years.

There is a wide variety of awards in all of these collective agreements, but the government sent only one package over to the AIB, not two. It did not send a government package and an employees' package; it just sent the one package which was subject to review by the Anti-Inflation Board. Surely for the sake of consistency, if nothing else, even though agreement had not been reached on the package it would have been fairer, as well as bargaining in good faith, for the government to say to its employees, "We will send the 8 per cent plus whatever is involved in the reclassification over to the Anti-Inflation Board and we will both accept what the Anti-Inflation Board rules and then sign a contract". But no, there was stubbornness, double dealing, a refusal to be consistent, let alone lack of fairness and bargaining in good faith.

The list is lengthy and I would likely use up an entire 40 minutes reading over all 24 awards, all of which were subject to review by the Anti-Inflation Board. Some of them were approved by the Anti-Inflation Board; other awards were rolled back. Under the Anti-Inflation Board guidelines this provision is built in.

In the case of the controllers, Treasury Board is attempting to prejudge whatever the Anti-Inflation Board might consider to be a settlement within the guidelines. That is surely a new stance on the part of Treasury Board. When negotiating in the past it has submitted agreements to the AIB in excess of the guidelines and has sought approval of the AIB. In some cases the approval was granted, in others it was withheld. In one case the cabinet overruled the AIB and approved a settlement.

In a two year contract between October, 1975, and October, 1977, with the Canadian Postmasters Association, Treasury Board negotiated a settlement of 14.81 per cent in the first year and 9.63 per cent in the second year. The guidelines called for 12 per cent in the first year and 10.8 per cent in the second year. The AIB recommendation approved the entire 14.81 per cent. The negotiated settlement for the first year of the contract was 2.81 per cent in excess of the guidelines for 1975; for the second year the AIB approved the agreement reached of 9.63 per cent.

With the Professional Institute of Public Servants, in a one year contract from July, 1975, to July, 1976, Treasury Board negotiated a settlement of 12.82 per cent. The guidelines

provided for 12.21 per cent and the AIB rolled back the settlement to 12.21 per cent.

The Public Service Alliance of Canada, negotiating with Treasury Board on behalf of the railway mail clerks, in a two year contract running from January, 1975, negotiated a settlement of 15.6 per cent. The guidelines called for 14 per cent but the Anti-Inflation Board approved the settlement of 15.6 per cent, which is 1.6 per cent above the guidelines. For the year 1977 the railway mail clerks received three increases of 5.8 per cent, 7.3 per cent and 5.1 per cent, totalling 18.2 per cent. This was 3 per cent above the guidelines. The board approved the first two increases taking effect in June, 1977.

In the case of the penitentiary service, in a contract commencing in October, 1976, a settlement of 12.44 per cent was negotiated. The AIB guidelines allowed 8 per cent, yet the AIB recommended and approved the 12.44 per cent. All that the air traffic controllers are asking is that the package they were asking for be submitted to the AIB, and the controllers will abide by the AIB's recommendation.

I also want to deal a little further with why we oppose this bill. We do not oppose the idea of ending the strike and legislating the controllers back to work, but we do oppose using this legislation to depart from the precedents and practices of previous back to work legislation by making no provision for an independent arbitrator to make a decision on the package which would be binding on both sides. Surely we should not sit here and legislate a pay package for the government's employees; that is an unheard of, untenable and indefensible position for this parliament to take, let alone for the government, the President of the Treasury Board, and the Minister of Labour to take.

I am surprised the Minister of Labour has the nerve to present such a bill as this. I recall hearing speeches of his in the House on legislation that did provide for an independent arbitrator in back to work legislation; on those occasions he prided himself in not having parliament legislate a pay package for government employees. Why was this not done in this case? Why the exception? What else is going on which we do not know about? Or is this just another plain case of stubbornness on the part of the Department of Transport? As I have said before in this House, the minister is a walking disaster looking for a place to happen. Everything he has touched since coming to this parliament as a cabinet minister has hurt people. Everything he has tried has caused disputes, fights, arguments, and some measure of disunity or alienation somewhere in the country.

It seems to me that in this instance it was time for the Minister of Labour to stiffen his back and to get this matter settled in a proper, honourable, positive and honest manner. If the Minister of Labour had told his two colleagues, the Minister of Transport and the President of the Treasury Board, to get the package over to the AIB, get their decision and abide by it whatever the ruling, things would be different; but no, the government wants to make the AIB's ruling for them. That is what it wants parliament to do. It would be tempting for the members of the AIB to resign since their functions are being usurped by government legislation which judges awards made under the Anti-Inflation Board legislation and regulations. Surely that is not the position for this parliament to take, let alone the government, and it is the fundamental reason why we cannot vote for this legislation on second reading.

● (1740)

We earnestly hope that the Minister of Labour will persuade his colleagues to accept an amendment, and it does not particularly matter whether it comes from a member of one of the opposition parties or whether it is moved by a government member so long as it does something about an independent arbitrator who would decide on what would be a fair and proper package which both sides can accept, and which will then be subjected to the review of the AIB.

Why should members of the House get the Minister of Transport and the President of the Treasury Board off the hook and out of a mess of their own creation? Why should we be responsible for bailing them out? I hope that, if nothing else, this debate will show to the public how inept and double-dealing these ministers have been and that that has been the basic cause of the strike. I hope that the official opposition will join us. I have listened to their spokesman on this and he did an excellent job of tearing the bill apart—almost as good a job as my leader did—but then he said he will vote for the bill; I do not know why. It is typical of Tories who run on both sides of the street at the same time.

In order to let the government know even more forcefully, it would be the responsibility of members of parliament, particularly on the opposition side, to vote against this legislation on second reading because the government has the majority. We should not be party to bailing out the President of the Treasury Board and the Minister of Transport because of their stubbornness and ineptness. Why should we be a party to that? If legislation accomplishes that, and it will, and brings an end to the strike, if it returns the matter of the pay package to proper collective bargaining or to the arbitration process, we will have done a good job. But why should we be party to legislation that does not do that? It will do part of it, it will get the controllers back to work, but it will not do the other essential part of making sure that the legislation is fair and that it deals honestly and in good faith with the air traffic controllers.

I urge hon. members to consider what we have to say on this, and I urge them to remember that the precedent being set here could well come back to haunt a subsequent parliament, or even a subsequent session of this parliament, because it is a precedent which we believe is unnecessary and dangerous.

This precedent could allow a subsequent government to use this as an excuse to do the same thing again, and we do not think that is the kind of precedent that should be on the law books of this country. I urge the House to get the government to accept a basic and important change in the legislation for which it will receive greater acceptance, not only from all sides of the House but from the government's own employees. The

public will feel better about it as well, even though with the planes flying there is still the dispute hanging over our heads, the failure to agree. The agreement that will be now legislated by parliament will be an agreement affecting public service employees. That is not a comfortable position for any of us and it is not something in which we should be involved, so I urge the government to make the changes in the legislation for which we are asking. It will then improve labour relations with the public service and it will be a feather in the cap of all hon. members of the House.

Mr. Leonard C. Jones (Moncton): Mr. Speaker, just think that we left this House last Friday night when negotiations could and should have been taking place between the employer, the Government of Canada, and the employee, the Canadian Air Traffic Controllers Association! Within a very few hours, as a result of the actions of the Minister of Transport (Mr. Lang) and as a result of his abdication of responsibility to the people of this country and to his employees, we were called back by telephone, by telegram and, in my case, even the RCMP were out trying to find out where I was, all at the taxpayers' expense. All that costs a lot of money. Some of us came by jet, some of us came by DC-9, and some of us drove, but, by golly, they got us here. In any event, the bill is one for the taxpayers to pay.

It seems to me that there is an abdication of responsibility by the Minister of Transport (Mr. Lang) and his colleagues. Why is that? It was their responsibility to negotiate a contract. As late as yesterday they had the chance to negotiate. I think every member of the House is prepared to discuss and vote for the clauses in the bill which provide for the resumption of air traffic controllers' services in this country, but the other provisions are terrible. But I think that we should not have to legislate even those provisions to resume air controllers' services when there was a chance to negotiate. This makes me think of one famous bank. I am not particularly proud of banks in this country, but one of them had a report one year which recommended less talks. There was a chance to talk on this agreement, but the government abdicated its responsibility.

Late yesterday CATCA issued a press release which I should like to read into the record. It reads as follows:

> In a final effort to reach a negotiated settlement and end the existing air traffic control strike CATCA has made a new offer of settlement to the government. In that offer we have again stated our willingness to accept the Anti-Inflation Board's decision on the question of whether or not wage increases resulting from classification changes are within their regulations.
>
> We have proposed that only CATCA's proposal of an 8% across the board increase, and an additional average increase of 4.6% resulting from classification changes be incorporated in the new agreement and submitted to the AIB for approval. Pending receipt of the AIB approval an interim salary adjustment of 7.43% would be paid to the controllers.
>
> In order to facilitate acceptance by the government of this solution we have agreed to the government's position on all other outstanding bargaining issues. A reply to our proposal was requested as soon as possible, and we again undertook to have the normal air traffic control system in Canada in operation within six hours of a settlement.

[Mr. Benjamin.]

If it was not fair of the association to make that final offer, then I do not know what you could call it, but they were stepped upon by their employer, the government.

I have had some dealings with unions throughout the years and I have found that it is never necessary for any union to resort to a strike if the employer is fair and reasonable. In this case the employees went the last mile.

● (1750)

Yesterday afternoon, even after they had started their strike, they went the last mile. But no way; the government was not prepared to negotiate. The government wanted this parliament to assume its responsibility for it. The government abdicated its responsibility not only to the people of Canada, to the airlines and to the employees who are employed by the airlines, but also to the travelling public.

It is not a very nice thing to come from a labour constituency and be asked to legislate people back to work. That is something that happened in the slave trade. People were forced to work. The air traffic controllers wanted to work yesterday, but the government would not accept their proposal. It was a fair proposal. The controllers were prepared to let the AIB settle the matter, but the government knew what the AIB would say. I suggest that the government misinterpreted the whole purpose of the AIB. It is not supposed to replace arbitration boards or arbitrators or any other form of the process of collective bargaining.

The government made itself a dictator to decide how it was going to be done, and it almost declared how the AIB should interpret the guidelines. I suggest that the minister reconsider the wisdom of his ways. We want these people back to work, and I think they would be prepared to go back to work. They indicated that yesterday. Let us pass legislation which would provide for the resumption of air traffic control services, which would provide for an arbitrator or an arbitration board and which would get this over with now, once and for all. However, it should be done in a proper manner, not in the manner outlined by this bill.

I think it is wrong to ask this parliament to reconvene on short notice to pass legislation of this kind. If the government was going to pass legislation of this kind, it could have told us Friday night or even Thursday night. The legislation could have been brought before us at that time. But no, the government puts the taxpayers of this country to more and more expense. I am told that the airlines estimate they are losing $3 million or $4 million a day. Who pays the deficit of one of the airlines, Air Canada? The taxpayers pay that deficit.

Goodness gracious, the money lost in the last two days could have paid any salary increase the air traffic controllers are seeking. This whole thing is an example of mismanagement on the part of the government. It is another example of the abdication of the government's responsibilities. That is what mismanagement is all about.

Mr. Arnold Peters (Timiskaming): Mr. Speaker, we have been asked to pass back-to-work legislation a number of times.

That usually happens after a considerable period of disruption in areas where the public is vitally affected. However, to my knowledge this is the first time we have been asked to pass legislation or informed of the legislation before the negotiations were completed. After a long period of negotiations the union gave notice that it was in a position to go on strike on Monday night and that there would be work stoppages of the rotation type. Those stoppages would no doubt have caused considerable disruption, but certainly not the end of air transportation in Canada. If the union had operated rotating strikes as had been done in the past, the disruption would have been of relatively short duration in particular areas around the country. Undoubtedly some concern would have been caused, but there would not necessarily have been a stand-still in air transportation in our country.

Last Friday the government did not indicate that it had legislation prepared. I gather it did not have it prepared until today because it was indicated to my caucus that there was a particular bill with certain clauses affecting this situation, and that when the bill was introduced it would be a different bill eliminating some very bad aspects. The bill would have involved penalties.

Very shortly after we adjourned on Friday the Minister of Transport (Mr. Lang) went on television and said that it was his intention to introduce legislation immediately to end the strike which was to take place a number of days hence. I am sure that the Minister of Labour (Mr. Munro) will agree with me that having Saturday, Sunday and Monday to settle a strike with mediators of the calibre of Mr. Kelly, or some others I know of—and certainly most of them are not involved with the Treasury Board—provided a reasonable opportunity to settle that strike.

At that time not only the points which have been mentioned were in contention but there were a number of other points which were in contention on Friday. They were in contention on Saturday, and I gather that it was not until later, on Sunday and Monday, that a number of those points were dropped by the union. They involved important issues about which I am sure the union was concerned. They involved pensions, leave, and familiarization matters. These and other matters which were still in dispute were dropped by the union in return for just referring the issue of wages to the AIB. The union suggested that it could live with that and abide by the decision of the AIB. It seems to me that that was the best time for the Minister of Labour to get involved and to bring in his best mediators to have a look at the situation and to try to correct the bungling which took place, mainly because of the Minister of Transport.

Anyone with a Prussian-like mind can probably develop a disaster out of a reasonably negotiable situation, but after the Minister of Transport made the statements he made I can understand the leadership of that union saying that the only alternative was to shut down and to do it then. I can understand the union not wanting to accommodate the government for the next two or three days. Mr. Speaker, may I call it six o'clock?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It being six o'clock, I do now leave the chair until eight o'clock tonight.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 8 p.m.

Mr. Peters: Mr. Speaker, before lunch—

Mr. Stanfield: Which day?

Mr. Peters: Well, if you are a rural Canadian you call it lunch; if not, you call it supper. Before we rose at six o'clock I was suggesting that the previous negotiations led to the strike, because the Minister of Transport had willed this to happen.

In the two or three days leading up to the strike the union had made a number of concessions which were not met with concessions on the other side, and this is one of our problems. The Minister of Labour is responsible for some labour negotiations in the federal field; similarly, the President of the Treasury Board (Mr. Andras) also has jurisdiction over some of those negotiations. Unfortunately, Treasury Board does not engage in negotiations as other employers do; hence any settlements to which it is party differ from the kind of settlements arrived at in other labour disputes.

In the present instance parliament is being asked to legislate air traffic controllers back to work. When parliament has legislated workers back to work in the past, it has always been reasonably generous to those it legislated back to work. Usually it agreed to the appointment of an arbitration board consisting of a union representative and a management representative. If parliament does this in the present instance I presume Treasury Board, or a representative of the Department of Transport, will represent management. In addition, parliament agreed to appoint an impartial arbitrator, who agreed to consider the matter in dispute and bring in a decision on which a settlement could be based. Usually such a decision has been reasonable, acceptable and justifiable, and to my knowledge it has been done this way in the past.

Parliament is negotiating a contract, Mr. Speaker. Parliament, by passing this legislation, will determine the wage structure of the controllers and some of their conditions of work. It is rewriting their contract of employment retroactively, I presume, to January 1 of this year. Therefore parliament is negotiating their contract. Unfortunately we do not have the facts on which we can negotiate such a contract. We are not expert enough to negotiate it, and there is nobody sitting on the other side of the table, as it were. I do not think the government and the opposition should be asked to make a settlement on behalf of a third party, but this is exactly what they are doing.

I am concerned about this question because it seems likely that the Post Office employees will strike, and parliament will also be asked to settle that strike with legislation. That course

is undesirable. Surely that is not the way to settle such strikes. Surely parliament should not be asked to negotiate the terms of a contract for a third party. For that reason I suggest it would have been better to consider this matter in committee. Each of the parties concerned could have been invited to present their side of the dispute to the committee. We could have asked the union to present its side of the story, Treasury Board to present its side, and could have invited members of the public to participate as well. I would have included the public, because its interest is involved, too. But the Minister of Labour did not want to do it this way. He did not want to involve a committee in the negotiations. He thinks such negotiations do not work well, which is why he did not adopt that course.

What are some of the things this bill will do? It speaks of familiarization training, and would establish a wage structure. But we in this House are discussing the classifications of controllers, knowing nothing of such classifications. The President of the Treasury Board suggested that the controllers were entitled to not more than 8 per cent, whether or not they were reclassified.

Normally the question of reclassification does not involve an exclusive advantage to either party in the negotiation. Classifications are usually worked out on the basis of acceptable compromise and are usually founded on increments both sides consider reasonable. Classifications are usually designed to encourage people to assume more responsibility, progressively. You apply for another position, in another classification category, and advance into that category.

Mr. Andras: But classification is not bargainable.

Mr. Peters: The increments are so designed as to encourage people to assume greater responsibility in the new classification. Therefore it is not always to the employee's advantage to move into another category. If he moves into another category with a pay increase, quite often that is not sufficient for the added responsibility. Therefore it is not wise to move.

● (2010)

In my experience in the mining industry, for a long time there were no job classifications. There were a number of set rates. As across the board increases took place, the rates got closer and closer together. It finally reached the point where a qualified miner got approximately ten cents an hour more than his helper. There was no advantage to a helper becoming a runner. For the extra ten cents, he had considerable added responsibility, needed to know more, and was responsible to his partner.

When the classification program was put into effect in my industry, it was mainly for the advantage of the employer. The categories were wide enough apart so that there was an advantage to apply for a higher position. The increment made it worth while. It became advantageous to apply. Quite often classifications are as much to the advantage of the employer as they are to the employee.

In the present case if the whole package had been forwarded to the Anti-Inflation Board they may have looked at the advantage to the employer and the advantage to the employee. They might have found that the 4.6 per cent in the reclassification program would have been equally advantageous to the employer and the employee. Therefore it would not have been an advantageous part of the wage package. They might have granted this on the basis that certain jobs were not being filled because the classification program was not up to date.

There will always be situations where the public is hurt extensively, even to the degree where action by parliament is necessary. However, that ought to be the exception, not the rule. It should not be as the Minister of Transport said, spelling out a number of industries that are not to have the benefit of collective bargaining. If that is so, the public had better be prepared. They will have to be overly generous with those categories that will no longer have to justify their wage increases.

There will have to be paternalism. There will have to be advantages such as there were for many years in some industries. We cannot get into the position that the hospital workers and others in similar categories get into because they were not treated generously or even justly. There were terrific repercussions when they finally got the opportunity to do something on their own.

If we are not going to provide a full bargaining position for workers under federal jurisdiction, we must substitute that with generosity. There must be fairness in our negotiations. That could easily be done in this case. The President of the Treasury Board could say that he agrees the strike must end in a fair and reasonable way, that he will establish an arbitration board and abide by their decision. I am sure the union would do the same.

If this had been done originally, the strike would not have taken place. The fact that it is taking place indicates that the Minister of Transport is saying something else. He is saying to les gens de l'air, "I will give you a pat on the back by using as rough a technique as I can on those who disagree with you." This has been the result.

There has been a great deal of vindictiveness with regard to indicating the government's position. It was willing to follow the legislative road rather than negotiating before the strike took place. The Minister of Labour will agree, I am sure, that in the three days preceding the strike there was a great possibility of further negotiation. It is my guess that the mediators were not asked to negotiate because they might have settled the problem and eliminated the possibility of this confrontation.

There will be a similar confrontation in the fall. We will be faced with the same problem unless the government treats the unions in a fair and equitable way. Rather than making it mandatory that we legislate them back to work if they go on strike, it should provide arbitration which, if impartial, will undoubtedly be accepted by the unions. We should be thinking about that road in our negotiations rather than passing legislation which is the unacceptable exception and which should be

treated with the contempt that it deserves in relation to public negotiations.

Mr. John Rodriguez (Nickel Belt): Mr. Speaker, I was not going to say anything in this debate.

Some hon. Members: hear, hear!

Mr. Rodriguez: In all seriousness, I did not intend to participate in this debate. However, having heard the arguments, I felt that members of parliament were participating with the sword of Damocles hanging over their heads. We were told that there are 55,000 Canadian people sitting in airports waiting to be transported and, somehow or other, we must take this legislation that has been presented and whip it through all stages in the space of 24 hours. That is an insult to any intelligent member of parliament.

Mr. Jarvis: You are insulted easily.

Mr. Rodriguez: I know the Tories do not get insulted easily. They get up and say that they disagree with the government, but they will vote for the legislation. They should be ashamed of themselves.

I intend to say a few words even though it will take a little longer to get to report stage. In any event the bill will move through report stage so quickly it will make your head spin.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Rodriguez: Just watch the show.

I said to myself that we should take our time and look at the legislation properly, so I want to say a few words about the whole process.

● (2020)

An hon. Member: Get it over with, then.

Mr. Rodriguez: First, let me say I am really impressed by the speed with which the government has moved. I am impressed by the speed with which it has moved in the face of the impending strike of the air traffic controllers. You know, Mr. Speaker, I wish it had moved with equal speed last June when the controllers went on a wildcat strike, when they broke the law, when they broke their contract and for ten days held the air travellers of Canada to ransom. But we heard not a peep out of the Tories then, and there was no move by the government. This puts their integrity into question. I suspect the government was playing on the racism which it thinks is present in the minds of the Canadian population. It did not move quickly then to save Canadian air travellers from the inconvenience caused by that strike. This is why I do not think it is incumbent upon me to expedite this legislation and help the government out of the mess in which it finds itself.

We are talking about a legal strike, a strike which has closed down the airports and kept the planes out of the skies, except, of course, for the military aircraft which brought us all here. I would remind hon. members, though, that the air traffic controllers had called for a rotating strike. Under that arrangement passengers would at least have been moved; it would not have been necessary to bus them to New York, Buffalo or anywhere else. I accuse the government of precipitating the air traffic controllers strike. And, having done that, it makes the workers the scapegoats for its mistakes. it does this consistently. That is one point I wish to make and it is directed to the whole question of the government's integrity.

An hon. Member: Oh, come on!

Mr. Rodriguez: If you don't watch your step we shall be here much longer than tonight. My second point is this: I have been here since 1972 and this bill is very different from the others with which members of the school of 1972 have had to deal in terms of sending strikers back to work. For example, I recall the bill ending the rail strike. The measure before us amounts to the imposition of a collective agreement upon a group of workers and it is the first time this has been done since I have been around here. I understand it is the first time that this has ever happened, the first time members of parliament have participated in collective bargaining with government employees. The precedent is a very strong one.

I cannot help recalling the debate which took place here in 1973 when parliament sent the railway workers back to work. I want to refer specifically to a comment made at that time by the then minister of transport, Jean Marchand. In the course of that debate he made an emotional speech during which he said:

> How is the level of wages established? Is it in accordance with a certain rule of justice? No. It is according to the strength of each party.

He went on to ask:

> How are we as members of the House to say what the settlement should be? We cannot say that. The only reason we are here is because there is a national emergency and the only thing we can deal with is that emergency, not the dispute between the parties.

These sentiments are important because they were repeated later in the debate by the present Minister of Labour. He said then—he has changed his mind since:

> If we start negotiating on the floor of this House and make our own subjective judgments instead of leaving it to the other process, the worker may decide he can get a better deal from the parliamentarians . . . why then should he go through the conciliation process?

This is the precedent we have all come to accept as members of parliament, namely, that we cannot participate in the actual negotiating which takes place between the worker and the employer. That is not our responsibility, and in this case the government has reneged on its duty and placed it upon members of parliament who never participated in the face to face negotiations with the workers involved. This being the case, I do not think that I, or anyone in my party, should be concerned with this finagling with the collective bargaining process, especially bearing in mind the precedent the government is setting in this particular bill.

I also heard some shameful statements from government spokesmen. The President of the Treasury Board (Mr. Andras) said the government could not send to the AIB anything which was obviously in excess of the guidelines. Mr.

Speaker, I recall quite well an earlier dispute in which I took an interest. I recall the agreement which was made between the Post Office and the postal workers after the last strike. The increase offered was clearly in excess of the guidelines in every way. It went to the AIB and the AIB rolled it back. So what did Bryce Mackasey, that great friend of the worker do? He took it to the cabinet and the cabinet overruled the AIB. Therefore it seems to me the government has the power to do what is fair and right in a particular situation affecting its employees.

In this instance the government is asking parliament to take it off the hook and save its skin. Well, if the people of Canada do not get the story properly through the media, it is not my fault or the fault of my colleagues in this party. I have described exactly what the government is doing. It is shirking its responsibility. Which brings me to the other question in my mind—what is the explanation for this, what is the reason behind it?

It is no secret whatsoever that the cabinet is top heavy with right wingers. Things have a tendency to sneak up. It is not surprising the hon. member for Crowfoot (Mr. Horner) should be able to find a home there—in fact he is to the left of most of them. Perhaps I am unduly suspicious, but sometimes I think there is a Machiavellian move under way. The Minister of Transport was interviewed on Sunday morning on a CBC program—I know he is going around saying he was misquoted, but these words are taken from the transcript of the program. He is quoted as having said:

● (2030)

. . . in cases like this (the air controllers' strike) we are going to have to very seriously consider whether or not that right to strike is at all appropriate.

The government is sensing a mood left by the National Citizens' Coalition. One only has to take a look at the ad placed in the *Globe and Mail* this morning indicating that there ought to be a removal of the right to strike in the public sector. One has to give the Minister of Transport credit for sensing the public mood.

Mr. Benjamin: That was one of their boys.

Mr. Rodriguez: Yes, he is the honorary president of the National Citizens' Coalition. Because he is sensing that mood, we are finding this right wing shift of the cabinet and the government in trying to absorb all the Tories' natural allies and supporters.

Mr. Benjamin: Right on. The Tories have had it.

Mr. Rodriguez: In effect, that is where he is headed. There was another article in this morning's *Globe and Mail* under the name of Geoffrey Stevens.

Mr. Benjamin: Who is he?

Mr. Rodriguez: I suspect he is the mouthpiece for some insider in the bureaucracy or in the cabinet.

An hon. Member: The NDP Party.

[Mr. Rodriguez.]

Mr. Rodriguez: He is promoting that same sort of philosophy through the media and across the country.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: The NDP has no mouthpiece.

Mr. Rodriguez: Yes, we have Lubor Zink.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: The NDP has no mouthpiece, only a mouth.

Mr. Rodriguez: It seems to me that is what is afoot. They are trying to remove the right to strike from the public sector. They want us to return to the past.

The right to strike is a basic right of the worker. It is the only thing he has. The challenge is to embark on a collective bargaining process, and the challenge is to stick with the issue throughout the process to a successful conclusion. To have the right to strike removed takes away the right to collective bargaining, which is the basic right of workers no matter where they live or work.

When I was teaching school I was told that school teachers were essential workers. One year in North York in Toronto the garbage collectors went on strike. They were not supposed to be essential workers, but with every passing day they became more essential. It was interesting to see the transformation in the newspapers and the media. They were talking about the removal of their right to strike.

Mr. Benjamin: Remove the garbage from the media.

Mr. Rodriguez: The government has suddenly discovered it has a problem on its hands with respect to collective bargaining and the air traffic controllers. I am an unbiased person when it comes to judging the Liberal government.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Rodriguez: The hon. member for Parry Sound-Muskoka (Mr. Darling) is aware of the fact that I am serious about that. I am an objective person when it comes to the government's performance. We are heading toward a serious situation right now, and I am referring to the postal workers. We are faced with the same evasive tactics—

An hon. Member: Order.

Mr. Rodriguez: I am sure that in the middle of the fall this year we will be here debating legislation putting the next group of workers back to work, which will be the Canadian Union of Postal Workers.

Where is the good faith bargaining when we have a government which is committed to taking the easy way out by using parliament to legislate workers back to their jobs before they are in a strike position? It seems to me that has been circumvented completely.

As I have pointed out and as other speakers have pointed out, the question of parliament putting into effect a collective agreement for the workers is contrary to the precedents of this House. It is something which has never been done before.

Knowing how this government can take a precedent and write it all the way to kingdom come, I am afraid this is just a first. Shortly down the road it will be the postal workers, the letter carriers' union, and then the entire public sector will be devoid of any meaningful collective bargaining. I object to that. I object to what that is doing to the workers and the collective bargaining process.

At this particular time the government is talking about tripartism, sitting down to work things out, discussing and coming to agreements. But without any sort of meaningful collective bargaining, the government slipped a bill into this House which will superimpose a collective agreement on a group of workers. Thus, I do not hesitate when I say that my party opposes the action of the government in relation to this particular situation with the air traffic controllers. We will give evidence of the position we have taken by voting against it when the bill finally comes to a vote.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): All those opposed to the motion will please say nay.

Some hon. Members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Call in the members.

The House divided on the motion (Mr. Munro (Hamilton East)), which was agreed to on the following division:

(*Division No. 105*)

YEAS

Messrs.

Alkenbrack	Blaker	Cossitt
Anderson	Blouin	Cyr
Andras (Port Arthur)	Breau	Danson
Andre (Calgary Centre)	Caccia	Darling
Andres (Lincoln)	Cafik	Daudlin
Baker (Gander-Twillingate)	Campagnolo (Mrs.)	Dawson
Baker (Grenville-Carleton)	Caron	De Bané
Baldwin	Clark (Rocky Mountain)	Demers
Basford	Clarke (Vancouver Quadra)	Dinsdale
Beatty	Clermont	Dionne (Kamouraska)
Béchard	Coates	Dionne (Northumberland-Miramichi)
Bégin (Miss)	Comtois	Duclos
	Condon	Dupras
	Corbin	Duquet
	Corriveau	
Ellis	Lamontagne	Munro (Hamilton East)
Ethier	Landers	Nowlan
Fleming	Lang	Oberle
Francis	Laniel	O'Connell
Fraser	Laprise	O'Sullivan
Gauthier (Roberval)	Lavoie	Paproski
Gauthier (Ottawa-Vanier)	Lawrence	Patterson
Gillespie	Leblanc (Laurier)	Pigott (Mrs.)
Gillies	LeBlanc (Westmorland-Kent)	Pinard
Goodale	Lee	Prud'homme
Goyer	Lessard	Railton
Gray	Loiselle (Saint-Henri)	Reid
Guay (St. Boniface)	MacDonald (Cardigan)	Reynolds
Guay (Lévis)	Macdonald (Rosedale)	Ritchie
Haidasz	MacDonald (Miss) (Kingston and the Islands)	Roy (Laval)
Halliday	MacEachen	Rynard
Hargrave	MacFarlane	Sauvé (Mrs.)
Harquail	MacGuigan	Scott
Herbert	Macquarrie	Sharp
Hnatyshyn	Maine	Smith (Saint-Jean)
Horner	Marceau	Stanfield
Howie	Marchand	Stevens
Huntington	Marshall	Stewart (Cochrane)
Hurlburt	Martin	Stollery
Isabelle	McCain	Tessier
Jarvis	McGrath	Trudeau
Jelinek	McIsaac	Trudel
Joyal	McKinley	Turner
Kempling	McKinnon	Watson
Knowles (Norfolk-Haldimand)	McRae	Whelan
Lachance	Milne	Wood
Lajoie		Yewchuk
Lalonde		Young—139.
Lambert (Edmonton West)		

NAYS

Messrs.

Benjamin	Firth	Orlikow
Broadbent	Gilbert	Peters
Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands)	Hogan	Rodriguez
	Jones	Symes—12.
	Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre)	

● (2110)

After the taking of the vote:

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. During the taking of the vote Mr. Condon rose in his place and was recognized and recorded as Mr. Collenette. The record will be appropriately corrected to show Mr. Condon as having voted.

And the result of the vote having been announced:

Mr. Speaker: I therefore declare the motion carried.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and the House went into committee thereon, Mr. Laniel in the chair.

The Chairman: Order, please. House in committee of the whole on Bill C-63, to provide for the continuation of air traffic control services. Shall clause 2 carry?

On clause 2—Definitions.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Prud'homme: Mr. Chairman, I just want to draw your attention to the fact that there is a disagreement between the English and the French versions of clause 2. We should place

the words "collective agreement" elsewhere, as well as "employee and employee organization". All I want to say is that the English version does not correspond to the French version.

● (2120)

The Chairman: Order, please. I would point out to the hon. member that as usual the definitions in bills are placed in alphabetical order, both in the French version and in the English version; the French definition does not necessarily come in the same order as the English version, but it can be found further down.

[*English*]

Clause agreed to.

On clause 3—Notice to be given.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Speaker, I note a difference in the French version, in clause 3(2). The words "les fonctions de son emploi" are missing, so I suggest that clause 3 be amended by striking out line 10 at page 2 of the French version and substituting the following therefor:

dre, selon le cas, les fonctions de son emploi.

[*English*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. It is my interpretation that the amendment proposed by the minister is more in the terminology than otherwise. I think it should be considered more as a printing correction than an amendment. The sense is exactly the same. That may be an easier way of solving the problem. Is there unanimous consent to make the correction and accept the interpretation of the minister?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 3 as amended agreed to.

On clause 4—Return to work not to be denied and employees not to be disciplined.

Mr. Broadbent: Mr. Chairman, the central point that we made in the second reading stage of the debate in outlining our opposition to this iniquitous piece of legislation—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Broadbent: I wish the Liberal backbenchers would get back to their serious work which is writing newsletters to their constituents.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Broadbent: I am sorry, I am probably giving them more credit than they are due. I know it is difficult for Liberal backbenchers to take the civil liberties of Canadians seriously, but some of us are actually trying to practice what we preach.

I said earlier that we oppose this legislation because there is one central part of the package that is objectionable. It is objectionable on the grounds that there was a proposition that according to two legitimate interpretations of the anti-inflation law which is in force in Canada now, it would be possible to conclude that the contract proposal put forward by CATCA, which included a wage increase related to reclassification, was a legitimate one and, second, that such a proposal would not be consistent with the law—

[Mr. Prud'homme.]

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): What clause are you dealing with?

Mr. Broadbent: Clause 5.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): We are on clause 4

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Shall clause 4 carry?

Some hon. Members: Carried.

Clause agreed to.

On Clause 5—Term of collective agreement extended.

Mr. Fraser: Mr. Chairman, I shall be brief. Consistent with the position I took this afternoon, clause 5(4) indicates that while there is provision for aspects of the schedule as presented in this bill to be altered before an arbitrator, there is a limitation placed on what that arbitrator can do. The arbitrator is confined to making such internal changes in the schedule as he may see fit, but not to allow the aggregate amount allowed under that schedule to be changed.

My point is that we believe it is appropriate that the argument that these prevail, and there was plenty of discussion on that this afternoon and tonight, to the effect that there is an arguable case for a larger amount to be claimed, that the amount over the schedule which is still to be argued ought to be put before an arbitrator because it is against the principles that have been enunciated and confirmed on both sides of the House that this House should determine the final terms of settlement of back to work legislation. As a consequence I move, seconded by the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton:

That subsection 5(4) at page 3 be amended by striking out lines 28 to 32 thereof and substituting therefor the following:

"Of pay and any such variation is binding on the parties to the collective agreement to which this Act applies."

● (2130)

The Chairman: Perhaps while the Chair considers the acceptability of the amendment the committee could hear the Leader of the New Democratic Party with regard to another proposed amendment to which the hon. member referred earlier in his remarks.

Mr. Fraser: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, I ask the courtesy of the House so that I can clarify one point. The object of the amendment I have put forward is to enable the arbitrator to increase the total amount payable under the schedule and change the specific items under the schedule. Nonetheless, our interpretation of the bill, as it would then stand, is that the result would still be subject to the ruling of the Anti-Inflation Board.

The Chairman: I do not disagree with the hon. member's point of view but I must be guided by the rules and precedents of the House. I have to be guided by one citation in particular—the hon. member will find it in both May and Beauchesne in different words. But it reads in Beauchesne's citation, 246(3) as follows:

> The guiding principle in determining the effect of an amendment upon the financial initiative of the Crown is that the communication to which the royal demand or recommendation is attached must be treated as laying down once for all (unless withdrawn and replaced) not only the amount of a charge but also its objects, purposes, conditions and qualifications.

I am seeking to determine whether the wording of the amendment might have an effect which is contrary to this citation.

Mr. Fraser: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. On the notice paper the recommendation reads:

> His Excellency the Governor General recommends to the House of Commons the appropriation of public revenue under the circumstances, in the manner and amounts and for the purposes set out in a measure entitled "An Act to provide for the continuation of air traffic control services".

That is a very general order and, besides, there is nothing specific in the legislation to determine the exact amount of money required. This is not in any ordinary sense a money bill. The thrust of the legislation is to require a return to work of employees within a bargaining unit who are legally on strike. The bill sets out certain terms in accordance with which remuneration would be worked out. If, in dealing with legislation of this sort, no amendment can be made by members of the House of Commons, I can only say we have been brought back here from all parts of the country at great public expense to little purpose. The government is telling us, in effect: do not suggest that there should be any amendment to the bill.

The citation the Chair has just read suggests that the House is completely unable to effect any amendment to this legislation, the intent of which is to return to work, under certain conditions, people who are legally on strike. The thrust of clause 5(4) is to establish a means of working out by arbitration adjustments in a certain schedule. The principle we want recognized is that there ought to be no limits to the aggregate amount in that schedule, and in the absence of anything specific in the order or in the legislation I would ask you, Mr. Chairman, to find that the citation which you have read from Beauchesne is not applicable in this case.

The Chairman: I do not disagree with the purpose the hon. member is seeking to achieve but I have to be guided by the terms of the recommendation and it is impossible for the Chair to dissociate the recommendation from the bill. Clause 5(4) sets a limitation upon the arbitrator. It would allow him to make changes as long as the aggregate compensation provided for by the schedule was not altered in total. The hon. member's amendment seems, in my view, to open the door to the expenditure of more money. If the hon. member is able to convince me otherwise, I am willing to accept the amendment. Indeed, if there is any doubt in my mind I am ready, with some reservations, to let the committee decide.

Mr. Fraser: Let me draw this to your attention, Mr. Chairman, with respect. In 1973, when the House considered a bill to provide for the return to work of railway workers, amendments which changed the basis of the payments were found acceptable. The difference, of course, was that the dispute on that occasion concerned a private corporation. Nevertheless, the principle is the same. The process of debating this matter and considering the legislation becomes very ineffectual indeed should Your Honour follow the course which you may feel is necessary on the narrow basis of the precedent just read to the House.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): I do not intend to deal at any length with the argument advanced by my hon. friend as to the breadth of the Royal recommendation which, framed as it is, really places an iron band around the legislation. If Your Honour rules in the way which you seem inclined to do at the moment we shall find it almost impossible to make an amendment, and having regard to our tradition perhaps you ought to consider carefully whether it is acceptable to limit our deliberations upon a statute in such a way because of the nature of the Royal recommendation.

There is another point I wish to make. It has to do with Your Honour's concern that the amendments might increase the amount of money directly payable under the bill. In my view, that is not the case. The amendment would not increase the amount of money directly payable under the bill. It allows steps to be taken which are already provided for by statute and in the estimates whereby the government would negotiate with the union, if necessary see that an arbitrator is appointed and, in the end, arrange for a hearing by the AIB.

● (2140)

The settlement being enacted by the bill sets the floor, but the amendment would allow other steps to take place. If any increase were permitted, it would be paid from the contingency fund established for that program and that purpose. The amendment does not sanction expenditures as such. It removes a discriminatory clause which would deny to one particular group the opportunities for arbitration and the opportunities for appeal which are already sanctioned by statute and the estimates which would apply to any other public service union not affected by the direct legislation.

The provision to encompass that with which Your Honour is concerned is already there but with this legislation in the form in which it is, unlike any other union in the public service, this union cannot take advantage of it. For those reasons I hope Your Honour could direct his mind away from finding the amendment an improper one.

The Chairman: I wish to thank the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton who has made some very interesting points. The first one concerning the Royal recommendation is something the Chair should consider in this type of situation. At the same time, the second point referred to the existing statute which permits negotiation and the provision of moneys for these negotiations upon settlement of labour disputes. If I accept the

amendment in its present form, after these arguments, I wish to warn the committee not to consider the acceptance of this amendment as an open door to any kind of other amendments, especially on the first point basing ourselves on the wide scope of a Royal recommendation. Therefore I am accepting the amendment, and I will put it to the committee.

Mr. Broadbent: Mr. Chairman, may I rise on a point of order?

The Chairman: Does the hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby wish to speak on the amendment? I have to put the amendment. Does he wish to speak on the procedural debate?

Mr. Broadbent: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order and in so doing I want to indicate to the spokesman for the conservative party that we have every intention of supporting what we regard as a very sensible and just amendment. I am rising simply to indicate that we have prepared an amendment which might more adequately come to grips with the same problem. It happens to come earlier in the bill, and I should like to put it before the committee. Then the Chairman can rule whichever way he wants in regard to having the vote on one rather than the other. Our amendment comes earlier in the same clause. I should like to move it now, and then it will be up to the Chair to decide whether we should vote on the one which comes first in terms of time or on the one that comes first in terms of sequence of the bill.

The Chairman: Order, please. The hon. member should allow the chair to put the amendment moved by the hon. member for Vancouver South in front of the committee. The way is open for him to present another amendment. Normally his amendment would be voted upon first if it is listed before or if it refers to a previous paragraph of the same clause. However, I will have to look at his amendment and decide upon it at that time. Moving away from our normal procedure and knowing there is another amendment to be presented by the hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby, I hope the committee will bear with me as I invite the hon. member to present his amendment in order for me to decide which amendment will be considered first, and then I will ask the committee to make its decision on either one of the two.

Mr. Broadbent moved:

That paragraph (a) of subclause (3) of clause 5 be amended by adding immediately thereafter, at the end of line 5 on page 3 of Bill C-63, the following words:

"provided, however, that the matter of increasing these rates of pay to amounts not greater than the minimum proposals made by the employee organization shall be referred to an independent arbitrator whose findings shall be binding with effect from January 1, 1977."

If I may speak to the amendment, I want to return to—

Some hon. Members: Order!

The Chairman: I thought the hon. member's amendment, although it was in regard to the same clause, might have a different implication than the amendment presented by the hon. member for Vancouver South. Because of the fact that both amendments try to achieve about the same thing, a decision will have to be made by the committee on the first amendment moved by the hon. member for Vancouver South.

[The Chairman.]

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

The Chairman: Does the hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby wish to rise on a point of order regarding this matter?

Mr. Broadbent: No, I do not wish to rise on a point of order. I assume we are continuing the debate.

The Chairman: The hon. President of the Privy Council.

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Chairman, might I suggest to the committee that under the provisions of Standing Order 6(5) we interrupt the proceedings to ask for an extension of the sitting of the House for the purpose of further consideration of this bill?

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

The Chairman: Order, please. In view of the request of the hon. minister, it is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 6(5)(a), to interrupt the proceedings of the committee of the whole in order to permit the House to make a decision on the motion proposed by the hon. minister.

Progress reported.

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the request which has just been made by the President of the Privy Council (Mr. MacEachen), I should like to move, pursuant to Standing Order 6(5):

That this House continue sitting beyond the ordinary time of daily adjournment this day for the purpose of continuing the consideration of Bill C-63, an act to provide for the continuation of air traffic control services.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. All hon. members are aware of Standing Order 6(5) which relates to such a motion to extend the hours of sitting for the purpose of considering a piece of legislation or an order that is under consideration. Upon putting the question, the Chair shall inform hon. members, as mentioned in paragraph (b) of the Standing Order, that those members who object to the motion shall rise in their place. If ten members or more rise, the motion shall be deemed to have been withdrawn. Otherwise, the motion shall have been adopted. The hon. member for Grenville-Carleton (Mr. Baker) on a point of order.

● (2150)

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): I have listened very carefully, Mr. Speaker, and I thought I caught correctly the words of the motion put by the parliamentary secretary which were broad and all-encompassing, and could be deemed to carry with them committee stage and third reading to be completed this evening. I should like the assurance that, while this

happens to be a worth-while objective, it is not the purport of this particular matter.

Mr. MacEachen: That is correct.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): I see the President of the Privy Council (Mr. MacEachen) is nodding his head.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: If the hon. member, before raising the point of order, had given me the chance to put the question he would perhaps have had his answer. The motion does not relate to any such indication. I would therefore put it to the House at this time. It has been moved under Standing Order 6(5) by the Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Goodale), seconded by the hon. member for Saint John-Lancaster (Mr. Landers):

That this House continue sitting beyond the ordinary time of daily adjournment this day for the purpose of continuing the consideration of Bill C-63, an act to provide for the continuation of air traffic control services.

All those opposed to the motion will please rise. I declare the motion carried.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Speaker, I should like to propose a motion under the provisions of Standing Order 44. I move:

That notwithstanding any Standing Order Bill C-63 may be proceeded with at any number of stages this day.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. Although the Chair identifies some disposition among the majority of the members to agree, I have some hesitation as to the time of moving the motion knowing that the House came out of committee for the purpose of agreeing to a motion by the minister to extend the hours of sitting beyond the normal hours to consider a certain piece of legislation. I have some hesitation about the minister taking advantage of the same opportunity to move a motion under Standing Order 44 and I am ready to accept some argument on that. I also wish to mention to the minister that this motion is debatable and could be debated for an hour.

Mr. MacEachen: On that point, Mr. Speaker, I did consider the very point you have raised before deciding to take this course of action. The Standing Order is very clear. It says that "a Minister of the Crown may, at any time when Mr. Speaker is in the Chair, propose a motion". It does not surround the moment of proposing this motion with any conditions. The plain fact is that the Speaker is in the Chair and the Standing Order plainly says "at any time".

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I must admit that the words "at any time" are fairly convincing. I will therefore put the motion to the House. Under this Standing Order the same rule would apply, namely, that ten members would have to stand for the motion to be withdrawn. The motion still remains, of course, debatable. The Pesident of the Privy Council (Mr. MacEachen), seconded by the President of Treasury Board (Mr. Andras), moves:

That notwithstanding any Standing Order Bill C-63 may be proceeded with at any number of stages this day.

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Mr. Leonard C. Jones (Moncton): Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that this is not one of the motions contemplated by this Standing Order. There are other provisions in the Standing Orders having to do with three readings in the same day. I suggest that the minister of the Crown who moved the motion did not indicate in the motion or the preamble thereto that there was any special urgency for third reading tonight.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I think the hon. member for Moncton (Mr. Jones) has the right to be heard at this time.

Mr. Jones: The very Standing Order under which the minister purports to make his motion provides that he is supposed to indicate something which he did not indicate, namely, that there was a serious and urgent matter here. If this motion is to have any effect, this should have been done. Furthermore, in order to have three readings in one day the legislation must deal with an extraordinary matter. Is it extraordinary? I suppose it is to re-write in a few hours an agreement reached by a bargaining unit. I think the minister's motion is strictly out of order on several grounds and it should not be entertained. I object to it very strongly.

Some hon. Members: Question.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I must bring to the attention of the hon. member that the motion is already in front of the House and that a decision has been rendered by the Chair, rightly or wrongly, which has not been tested in due time. If no other member wishes to speak to the motion I will put the question on the motion.

Mr. John Rodriguez (Nickel Belt): Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that we have a bill here which is before committee of the whole. As we go through the bill we find ministers bobbing up like jack rabbits out of hats pointing out that certain parts of the bill do not coincide, that the French version does not coincide with the English, and vice-versa. It seems to me we are proceeding with undue haste. Moving quickly to deal with all stages out of hand without making a decision after we finish committee stage of the bill seems to me rather precipitately giving power to the government to move all stages this evening. It seems to me that is not the way to deal with this serious matter of putting into force a collective agreement for a group of workers. If members of parliament let the government escape with this kind of sleight of hand under this particular Standing Order, I do not think we would be serving the purposes for which we have been elected and for which we are debating this bill here tonight.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. Members: Question.

• (2200)

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: No members having risen, I declare the motion carried.

The House will now resume in committee of the whole for the consideration of the bill.

House again in committee of the whole, Mr. Laniel in the chair.

[*Translation*]

The Chairman: When the committee interrupted its proceedings, it was studying Clause 5.

[*English*]

Shall the amendment moved by the hon. member for Vancouver South carry?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Broadbent: Mr. Chairman, I want to speak in support of the amendment before the committee. I hope that we can have a minimum of procedural hassles and deal with the substance of the issue which is embedded in the hon. member's amendment. The point at stake here is not whether X amendment or Y amendment passes or fails. One hopes that the substance that the opposition parties want to have in this measure carries in the House.

In supporting the amendment I want to indicate the reasons why we do so.

Mr. Chairman, I wonder if you can get some order on the government side in this rather important debate.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Broadbent: This afternoon we heard a serious speech by the President of the Treasury Board in which he tried to come to grips with the argument that the point made in CATCA's proposal that reclassification, which is embedded in this bill and in the agreement, should not be a consideration for a further increase in salary. I would like to deal with that argument and deal in point form with the issues that the President of the Treasury Board raised, because in my view the argument raised by the President of the Treasury Board—and specifically the conclusion that he drew—is a false conclusion, and since that is central to the whole dispute between CATCA and the Treasury Board, it is central to the decision that we will reach here in discussing the legislation today, and it is the point to which the amendment that we are now considering hopes to provide a solution.

The issue is whether or not the reclassification of the members of CATCA should entitle them to a legitimate understanding that the AIB would accept their reclassification as warranting an extra 4 per cent or 5 per cent in income. I would like to put on the record the following considerations in support of their claim, which is all that is required for submission to the AIB, and it is that precisely which the government has denied.

During the period from June 6, 1975, to January 13, 1976, there were no fewer than six letters exchanged between the Department of Transport and CATCA concerning reclassification. Earlier this afternoon the minister selected two of these letters and had them tabled. I submit that if one wants to look at all six letters, what one will find in that exchange of correspondence between the union and the Department of Transport is an agreement that the issue of reclassification is of fundamental importance and should be a matter of continuing negotiation between the government and the union.

I want to make the case beyond that, but for our purpose I think it is sufficient to have a reading of those six letters to agree—the President of the Treasury Board would agree with that conclusion if he were here—that there was acceptance on both sides that reclassification, which has not been done in that industry since 1966, was a matter of serious concern leading to the present negotiation. That is the first point.

The second point is perhaps of even greater importance to the acceptance of the idea that reclassification is central to the dispute, and that is that the government, in the contract that it has been willing to sign with CATCA, has indicated not only a willingness to accept 10 per cent, 20 per cent or 40 per cent of the reclassification areas but has indicated it will accept 100 per cent. There has been agreement between the union and the government on 100 per cent of the cases involving reclassification which, I submit, has come about precisely because there was agreement going back some years before the controls system came into being on the need for such reclassification.

The third point I would add is that the government's own additional acceptance, repeated by Treasury Board officials, repeated by some ministers, if my memory serves me correctly, and indeed repeated at the press conference yesterday by the Prime Minister, of the idea that if both packages were submitted to the AIB—namely, the one that the government thinks is desirable, and the one that is about 5 per cent higher that CATCA thinks is desirable—and AIB accepted the higher one, the government would go along with it. I submit that it would go along with it precisely because it has accepted the idea of reclassification.

Reclassification is central to the dispute. It goes back, in terms of discussion, debate and correspondence between the union and the government, to a period preceding the establishment of the controls. But above and beyond that, I do not rest the case on that issue—the case in favour of sympathetic consideration of the principle that reclassification should be accepted as justifying a further increase. I would say it rests on the fact that nowhere in the law as it now exists in Canada is it

spelled out what procedures are necessary to make reclassification acceptable under the guidelines.

● (2210)

Secondly, in the guidelines themselves and in a whole series of bulletins which have been issued by the AIB, at no point is it spelled out how the AIB is to determine whether a reclassification argument is germane and acceptable. Nowhere is it spelled out in any of the regulations or instructions from the AIB that prior discussions between the union and the government have to conclude with a written commitment. Nowhere is it spelled out in the regulations that a written commitment on the part of the government or on the part of any two bodies, whether we are talking about the private sector or the public sector, is a necessary criterion for acceptance by the AIB and for the reclassification argument to hold. I think that is central to the argument.

I notice that the President of the Treasury Board is talking to some of his officials, and I hope that he will come back into the debate tonight and respond to that issue. Does he agree that it is not spelled out in the law? Does he agree that it is not spelled out in the regulations? He says we have a case law situation in which the AIB has made some rulings on reclassification. I say to the minister that I know of only one such ruling. There may be more, but one is hardly enough upon which to generalize.

In light of the absence of all these tests of written regulations and of written law, why is the government so reluctant to have the issue go before the AIB and to allow the AIB to settle it? That really is the nub of CATCA's position. That really is the point of the amendment of the Conservative party at this stage of the bill. That really has been the central case we have made during this debate.

I want to conclude by saying that if the point which is attempted to be dealt with in this amendment had been accepted by the government two weeks ago or three weeks ago there would be no striking going on in Canada now, airplanes would be flying and members of parliament would be back in their constituencies or elsewhere instead of attending this unnecessary session we are now going through. I urge that the government give serious consideration to accepting this amendment put forward by the Conservative party, and I say on behalf of my colleagues that we will certainly support it.

Mr. Rodriguez: Mr. Chairman, I want to ask some questions relating to clause 5 and a couple of subclauses within clause 5. I presume it would be in order to do so at this time.

The Chairman: The questions would have to relate to the amendment or to the objective of the amendment which is before us. I think it would be simpler to dispose of the amendment. That would leave the opportunity for all kinds of questions regarding clause 5. Is the committee ready for the question?

Some hon. Members: Question.

The Chairman: The question is on the amendment of the hon. member for Vancouver South.

Amendment (Mr. Fraser) negatived: Yeas, 41; nays, 72.

The Chairman: I declare the motion negatived. The hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby gave the Chair notice of another amendment, which I will put to the committee under the same condition as the first one.

Mr. Broadbent moved:

That paragraph (a) sub-clause (3) of clause 5 be amended by adding immediately thereafter, at the end of line 5 on page 3 of Bill C-63, the following words:

"provided, however, that the matter of increasing these rates of pay to amounts not greater than the minimum proposals made by the employee organization shall be referred to an independent arbitrator whose findings shall be binding with effect from January 1, 1977.".

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Chairman, clause 5 really represents the part of this legislation to which we are most violently opposed, and the amendment moved by the hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby seeks to rectify what we think to be an iniquitous part of this legislation. As the leader of this party and my colleagues who spoke at second reading of the bill have said, we support the legislation to put the air traffic controllers back to work.

In the past 15 years I recall at least five occasions when back-to-work legislation has been introduced. The New Democratic Party supported that legislation because we recognized that it was in the national interest to bring strikes which were disrupting our entire economy to an end.

All members in this House from all parties have paid lip service through the years to the basic principles of labour legislation in a democracy: first, the right to bargain collectively regarding wages, hours and conditions of labour; and second, the right of a worker to withhold his or her services. However, we have recognized also that there have been situations in which either employers or employees collectively have abused the powers given to them in a free society, or created situations which became intolerable in terms of the public welfare. Therefore there are times when it is necessary to introduce legislation which will send workers back to their jobs. But in every piece of legislation for sending workers back to the job, which I can recall, we have not endeavoured to do what clause 5 of the present bill seeks to do.

● (2220)

Clause 5 actually seeks to impose a collective agreement by legislation. It would be bad enough if a private employer did it; but when the government, the employer, lays down terms upon which its own employees shall work and asks parliament to endorse those terms, that, I say, is the negation of industrial democracy in this country. The purpose of clause 5 is to put in legislative form the proposals, which the Minister of Transport (Mr. Lang) and the President of the Treasury Board (Mr. Andras) laid before the air traffic controllers. The ministers involved are the judge and jury passing judgement on the

dispute, and the government asks the House to be the executioner.

Mr. Fraser: Right on.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): When parliament takes from people their basic right to free, collective bargaining and their right to withhold services, it has the responsibility to give them something in exchange. In every piece of legislation I have seen in the last 15 years ordering workers back to work, parliament has given, in exchange, an independent arbitrator or arbitration board.

In the case of the railway workers we said, in the legislation, that the offer made by the employer would be the floor below which the arbitrator could not go in making his recommendation.

What are we doing in the present case? The government is asking parliament to impose on the government's own employees terms and conditions the government has concocted, without regard to a reference to an impartial, independent body. This is the negation of everything the Liberal party has professed to stand for when, across this country, it has spoken of its faith in collective bargaining and the right of workers to withhold their services.

The point at issue in clause 5, to which my leader moved an amendment, is simple. As the President of the Treasury Board admitted this afternoon, the issue comes down to one thing, whether increased wages which may have to be paid on the basis of a reclassification to which both the government and the air traffic controllers agreed would come under the ceiling of the Anti-Inflation Board guidelines.

The minister said this afternoon that the government had worked out what the Anti-Inflation Board would be prepared to approve and had therefore put that in the legislation. I submit that the government has no more competence to foresee what the Anti-Inflation Board will decide than you or I have, Mr. Chairman. Who are they to presume what the Anti-Inflation Board will decide? Parliament set up the Anti-Inflation Board on the assumption it had the competence and experience to make these decisions. It is not up to the government to make these decisions, and then say what the Anti-Inflation Board would do.

Who can tell this House what the Anti-Inflation Board will do? The Board has changed some of the agreements the government entered into with its own employees. That shows you that the government assumed wrongly what the Anti-Inflation Board would decide. The Board announced that maximum increases of $2,400 a year would be paid to professional groups, but last year the average increase over the previous year for professional groups was $4,900, and in some categories, $7,200. Could anybody foresee that the Anti-Inflation Board would make that kind of decision? Could anyone foresee that it would allow the salary of the president of Kaiser Resources Limited to rise by $60,000, not $2,400? Was anyone to assume that the Anti-Inflation Board would make such a decision? Yet here is the government saying that in its wisdom, in its omniscience, it knows what the Anti-Inflation Board will decide, and it is therefore writing into the legislation what the employees will get.

The Prime Minister, if the press reports him correctly, says that we have no right to pass the buck. Neither the government nor any other employer has the right to pass the buck to the Anti-Inflation Board. But the fact is that again and again the government has signed agreements which, when they went before the Anti-Inflation Board, were altered. That has happened with other employers, which is understandable.

Mr. Fraser: And which was expected.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Of course, that is precisely why the Anti-Inflation Board was set up. But I defy anyone to study the regulations, study the board's decisions, and prophesy with exactitude what the board will decide. In clause 5 the government is putting itself in the place of the Anti-Inflation Board.

Mr. Fraser: And the arbitrator.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): We were told in October, 1975, that the government was to set up an anti-inflation board which would be free to make decisions, independent of the government. Now the government says that it will make that decision, and it decides what the Anti-Inflation Board would do in the case of a certain proposal. Perhaps the government does not trust the Anti-Inflation Board's judgment, which is some reflection on its appointees to the Anti-Inflation Board.

So long as the Anti-Inflation Board is in existence, the government has no right to assume what the Board will decide. It has no right to put itself in the place of the Board and say, "We know in advance what the Anti-Inflation Board will do; therefore, parliament must pass legislation to put into effect a collective bargaining agreement which has not been referred to that Board." The hon. member for Vancouver South and the hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby both tried, by way of amendment, to persuade the government to change clause 5.

Without doubt, the workers will go back to work once this bill passes. A number of items in the agreement are not in dispute. But we and the Conservative party have said, in our two amendments, that the matter of wages should be referred to an impartial body and that the government should not force parliament to impose on the government's own employees a collective bargaining agreement devised by the Minister of Transport. This is a much more important principle than some members seem to realize.

● (2230)

In the broadcast "CBC Sunday Morning," the Minister of Transport said that we should be giving serious consideration to whether we should allow strikes in the public sector. If the Minister of Labour and the government have in mind removing the right to strike from public servants, what is going to take its place? From then on we are going to have public servants' wages, hours and conditions of labour determined by

the government and rubberstamped by parliament. That is what is going to happen.

If we pass this legislation as it now stands, we will be establishing a dangerous precedent. We will be saying that from now on not only has parliament the right to send workers back to the job and not only has parliament the right to say the dispute shall be submitted to arbitration, but we are saying that the government can use its majority in parliament arbitrarily and arrogantly to lay down the terms and conditions upon which workers will work.

I submit that not since Abraham Lincoln freed the slaves on this North American continent have people had to work for a wage that was dictated by the employer. If the employer and the employee cannot agree, and there comes a time when the dispute has to be settled and it is to be brought to an end by parliament, the very least the workers of this country are entitled to is that the final disposition of their wages, hours and conditions will be settled by an independent body before which they can appear to plead their case. That right is being denied them under clause 5 of this piece of legislation.

I plead with this committee of the whole to pass this amendment and to do what should have been done in the first place, namely, say to the workers, "Go back to your job and we will let you take your case to an independent body." If the government is prepared to do that, we are prepared to support this legislation. If the government is not prepared to do that, this legislation is not worth the support of any person who believes in the basic principles of democracy.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Rodriguez: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby has proposed an amendment to clause 5 which is the heart and guts of the collective agreement. I am supposed to be knowledgeable about the collective agreement on which I am going to be asked to vote.

Clause 5 raises several questions in my mind. For example, there is the technical language. What are the implications of the categories A11 to A18? Where do the VFR controllers, shift supervisors and unit chiefs fit into this schedule? What do the columns under the rates of A11 to A18 mean? There are nine columns and two sets of figures. What do they constitute?

This is a complicated situation on which hon. members are being asked to vote. This is not as it was in the past. It is not the kind of situation we had with regard to the railway workers. That is the purpose of the amendment by the hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby. In the past the contract or agreement was always sent to an independent arbitrator or body to look at the settlement. In this instance we are being asked to pass a collective agreement.

One has to assume that those who are negotiating the collective agreement have some knowledge with regard to the amounts being agreed on and the terminology. They ought to know, for example, what is meant by familiarization flights in Schedule IV. I have no idea what that means.

We can see from the hour and the attitude of members that they are not the least bit interested in finding out what this means. The Minister of Labour is having a jocular time with his officials. Backbenchers on the government side are not interested in asking questions about this clause. All they are interested in is getting it over with and getting out of here. If that is the kind of collective bargaining in which members of parliament are going to participate, it is a crying shame.

The Minister of Labour likes to cast himself as the friend of labour. However, no friend of labour would set a precedent such as that contained in clause 5. He is a great one for talking about his 14 point program. He should add a fifteenth point. That ought to be that the government should never set precedents by establishing collective agreements through parliament.

Maybe the Minister of Labour ought to direct his attention to eliminating the strike program. There are a lot of other things he should do. This does not indicate that he has an attitude which is open to the trade union movement.

At this time the government is trying to cultivate its friendship with labour. At any rate that was the context of the debate which the minister and I had. He put forward the idea that labour ought to stay loose in the Canadian political scheme so that they can have some influence with the various political parties. It is obvious he has blown that façade. It is obvious that he does not speak for labour in cabinet. The Minister of Transport has taken on that job. He stated over radio and television that we should proceed in the direction of no strikes in essential services.

I want to know how much clause 5 will cost the taxpayers of Canada. How much is this agreement worth in dollars and cents, and what is the total cost of the fringe benefits?

● (2240)

Can the minister explain the meaning of the columns A11 to A18? What are "familiarization flights"? Where do VFR controllers and shift supervisors fit into the schedule? What is meant by "high density U.S.A. units"? Now that I am a bargainer, I want to know what overtime is predicted for air traffic controllers and what this is likely to cost. When I was negotiating with school boards we had to know the facts, and as a negotiator now I want to know these things. I think this is only fair ball. Can the minister explain the rates of pay set out in Schedule I? What do these nine columns of figures mean? Where does experience fit into that scheduling? I should also like an explanation—

The Chairman: Shall the amendment carry?

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Rodriguez: Since this is his bill, I ask the minister for an explanation of this terminology. Indeed, I demand an explanation.

Mr. Munro (Hamilton East): With respect to the terminology the hon. member is talking about in Schedule II, each and

every one of these are items agreed to between the parties themselves prior to this legislation being brought down. I would assume the hon. member would wish to see adopted the very terms to which the controllers have agreed and which, presumably, they wish to be adopted. All those areas in Schedule II are areas where beneficial and constructive collective bargaining went on.

With respect to Schedule I, I am getting an estimate of the over-all cost of the 8 per cent which will amount, roughly, to 8 per cent of the present cost of the salaries of all the controllers in Canada, including their fringe benefits. As far as the eight columns of figures are concerned, these are different steps within each classification, the principles of which have been acknowledged; the parties have been operating under them for some time. The contest came with respect to reclassification, the general upgrading of the various levels within each classification.

I repeat that Schedule II represents what the parties have agreed upon, and Schedule I is a reflection of the apportionment of the 8 per cent total compensation. If the apportionment as set out is not to the satisfaction of the parties, Clause 5 provides for an arbitrator who can be requested by the controllers to decide on a different allocation. I am now in a position to give the hon. member the figure for the total cost. It is $3.8 million in terms of the increase set out in the bill before us.

Mr. Rodriguez: It may be that the minister's bureaucrats have worked this out with CATCA, but since I am now a party to the agreement as a member of parliament I should like to ask certain further questions; it is not enough for the minister to tell us that all this has been agreed to. I have been injected into this situation as a member of parliament, and since I want to vote intelligently upon the matter I need to know these things. Can the minister tell us where "experience" fits in in Schedule I? Can he tell us the number of employees associated with each of the categories mentioned?

Some hon. Members: Question!

Mr. Munro (Hamilton East): As to the number of employees affected in each of the columns of figures, I can supply that information without difficulty. We will get the information to the hon. member shortly.

Mr. Rodriguez: I do not want to be obstreperous, Mr. Chairman—

Some hon. Members: Oh!

Mr. Rodriguez: —but I should like to know, before we vote on this collective agreement, the number of employees involved in each of these categories. I want to know this as a negotiator. For the minister to say he does not have this information handy means he was expecting to push this bill through in a very short period. It is important we should get these figures, that we should be given a breakdown of these employees. Could the minister explain to me as a negotiator what is a "high density U.S.A. unit"? Is that like a low density minister?

Mr. Munro (Hamilton East): If the hon. member wants an explanation of the various terms used in Schedule II, I suggest he has only to start reading them. Perhaps that will enlighten him as to what they mean.

Mr. Rodriguez: It is obvious the minister is not familiar with his own bill. The minister gave us the figures of the cost of Schedule I, the rates of pay. I believe he said the total cost would be $3.8 million.

The Chairman: Order. It occurs to me the hon. member is going far beyond the amendment which is before the committee. The hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby has moved an amendment which is directly related to a settlement. The committee will be considering the schedules at some point. I think the hon. member should try to limit his contribution to the amendment in front of the committee at this time.

● (2250)

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Rodriguez: Perhaps we can deal with the amendment and then we can return to clause 5 and get into specific questions.

As the minister has not spoken since earlier today, I wonder what his reaction is to the amendment of the hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby.

Mr. Munro (Hamilton East): Mr. Chairman, the reason I did not respond is because I thought the President of the Treasury Board explained in some considerable detail precisely what took place in the negotiations which led to the conclusion before us. The total compensation of 8 per cent was based on a conciliation board report which was unanimous. That is not an unusual procedure when we are passing legislation with respect to back to work.

The hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby took exception to my analysis on the basis that what I did not tell the House was that reclassification was beyond the purview of the conciliation board. That is true in the sense that under the Public Service Staff Relations Act classification is not subject to the collective bargaining process and arbitration, which is part of the law passed by parliament. Naturally it is beyond the conciliation board's purview.

The costing of the total compensation of 8 per cent and how it was arrived at was not done by the government itself, as has been suggested by other members of the New Democratic Party. There was the conciliation board, with labour, management and government representation. They were unanimous in recommending a total compensation of 8 per cent in this particular case. What was left in the conciliation board report was the availability of the parties to get together with respect to the apportionment of that 8 per cent.

As the President of the Treasury Board said, when speaking for the negotiators, there was no prior commitment with

respect to reclassification and the level which that would have cost, in terms of 12.6 per cent. There was a unanimous report of the conciliation board before the government came with this bill and the 8 per cent total compensation in this legislation.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Broadbent: Mr. Chairman, that is not an analysis. I say to the minister that that is propaganda.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Broadbent: I have in my hand a copy of the report of the conciliation board which the minister has been proudly reporting on, and which has been so loudly cheered by his yelping backbenchers. The minister keeps reiterating that this report pertains to the 8 per cent settlement. As I thought everyone understood by now, this whole issue concerns reclassification. I should like to quote from page 2 of the report—

An hon. Member: Order.

Mr. Broadbent: Whenever you present the truth to a Liberal, he wants you to shut up.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Broadbent: I say to the backbenchers, who were only listening to the minister, to listen to what the report indicates.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Broadbent: We can stay here all night. We probably will.

Mr. Corbin: That does not bother us.

Mr. Broadbent: Nothing bothers you, brother.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): That is one of your problems, Corbin.

Mr. Corbin: Canadian people love you.

Mr. Broadbent: At page 2 the report reads as follows:

> In the course of the proceedings of this conciliation board the parties engaged in considerable discussion with respect of these two issues. As these matters are beyond the jurisdiction of this board, we make no recommendation with respect to them. However, in view of the fact that these two issues were of paramount importance, we urge the parties to continue their efforts to resolve them.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): There is your answer.

Mr. Gauthier (Ottawa-Vanier): So, what is new?

Mr. Broadbent: In terms of the substance of the minister's argument, this paper does not mean a damn thing and he should know it. It indicates that the two parties should get together, try to work out a solution and make unanimous recommendations on other matters.

Normally on labour matters the minister speaks seriously, and I mean that. If this amendment is passed by this House, it would provide what legislation introduced by the Liberal government during the last ten years always provided, namely, an arbitrator. Back to work legislation has always provided that, since I have been here from 1968. We have not sat down and indicated that all the "t's" have been crossed and all the "i's" have been dotted. Here we are imposing a specific settlement on workers and we are setting up an arbitrator who does not have a ceiling under which to operate. That has never been done before. We propose a specific ceiling which the arbitrator cannot go beyond. The entire point of the amendment is to have an impartial arbitrator who can interpret the legitimacy of CATCA's case.

The minister has stated that the President of the Treasury Board dealt with that argument this afternoon. I say to the minister in all seriousness that I listened to the President of the Treasury Board this afternoon and I—

Mr. Munro (Hamilton East): You were not in the House.

Mr. Broadbent: I was present for the first couple of minutes, and I have since read *Hansard*.

An hon. Member: Where did you get a copy of *Hansard*?

Mr. Broadbent: I have it before me now. I suggest that members of the Liberal party should take the time to read it.

I do not want to waste the time of the House by speaking to the Minister of Labour when he is not listening. I should like to ask him if he is going to reply.

Mr. Munro (Hamilton East): You have got to sit down before I can answer.

Mr. Broadbent: Well, will you listen?

Mr. Munro (Hamilton East): I am listening.

Mr. Broadbent: Prior to this contract coming into being, there was no program pertaining to reclassification, which was the case made by the President of the Treasury Board this afternoon. He also cited two letters. In my reply tonight I indicated there were six letters, and not two letters. In the six letters it was abundantly clear that prior to the controls legislation being passed the government was negotiating with CATCA on the issue of reclassification. Thus, there was a clear understanding between the government and CATCA that reclassification was an issue. I also said that nowhere in AIB law or regulations are there instructions as to what is to be considered as legitimate criteria to apply to the reclassification point for consideration by AIB.

● (2300)

This is an open-ended situation. My point to the President of the Treasury Board, which I am now making to the Minister of Labour, was this: if it is so open-ended in terms both of the law and the regulations, and if they have been talking about changing the classification for over two and a half years, why is the government reluctant to put it to the AIB to decide? That is the question. This amendment would make that possible. It would be open to the arbitrator at least to consider

making a ruling, and then within the framework of the law, which we accept, the AIB could still decide on the arbitrator's recommendation. Therefore I ask the Minister of Labour in all seriousness, what does he have against this amendment, which is fully consistent with past back to work legislation and fully consistent with the spirit and law of the anti-inflation controls program?

Mr. Munro (Hamilton East): Mr. Chairman, I think the hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby indicated, when I told him that this legislation was based on the unanimous report of a conciliation board, that he thought it most unusual that there had not been legislation in this House which had followed that type of procedure, but rather that we had always appointed an arbitrator.

Mr. Broadbent: No.

Mr. Munro (Hamilton East): Well, that is the way I took his remarks and that is the way my colleagues understood them.

Mr. Broadbent: That is not right.

Mr. Munro (Hamilton East): He certainly mentioned that we usually go by way of an arbitrator. Many members around me heard him say that, but we will check the blues. At any rate, I just want to indicate what has been done before. As I said in my opening remarks, with respect to the grain handlers dispute some time ago a single commissioner was appointed, which in terms of procedure is analogous to a conciliation board. He came in with a report and we based our legislation in that dispute, ordering the men back to work, on his recommendations.

Mr. Fraser: No one commended you for that.

Mr. Munro (Hamilton East): I may be wrong; I think the NDP voted for it but I do not think the Conservative party did. That was the Parry recommendations.

Judge Gold was appointed an independent conciliation commissioner in the longshoremen's dispute three years ago. He made recommendations and the legislation was based on those recommendations.

The last item is the legislation which I myself brought in to end the lockout at Halifax. I placed a proposal before the parties which the union had accepted and the company had not. So there has been a variation. We brought in the unanimous report of the conciliation board, and at times when there was no board we brought in the report of an independent commissioner.

I repeat, what we are now doing is bringing in legislation based on the unanimous recommendation of the conciliation board report—

Mr. Fraser: Which excluded the point at issue.

Mr. Broadbent: It deals with the reclassification issue.

[Mr. Broadbent.]

Mr. Munro (Hamilton East): No, it did not. The hon. member indicated in his remarks that everything was agreed upon up to 100 per cent. Does the hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby agree that he did say up to 100 per cent?

Mr. Broadbent: In terms of the reclassification item.

Mr. Munro (Hamilton East): That is not my information. There were in excess of 100 positions concerning which the parties were still trying to arrive at some agreement. That is certainly not subject to arbitration. He knows it and we know it. That is just one of the inaccuracies which we have perceived in what the hon. member talked about. So it is not 100 per cent.

Mr. Broadbent: It is 97.

Mr. Munro (Hamilton East): Well, in excess of 100 positions were still subject to discussions between the parties.

Mr. Broadbent: May I deal with a couple of points which the minister brought up, Mr. Chairman. I think he misunderstood the point I made about an arbitrator being placed at the heart, in a sense, of back to work legislation, given, if you will excuse the word, a Liberal framework within which to work. I am saying that that is totally absent in this legislation. There is a ceiling and the ceiling is the government's own proposal. That is no framework.

The minister referred to the grain handlers dispute and said that the conciliation board was one which consisted of a single commissioner who touched on all the issues and proposed a total package.

Mr. Fraser: That was his argument then.

Mr. Broadbent: Yes, but that is not the argument that I am making. It is true that there was a comprehensive report but there were two important differences in the argument that I am making. First of all, the degree of comprehension is totally absent from the report of the conciliation board which pertained to CATCA; that conciliation board did not deal with the issue at the heart of the dispute, namely, reclassification. In that sense it is irrelevant. My second point is that, if I recall correctly, in the grain handlers dispute there was an arbitrator appointed to pass judgment on the details of the proposal or, if there was not that, on a settlement which was not at the level recommended by the employer. That is exactly what is being done in this case.

Mr. Munro (Hamilton East): I did not say that Judge Gold who was appointed in the longshoremen's dispute was an arbitrator. I said he was a conciliation commissioner. Under the Canada Labour Code there is an option to appoint a conciliation commissioner. If the parties prefer a single person rather than a board, you can appoint a single commissioner. He was a conciliation commissioner, not an arbitrator.

Mr. Broadbent: But he dealt with all the issues.

Mr. Munro (Hamilton East): Yes, he did in many cases. Some were dealt with satisfactorily to the employees and some to the employer, but he dealt with the issues as he saw fit. Where he did not deal with them, the previous provisions in the collective agreement were considered to stand. The commissioner may not deal with the issues in the manner in which the parties perceive should be the case.

Mr. Fraser: Mr. Chairman, I intervene at this stage only to remind the minister that when Judge Gold's report was put to us we were not the employer. Secondly, as the minister well knows, I pointed out at the time that we would accept Judge Gold's report because under the circumstances there was probably nobody else who knew as much about the situation who could write a better report. Let me remind the minister of this, and I am now speaking in support of the NDP motion. As reported in *Hansard* for April 23, 1975, at page 5126, I said:

> I can understand why in this particular instance the minister has chosen the Gold report as the basis of the legislation, but I say it is a dangerous precedent. There should be legislation to restore normalcy as far as work is concerned, but determination of the final terms of settlement should be left to somebody independent of this chamber.
>
> ● (2310)
>
> That is the only proper way to approach this situation, and in the long run only on that basis will both sides of the dispute accept the terms of settlement.

If that is true when we are not the employer, surely it applies a thousand times over when it is the government that is the employer and it is the government that is introducing legislation.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Peters: Mr. Chairman, I have been trying to follow the argument and I am having some difficulty. I gathered from the minister that when the conciliation board met, they handled those problems in the dispute that were within the purview of collective bargaining, and that the classification program and the civil service statutes are some time outside collective bargaining. I understand that some time after the matter was negotiated, the President of the Treasury Board, or whoever was doing the negotiating, agreed to negotiate, in addition to matters that were before the conciliation board, the matter of classification.

Therefore, I wonder how the minister can refer to it as being a unanimous report on the dispute. Because of this, I would like to know from the minister why, when this matter was referred to the conciliation board, the classification matter was not included, when it had been the subject of negotiation for over two years. Why was it not considered part of the negotiation, and at what stage did it become part of the negotiation?

Mr. Munro (Hamilton East): If the hon. member is looking for an answer to that question, the fact of the matter is that the conciliation board is part of the collective bargaining process. Reports are made to it, and parties can come to an agreement. In this case it was decided that this was the appropriate procedure. The government appointed a chairman who was acceptable to both parties. The question of reclassification under the Public Service Staff Relations Act is not part of the collective bargaining process and is not subject to arbitration, so naturally the board could not consider it.

Mr. Peters: How did it become part of the bargaining process? It would seem to me that someone must have decided, somewhere along the line, that it was a matter for collective bargaining and was now part of the conciliation process. As I understand it, it is the only part that is in dispute—yet the conciliation board's report was unanimous.

It seems to me that what is in contention is this other matter. I am sure the minister has been aware for a long time of the many factors that are not normally part of the collective bargaining process. One of them that was nearly always excluded from the collective bargaining in which I was involved was safety, yet a safety committee would be set up which would make suggestions. But if it was not negotiable, it was not referred to a conciliation board. Health plans were also excluded, as were community activities and sports associations. The minister has not indicated to us why for two years we have been negotiating with CATCA matters concerning reclassification if they did not become part of the collective bargaining process.

Could this matter not be referred to the AIB, in any case? It might fit into a different category and not be considered a matter of wages. Under clause 5, the minister has indicated that there is an aggregate amount of about $3,800,000. An arbitrator can make a decision on a particular classification when the two parties grieve. I fail to see how we can write laws which say that the union is allowed to grieve on this matter of classification when the matter is not included under the Public Service Staff Relations Act. What is the turnover, and what are the changes in classification and the stability of personnel?

I gather there are about 2,200 people involved, and if we lost 200 people, although I am not good at mathematics, I imagine it would be about 4 per cent. Without changing the average, we would have the increment which would bring up the classification to 4.2 per cent. We seem to agree that classification is involved and that either the government or the employers' association can object to a classification and start a grievance procedure only to the extent of the aggregate which the minister now informs us is $3,800,000.

It seems to me that this strike took place simply because of the classification program. The matters before the conciliation board were agreed to unanimously. Therefore, that part of it is settled. Now we have this part which was not before the conciliation board, but the minister tells us it is not included in the civil service staff relations act and therefore cannot be considered as a wage factor in collective bargaining. I fail to see what the dispute has been about. Obviously, it must be handled in a way other than collective bargaining. Therefore, I doubt very much if the AIB can be seized with the problem of classification. Obviously, the government has negotiated over a period of time.

I would like to ask the minister what the figures in the schedule mean, if they do not mean classification.

● (2320)

It indicates to me that if you are an A11, you have seven categories of wages. If you go to A12, it is very odd. They are not a continuation, so you cannot say they are continuing. The highest you can rise to in class A11 is $15,785, and you start in A12 considerably below that because you start at $13,551. That seems to me to be a classification. We are negotiating now the classification program which the minister says is illegal to put before a conciliation board in normal negotiations. In A13 there are 14 classifications, the highs and lows in seven categories.

An hon. Member: What about A3?

Mr. Peters: The hon. member has not looked at the bill. There is not any A3. The next one, A13, goes up, not down. These sections in the schedule would not offend you even if you took your shoes off. They would fit in very well. We are discussing a classification.

An hon. Member: No, we are not.

Mr. Peters: Well, I would like to know what these figures are. They certainly are classifications in terms of the office staff in any other category. It may not be what we are talking about.

Mr. Munro (Hamilton East): Mr. Chairman, if I may just answer the hon. member, the rates he sees there and from which he is quoting are the classifications and rates which have already been agreed to and are operative now. They are old classifications.

Mr. Peters: Of course, that is true. They are already agreed to. In other words, we have a classification program. We have this classification in the rate structure of all the public service I know of, and it is almost identical to this. If one knew what the A stood for, one would probably be able to say what category it is equal to in the Department of Transport or in the Department of Labour. The minister probably has civil servants in all these categories. They are classifications. A person can move within one classification to a higher rate; then he can go to another classification. I presume that A11, A12 and A13 are different types of jobs. One may be a controller on VFR. One may be a unit chief or supervisor. One may be a ground control officer or a visual controller at a very small airport operated by the Department of Transport.

I presume that every one of these is a classification, and I would like to know what the minister means when he says that classifications are beyond public service legislation. This was not even referred to a conciliation board.

The minister knows as well as I do that members of parliament do not have classifications. Office staffs may have, but members of parliament do not. They have a set salary, and it is equal for everyone. Additional amounts are added when a member becomes a minister, a parliamentary secretary, or a chairman of a committee, but there are still no classifications in these categories. There is not just one category of controller. Different VFR controllers get different wages. There are a number of categories. In fact there are seven categories, and there are levels in each of those seven categories. It seems to me that we are not being very honest about what a classification is. I am sure that classifications were put before the conciliation board, and I am sure that increments were considered in those classifications. I presume that the minister has been talking about reclassification in which, for some reason or another, a change is made in certain categories which has to do with changing conditions for people in these categories.

An hon. Member: It's all right, Arnold.

Mr. Peters: It might be all right for some of my colleagues, but I do not understand what the minister is talking about. I see the classifications here, but I do not see that they are prohibited by public service legislation. If changes are made I am curious to know why those changes cannot be referred to a conciliation board just as the classifications we have now. I do not know why the changes could not be referred if the categories could be referred.

Mr. Jones: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the minister one question. Here we are writing the collective bargaining agreement, and reference is made in two clauses to an agreement. Does the minister not think that if a bill like this comes before parliament all members of parliament should be privy and have a copy of the collective agreement itself? What the minister has provided here are amendments to an agreement which should have been tabled at the very beginning, at the time of the introduction of this bill.

Mr. Munro (Hamilton East): Mr. Chairman, I can answer the hon. member by indicating that Schedule II contains all the items to which the parties have agreed. In a sense we have been able to resolve the wage issue. This would have been a very significant part of the collective agreement.

Mr. Jones: The point I am trying to make is that this whole thing is a jigsaw puzzle, and we have just some of the pieces. If we had been given the whole agreement, we could have put this jigsaw puzzle together very easily today.

The Assistant Deputy Chairman: Is the committee ready for the question?

Some hon. Members: Question.

The Assistant Deputy Chairman: The question is on the amendment of the hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby.

(*And the result of the vote having been announced:*)

● (2330)

Mr. Benjamin: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. The seating plan in my desk is somewhat out of date. The hon. member who is sitting in the seat which is in the fourth row, second from the end, entered the House and took his place after members on my side of the House had risen for the vote.

He stood, to have his vote recorded, which he should not have done.

The Assistant Deputy Chairman: Order, please. It has been brought to the attention of the Chair that an hon. member came into the Chamber after the question was put. If there is no objection, we shall have to disregard or ignore that vote. I see there is no objection; therefore it will be recorded that 69 members voted against the amendment.

Amendment (Mr. Broadbent) negatived: Yeas 48; nays, 70.

The Assistant Deputy Chairman: The question is on clause 5.

Mr. Rodriguez: Mr. Chairman, earlier we learned that it will cost $3.8 million to implement Schedule I. What is the estimated projected cost of the overtime items contained in Schedule II? I am referring specifically to item 15.02(a) of Schedule II. Perhaps the Minister of Labour could provide the figure. I should like to know the answer, and I should like to ask several more questions.

Mr. Munro (Hamilton East): Mr. Chairman, I believe the hon. member for Nickel Belt wishes to know the cost of overtime, or the cost of compensation set out in item 15.02(a) of Schedule II. According to my figures, the cost will be $236,519.

Mr. Gilbert: In United States or Canadian funds?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Joyal: Mr. Chairman, with the consent of the House, I would like to move an amendment to subclause (5) of clause 5.

I am particularly aware of the inconveniences that are being caused at this time to the public and users of air transport by the air controllers strike, so it is not my intention to unduly prolong my contribution or delay the discussion of the bill that is now before the House. However, in spite of the weight of the inconveniences that business and the travelling public have to cope with I would like to deal with two aspects that this conflict brings out and conclude with the tabling of an amendment to subclause (5) of clause 5 of Bill C-63.

The first comment I would like to make has to do with the right to strike in the public sector. When the legislator authorized the right to strike in the public sector in 1967 he measured all the inconveniences that could result from that right. If he saw fit to include it in the law of the land it is because he favours the notion of collective agreement bargaining that, although generous and liberal, is nonetheless strict in its reasoning and application. By leaving the responsibility to determine working conditions to the parties the legislator wanted at the same time to make sure that conditions in which bargaining takes place should not benefit one party to the detriment of the other but, quite the contrary, that the law should act as some sort of referee in the test of strength that is always present at the bargaining table.

I do not have to emphasize that the foundation of collective agreement negotiation is the willingness of the parties based on their mutual good faith, and if one has a weapon or means of blackmail we can no longer properly talk of free and close discussion on the stakes of the agreement but rather simply the drawing up of a protocol of surrender with one of the parties dictating to the other the terms of the end of the debate. Those conditions take a special shape in the public sector; unlike in the private sector negotiation in the public sector imposes a particular ethic on the parties and neither of them can ignore that it holds the public at its mercy. That is where we stand today, Mr. Chairman; on June 28, 1976, CATCA and CALPA dictated the protocol of surrender, and today the Minister of Transport (Mr. Lang) imposes the terms of the return to work.

I really have no sympathy for the way CATCA leaders are fulfilling their responsibilities to the Canadian people and some of their members. They have shown in the past that they would rather give vent to their prejudices and bigotry than try to understand the nature of this country. Their conception of Canadian duality is narrow, false and biased. Thus, some people may be inclined to believe that I am looking forward to Parliament checking a union that denies many of its members their vested right to speak their own language which has been officially recognized by the law of the land and is entitled to the same rights, privileges and status as the other official language.

● (2340)

Such is not the case. It is very reluctantly that I will support this bill, realizing that once again the Minister of Transport (Mr. Lang) has committed himself on behalf of Parliament before the bill was introduced and its provisions were made public. It is to be deplored that the Minister of Transport has threatened to pass a special legislation before the legal strike was called. Regardless of the circumstances, it seems to me that the Minister of Transport could not threaten a union with the decisions of Parliament before the strike was called and before Parliament was convened and legislated. How can an individual or a group be threatened with the deprivation of a right granted under the law before it is even exercised? Any jurist with the least experience, and the Minister of Transport is an outstanding jurist, would endorse my reservation and my concern. The air controllers' strike on August 7, 1977 is entirely legal. We can surely argue about the reasons which prompt CATCA to resort to it, but the strike remains within the context of the legislation and as such it abides by the rule of law, the primacy of law.

Therefore, if the Canadian legislator has recognized the right to strike legally under certain circumstances, the government cannot threaten a union to end a strike or warn them to that effect in the course of negotiations without disowning the present philosophy of staff relations which is moreover legitimated and recognized by the law. It is therefore with much reservation that I view this bill, regardless of the opinions I might have on the union concerned. But one may wonder about the eagerness and the celerity with which Parliament is asked to end that strike though young and legal, whereas in June 1976, on the very eve of the Olympic Games, a strike

declared illegal by Mr. Justice Addy of the Federal Court was allowed to last ten days before a draft agreement was signed under which the rights of Parliament had once again been negotiated.

Mr. Chairman, I was among those who last year urged Department of Transport and Treasury Board officials to bring legislation before Parliament which was sitting then, in order to ensure that the law of the land was enforced and that the law enforcement agencies were respected. Now, one year later, we are still living the consequences of this period and, in this perspective, everything that was undertaken to settle that conflict seems even more out of proportion and from many aspects useless. It is sufficient to read what the Hon. Jean Marchand, who is in the gallery tonight, stated on July 12, 1977, on the publication of the report of the Commission on Bilingual Air Traffic Services to be convinced that if we want to put back some order in the relations between CATCA and the Department of Transport, we must come back to a fair situation and not question the labour relations philosophy which marks the Canadian federal public service as one of the most progressive in the world.

Mr. Marchand wrote on July 12 last:

"The interim report shows that the argument of air safety invoked by CATCA and CALPA against bilingualism in Quebec for air communications was false and even ridiculous. This was a bugaboo that could not have scared people with the barest knowledge of the problem, especially not the government."

And he added:

"(c) From everything that has been said, it also appears that the federal Department of Transport really is the best agency to regulate air traffic, like it regulates maritime and rail traffic. It has the knowledge, the staff and the means to protect the public and the employees in the field of air traffic." Mr. Marchand also stated: "It therefore seems to me that an inquiry commission, whatever the honesty and the qualifications of the judges, is redundant and can only serve to put an end to the phychosis artificially and illegally created by CALPA and CATCA."

Therefore, if we want to normalize the relations between the Canadian Air Traffic Control Association and the federal Department of Transport, if we want to give back to the authorities concerned the responsibility towards Parliament and the Canadian public, if we want to re-establish the authority of Parliament and the Minister of Transport, we must annul the protocol of agreement of June 28, 1976, between the Minister of Transport, CATCA and CALPA, recall orders in council 1576, 1583, and 1588 and give to the federal Department of Transport sole responsibility for implementing bilingualism in air communications in Canada.

This is why, Mr. Chairman, I would like to table the text of the following amendment to subclause (5) of clause 5 of Bill C-63, seconded by my colleagues the hon. member for Montmorency (Mr. Duclos) and the hon. member for Matane (Mr. De Bané), I therefore move that Bill C-63, An Act to provide for the continuation of air traffic control services, be amended by adding immediately following clause 5, subclause 5, the following, as subclause 6:

6.(1) Orders CP-1976-1583 and 1976-1588, minutes of the meetings of the committee of the Privy Council, approved by His Excellency the Governor General, on June 23rd and 28th, 1976, and the protocol agreement between on the one hand, the Minister of Transport and, on the other hand, the Canadian Air Traffic Control Association (CATCA) and the Canadian Air Line Pilots' Association (CALPA), signed on June 28th, 1976, are abrogated and annulled.

(2) The Minister of Transport alone is responsible for the implementation of bilingualism in air communications.

The Assistant Deputy Chairman: Order, please. The Chair has reservations about the amendment being in order. I feel it is in no way pertinent to the bill now before the committee.

[*English*]

I wish to refer to May's nineteenth edition page 521, inadmissible amendments. I quote from paragraph 1:

An amendment is out of order if it is irrelevant to the subject matter or beyond the scope of the bill—

I think this amendment breaches both grounds and it does go beyond the scope of the bill. Therefore it is not receivable.

Mr. Rodriguez: Mr. Chairman, I have a couple more questions I want to ask the minister. Can an employee under this agreement use non-utilized time off for familiarization flight?

Mr. Munro (Hamilton East): Mr. Chairman, I will endeavour to ascertain the answer to that question. In the meantime I can give an answer to the previous question of the hon. member. He talked about the total compensation and the allocation of moneys between the various people who fell into the different levels and different categories, the different classifications.

Going through Schedule I, I wish to revise my figure. I gave an erroneous figure earlier. The total cost has been costed out at $3,372,000. The number of people in the different categories are as follows: A1.00, 75; A1.01, 94; A1.02, 257; A1.03, 212; A1.04, 289; A1.05, 589; A1.06, 309; A1.07, 85; and A1.08, 33, for a total number of controllers of 2,213. Yes, experience is taken into account in providing the annual increment at all levels up to a maximum of six.

Mr. Rodriguez: While the minister is getting the answer to that question, I wonder if he could give the rationale for the non-payment of an employee's familiarization flight taken in conjunction with his days of rest.

Mr. Munro (Hamilton East): Mr. Chairman, I will endeavour to ascertain that information and send it to the hon. member.

Mr. Rodriguez: On the retirement or debt, which is Schedule II, is this new or was there a similar clause in the previous collective agreement, and what is the projected cost of this clause?

Mr. Munro (Hamilton East): Mr. Chairman, in answer to the first question of the hon. member, familiarization flights are taken during an employee's normal hours allotted so that

he does not need overtime for that. With regard to the last question, neither I nor my officials caught it. I would appreciate him repeating it.

Mr. Rodriguez: I would like to know the rationale. The minister said earlier there would be a non-payment of an employee's familiarization flight taken in conjunction with his days of rest. What is the rationale for that?

Mr. Munro (Hamilton East): Mr. Chairman, I will endeavour to get an answer to the hon. member's question. We had some difficulty in understanding what the hon. member was getting at.

Mr. Rodriguez: The agreement specifically prohibits payment to employees for familiarization flights on their days of rest. Why can an employee not be paid when he takes his familiarization flight on his days of rest? There must be a reason for putting that into the collective agreement.

● (2350)

Mr. Munro (Hamilton East): If the hon. member would refer to Schedule IV he would find that it is based on a letter of intent between the parties. It was previously provided that familiarization flights would not be taken on days of rest. Now, this is to be changed so that days of rest can be taken in conjunction with familiarization flights, which means that many of the controllers will be in a position to utilize some of their free time for familiarization flights.

Clause agreed to.

Clause 6 agreed to.

Schedules I to IV inclusive agreed to.

Clause 1 agreed to.

Title agreed to.

Bill reported.

Mr. Munro (Hamilton East) moved that the bill be read the third time and do pass.

The House divided on the motion which was agreed to on the following division:

● (Midnight)

(*Division No. 106*)

YEAS

Messrs.

Alkenbrack	Baker (Grenville-Carleton)	Caccia
Allmand	Baldwin	Cafik
Anderson	Basford	Campagnolo (Mrs.)
Andras (Port Arthur)	Beatty	Caron
Andre (Calgary Centre)	Béchard	Clark (Rocky Mountain)
Andres (Lincoln)	Bégin (Miss)	Clarke (Vancouver Quadra)
Baker (Gander-Twillingate)	Blais	Clermont
	Blaker	Coates
	Breau	Comtois
	Buchanan	
Condon	Joyal	McKinley
Corbin	Kempling	McKinnon
Corriveau	Knowles (Norfolk-Haldimand)	McRae
Cyr	Lachance	Milne
Danson	Lajoie	Munro (Hamilton East)
Darling	Lalonde	Nowlan
Daudlin	Lambert (Edmonton West)	Oberle
Dawson	Lamontagne	O'Connell
De Bané	Landers	O'Sullivan
Demers	Lang	Paproski
Dinsdale	Lapointe	Patterson
Dionne (Northumberland-Miramichi)	Lavoie	Pigott (Mrs.)
	Lawrence	Pinard
Duclos	Leblanc (Laurier)	Prud'homme
Dupras	LeBlanc (Westmorland-Kent)	Railton
Duquet	Lee	Reid
Ellis	Lessard	Ritchie
Ethier	Loiselle (Chambly)	Robinson
Fleming	Loiselle (Saint-Henri)	Rondeau
Francis	MacDonald (Cardigan)	Roy (Laval)
Fraser	Macdonald (Rosedale)	Rynard
Gauthier (Ottawa-Vanier)	MacDonald (Miss) (Kingston and the Islands)	Sauvé (Mrs.)
Gillespie	MacEachen	Scott
Goodale	MacFarlane	Sharp
Goyer	MacGuigan	Smith (Saint-Jean)
Grafftey	Macquarrie	Stanfield
Guay (St. Boniface)	Maine	Stevens
Guay (Lévis)	Marceau	Stewart (Cochrane)
Haidasz	Marchand	Stollery
Halliday	Marshall	Tessier
Hargrave	Martin	Trudel
Harquail	McCain	Turner
Herbert	McGrath	Watson
Hnatyshyn	McIsaac	Whelan
Horner		Wood
Howie		Yewchuk
Huntington		Young—136
Hurlburt		
Jarvis		
Jelinek		

NAYS

Messrs.

Benjamin	Gilbert	Orlikow
Broadbent	Hogan	Peters
Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands)	Jones	Rodriguez
	Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre)	Symes—11

● (0020)

Mr. Speaker: I therefore declare the motion carried.

Motion agreed to and bill read the third time and passed.

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Speaker, in accordance with the motion passed earlier I would suggest that the House agree to being available for Royal Assent when the other place has dealt with this bill.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Pursuant to the order made earlier this day under Standing Order 44, the sitting of the House is suspended until the call of the Chair.

* * *

SITTING SUSPENDED

At 00.24 a.m. the sitting was suspended.

Message from the Senate

● (0320)

SITTING RESUMED

The House resumed at 3.27 a.m.

THE ROYAL ASSENT

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker: I have the honour to inform the House that I have received the following communication:

Government House
Ottawa

August 10, 1977

Sir:

I have the honour to inform you that the Honourable R. G. B. Dickson, Puisne Judge of the Supreme Court of Canada, in his capacity as Deputy Governor General, will proceed to the Senate Chamber today for the purpose of giving Royal Assent to a bill.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your obedient servant,
Edmond Joly de Lotbinière
Administrative Secretary
to the Governor General

* * *

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

Mr. Speaker: I have the honour to inform the House that a message has been received from the Senate informing this House that the Senate have passed Bill C-63, An Act to provide for the continuation of air traffic control services, without amendment.

THE ROYAL ASSENT

[*English*]

A message was delivered by the Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod as follows:

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

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

And being returned:

Mr. Speaker informed the House that the Deputy Governor General had been pleased to give, in Her Majesty's name, the Royal Assent to the following bill:

Bill C-63, An Act to provide for the continuation of air traffic control services—Chapter 57.

● (0330)

Mr. Speaker: Accordingly and in conformity with the order made July 25, 1977, this House stands adjourned until October 17, 1977, at two o'clock in the afternoon.

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Speaker, I intended to move another adjournment motion with the same date, but I presume the adjournment which you have described contains all the conditions and qualifications which might make it possible for us to return, if necessary, before October 17, if the public interest requires.

Mr. Speaker: The adjournment motion which was made on July 25 contained provisions to resume for August 4 and 5 also provision to resume if in the event, after consultation with the government, the Speaker should perceive that the public good requires the resumption of the House before that time. It is to be assumed that upon adjournment now until October 17 at two o'clock in the afternoon, all of these conditions prevail.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Agreed.

At 3:44 a.m. the House adjourned, without question put, pursuant to special order.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Monday, October 17, 1977

The House met at 2 p.m.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

FINANCE

PROPOSAL TO REDUCE TAXES AND END CONTROLS—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Joe Clark (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I rise under the provisions of Standing Order 43 on a matter of urgent and pressing necessity. Considering that unemployment in Canada continues to rise, the Canadian dollar continues to fall, business investment is leaving Canada, and the government was wrong in its targets for real growth, for inflation and regarding the budgetary deficit, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Joliette (Mr. La Salle):

[*Translation*]

That the government consider:

(a) a new budget with tax reductions for all Canadians earning less than $16,000 yearly;

(b) a sales tax reduction in co-operation with provincial governments;

(c) a tax reduction for corporations investing in the country and

(d) an end to wage and price controls.

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker: In accordance with the terms of Standing Order 43, the presentation of such a motion for debate requires the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

* * *

THE CANADIAN ECONOMY

REQUEST FOR MEASURES TO CREATE JOBS—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby): Mr. Speaker, I too rise under the provisions of Standing Order 43.

[*Translation*]

Considering the confidential report of the Department of Employment which forecasts an increased number of unemployed during the next two years and considering the forecasts of all experts to the effect that unemployment will reach a record high this winter, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles):

That this House acknowledge that the Canadian people want jobs rather than welfare assistance and strongly urge the government to give priority to the implementation of a job creation program.

Mr. Speaker: Order. The House has heard the motion of the hon. member. Under the provisions of Standing Order 43, this motion requires the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

* * *

MANPOWER

SUGGESTION GOVERNMENT REASSESS JOB-CREATION PROGRAM—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Eudore Allard (Rimouski): Mr. Speaker, I ask for the unanimous consent of the House to present a motion on a very urgent and important matter.

Considering that a very high increase in unemployment is prevailing in most regions of Canada, especially in Quebec, that this nationwide increase in the rate of unemployment particularly affects young people aged 15 to 24 years and that according to every forecast the rate of unemployment will be going up in the coming months, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Roberval (Mr. Gauthier):

That the House immediately make the necessary arrangements so that the federal government may reassess job creation programs now in force in order to give back confidence to Canadian workers, especially Quebec workers, and to give increased efficiency to this battle against unemployment.

Mr. Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 43, this motion requires the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

* * *

[*English*]

FINANCE

SUGGESTED COMMITTEE STUDY OF REASONS FOR LACK OF CONFIDENCE IN CANADIAN DOLLAR—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Sinclair Stevens (York-Simcoe): Mr. Speaker, I too rise on a matter of urgent and pressing necessity. With the

Canadian dollar plunging to 90.4 cents U.S. this morning, and this in spite of the massive $500 million intervention by the Bank of Canada so far this month, I move, seconded by the hon. member for St. John's East (Mr. McGrath):

That there be an immediate reference to the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs so that that committee may hear evidence as to why there should be such deterioration in world confidence with respect to our dollar, as to the adequacy of our U.S. dollar reserves which have fallen 40 per cent this year, and what measures it is necessary to take to restore domestic and world confidence in our currency.

Mr. Speaker: Standing Order 43 requires the unanimous consent of the House for the presentation of such a motion. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

* * *

GRAIN

PROPOSAL TO AID PRODUCERS AS RESULT OF ADVERSE WEATHER CONDITIONS—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Prince Albert): Mr. Speaker, I rise under the provisions of Standing Order 43 on a matter of urgent and pressing necessity, to move, provided it is accepted, seconded by the hon. member for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski):

That the government give immediate consideration, in view of the disastrous rainfall in recent weeks having resulted in the loss of many millions of dollars to prairie farmers whose grain is still in the fields, to making available drying equipment by transporting it to needed areas, freight free; as propane gas is necessary for grain drying equipment, and very costly, that the price be frozen until the new year against further increases; and as farmers whose wheat is unharvested are generally short of funds to carry on their needed autumn operation, that cash advances be provided for, based on the estimated amount of grain remaining in the fields to be harvested.

● (1410)

Mr. Speaker: The provisions of Standing Order 43 require the unanimous consent of the House for the presentation of such a motion for debate. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

* * *

VETERANS AFFAIRS

SUGGESTED INCREASE IN VARIOUS CATEGORIES OF PENSIONS—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, because November 11 is only three and a half weeks away, and because it is urgent that we do more for our veterans than just pay tribute to them with words, I move under Standing Order 43, seconded by the hon. member for Timiskaming (Mr. Peters):

[Mr. Stevens.]

That this House urges the government, between now and Remembrance Day, to bring in legislation to restore the basic amount of the war disability pension to the average level of the five designated categories of public servants, to provide pro-rata pension for the widows of veterans in those cases where the veteran's pension was less than 48 per cent and to provide prisoner of war pensions for the 200 surviving Canadian veterans who were prisoners of war during World War I.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: Under the provisions of Standing Order 43, such a motion can be presented for debate only with the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: During the routine proceedings which will follow the oral question period, at the time of tabling of the fifth report of the special committee on implementation of the television resolution, I will seek the indulgence of the House to make a few explanatory remarks about the progress of that particular project and some of the new installations which are here. I will do that after three o'clock.

* * *

VACANCIES

Mr. Speaker: At the moment I have the honour to inform the House that I have received a communication notifying me that a vacancy has occurred in the representation, namely, Gordon Fairweather, Esq., the member for the electoral district of Fundy-Royal, by resignation. Accordingly, I have addressed my warrant to the Chief Electoral Officer for the issue of a new writ of election for the said electoral district.

I have the honour also to inform the House that I have received a communication notifying me that a vacancy has occurred in the representation, namely, John Reynolds, Esq., the member for the electoral district of Burnaby-Richmond-Delta, by resignation. Accordingly, I have addressed my warrant to the Chief Electoral Officer for the issue of a new writ of election for that electoral district.

I have the honour to inform the House that I have received a communication notifying me that a vacancy has occurred in the representation, namely, Sean O'Sullivan, Esq., the member for the electoral district of Hamilton-Wentworth, by resignation. Accordingly, I have addressed my warrant to the Chief Electoral Officer for the issue of a new writ of election for that electoral district.

* * *

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

Mr. Speaker: I have the honour to inform the House that a message has been received from the Senate informing this House that the Senate have passed Bill C-41, an Act to provide a maritime code for Canada and to amend the Canada

Shipping Act and other acts in consequence thereof with amendments to which the concurrence of this House is desired.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[*English*]

THE CANADIAN ECONOMY

MEASURES TO PROVIDE JOBS—RESPONSIBILITY OF PROVINCES

Mr. Joe Clark (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Prime Minister, and it is framed in the knowledge that on this day television is first reflecting the debates of the House of Commons. Among the Canadians who are watching us here today are a large number of the army of Canadian unemployed who, because of the policies of this government, have nothing else they can do with their time today.

Since the Prime Minister's and the government's forecasts in the last two budgets have been dead wrong concerning economic growth and job creation, will the Prime Minister tell the House right now what specific programs the government will introduce this month to bring jobs to the more than one million Canadians who are out of work today because of the policies of this government?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, it is the government's intention to address this question of high unemployment, which has given us great concern, immediately. We will be doing it tomorrow on the first day of the new session. We will make an announcement in the Speech from the Throne, and it will be followed up by more specific recommendations made by my colleague, the Minister of Finance, who will participate very early in the debate. Of course, we will also be anxious to hear from the opposition which always has such constructive measures to propose.

Mr. Clark: Mr. Speaker, the country has been waiting for nearly a decade for some economic policy from this government. We will wait with interest one more day to see if in fact there will be a clear proposal in the speech tomorrow which will provide jobs for the more than one million Canadians put out of work by the policies of this government.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Clark: But may I ask the Prime Minister now whether the Minister of Finance was expressing government policy when he said in Washington at a press conference that it was his view that the major responsibility for dealing with unemployment, particularly in the province of Quebec, lies with the provinces of Canada and not with the national government?

Mr. Trudeau: It has never been the intention of this government or of the ministers to indicate that the problem of unemployment could be solved by any or each government acting alone. We believe that all governments acting together must tackle this problem. We believe particularly that since jobs are created overwhelmingly by the private sector the private sector should join in the effort to stimulate the economy.

DATE OF TERMINATION OF CONTROLS

Mr. Joe Clark (Leader of the Opposition): I think it is clear to most Canadians that a disturbing number of job creators in the private sector, because of the policies of this government, have left this country with their investments and are creating jobs and promoting growth in other countries.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Clark: Part of that is due to the determination of this government, despite the promises of one of the former ministers of finance to announce an end to controls, to keep controls in. Will the Prime Minister tell the House of Commons now that the Minister of Finance this week or the throne speech tomorrow will give an explicit date for the termination of controls and will spell out the program by which the government of Canada intends to move this country out of controls?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): I can give the undertaking that the Minister of Finance will address this question in his statement on Thursday of this week. I must say that there are some aspects of the question of the Leader of the Opposition with which I must disagree in that controls were brought in in order to make the Canadian cost and price structure more competitive. They have been successful in bringing inflation down from two digit inflation to something around 7.5 per cent.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Trudeau: We do not think that inflation will continue to come down if the controls are lifted unless there is a general agreement among Canadians to do their utmost to continue pressing down on the rate of inflation, and this calls for more than just the bland statement by the Leader of the Opposition.

• (1420)

Mr. Clark: Not wishing to compete with the Prime Minister for blandness—

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Clark: —may I ask him whether it is the intention of the government of Canada to announce this week a date and a process for the termination of controls?

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, I have just said that the Minister of Justice would address this question.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Trudeau: If it pleases the opposition, I can have the Minister of Justice address this question.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): God help us.

Mr. Hees: That is just too much to expect.

Mr. Trudeau: I do not know if the hon. member for Prince Edward-Hastings thinks he is on camera, but he is not.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

* * *

FINANCE

ACTION TO STABILIZE CANADIAN DOLLAR

Mr. Sinclair Stevens (York-Simcoe): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Finance, but first I would like to congratulate the minister—if that is the proper expression—on becoming the fourth Minister of Finance under the Prime Minister. In that connection I point out that they seem to be falling quicker and quicker, one after the other.

My question is based on our rising unemployment, coupled with rising inflation, having apparently intensified world concern with respect to the Canadian dollar, as evidenced by the decline of the Canadian dollar still further today under heavy pressure. Would the minister tell the House what instructions he has given to the Governor of the Bank of Canada with respect to stabilizing our dollar?

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank very sincerely the sixth critic of the Tories on financial affairs.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Chrétien: Sometimes they need two at a time. I do not know what kind of government they would form if the people were to make that mistake.

I have not given any instruction to the governor of the bank with regard to the Canadian dollar. The Canadian dollar is a floating dollar, and it is the market place which will decide where the Canadian dollar should be. That is the policy of the government, and I have not given any specific instruction to the governor of the bank. We are following the situation very carefully, but I think that the hon. member should be more moderate in his statement. He throws out figures, but everyone knows that we do not know exactly the amount of money that is used in that type of trading.

Mr. Stevens: If the Minister of Finance does not know what number of dollars are being used in trading, he is one of the few in the market place who does not.

Mr. Chrétien: I do, you don't.

Mr. Stevens: As our United States dollar exchange reserves have declined $500 million or an estimated 20 per cent so far this month—all gone in defence of our dollar—will the minister explain how he reconciles such massive intervention on the part of the Bank of Canada with what he has called today a floating dollar?

Mr. Chrétien: I do not think I can agree with the statement made by the hon. member. The governor of the bank is not intervening with regard to the floating of the Canadian dollar. The Canadian dollar is floating in the market place.

Mr. Stevens: A final supplementary again to the Minister of Finance, Mr. Speaker. Surely, the Minister will not disagree with Dr. Hood, an official in his own department, who, based on evidence given by him before a committee of this House, has indicated that the 13-cent fall in our dollar so far will result in 4 per cent inflation in the next two years. Would the minister indicate if he is content to see still further devaluation of the Canadian dollar, bearing in mind that such devaluation will mean more inflation and ultimately more unemployment?

Mr. Chrétien: Mr. Speaker, there are some advantages to having a lower dollar. For example, I am very pleased to report to this House that we are improving our export performance very much and will have a major surplus on the export of Canadian goods abroad. In doing that we are creating more jobs.

* * *

THE CANADIAN ECONOMY

UNEMPLOYMENT—REQUEST FOR CLARIFICATION OF PRIME MINISTER'S STATEMENT SITUATION EXAGGERATED

Mr. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Prime Minister. The Prime Minister referred to bland statements and as we all know, he is the expert. Considering that he said just a few days ago in London, Ontario, that "unemployment is not as bad as some people out there want to pretend it is," and said even more recently that the reason we have such a high level of unemployment is that Canadians have gone soft, and considering that we have more than one million people unemployed, and according to his government's figures only 43,000 jobs are listed as being available in the economy which means there are 15 people applying for every job out there, would he mind explaining for the edification of the House what he meant when he said in London that unemployment is not as bad as some people out there pretend it is?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Yes, Mr. Speaker, I intend to do that in a speech in this House the day after tomorrow.

ACTION TO CREATE JOBS—REFERENCE TO PRODUCTIVITY OF CANADIAN WORKERS

Mr. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I should like to thank the Prime Minister for his smiling, bland answer to a very important question. More specifically, because part of the implication, presumably, of his assertion that he made about Canadians

being soft refers to other statements he has made in the past about not making enough effort to get jobs, I should like to ask if his government has looked at the situation in St. Lawrence, Newfoundland, where a mine is being shut down by Alcan? Apparently it made some $85 million profit in the first six months of this year, so it is not being closed because it is a losing operation but because they say they can make higher profits elsewhere. And according to a recent government study Canadian auto workers are more productive than American workers, not less, but they are not getting some 20,000 jobs that they ought to, because the government has, among other things, failed to implement Canadian tax laws. Specifically, I should like to ask if he or his ministers in these two very different parts of the country have taken steps in the last few days to insure that Canadians who want jobs, not handouts, will get them?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I refer to the remarks and the debate because I do not really think I could convince the leader of the New Democratic Party in a short answer of the rightness of his theories or the righteousness of mine.

An hon. Member: They are very similar.

Mr. Trudeau: It would take longer than we have during the question period. Perhaps a short statistic in answer to his question might indicate the course of my thinking on these things. It is that in manufacturing generally Canadian workers are productive but only 80 per cent as productive as the American worker in manufacturing. At the same time, the average wage rate for the Canadian worker in manufacturing is 7 per cent higher than that of the American. If the hon. leader of the New Democratic Party thinks about that he will understand that this means our costs are higher and that we cannot compete with our main competitors in the market, the United States. If we cannot compete, that means we cannot continue to invest and if we cannot continue to invest, it means we cannot continue to create jobs. Therefore, the productivity of the worker in the Canadian manufacturing sector is very important. It has progressed, I agree, but it is still only 80 per cent of that of the Americans.

Mr. Broadbent: A final supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. The Prime Minister knows that in Canada as well as elsewhere in industrial countries the main reason for low or higher productivity is whether management has introduced new capital equipment or not. Instead of blaming Canadian workers, he might blame Canadian management for not keeping Canadian industry as competitive and up-to-date as that of other countries. With reference to his general statement would the Prime Minister for once undertake to provide the House with specific examples from the sector after sector he named when referring to Canadian productivity, and we would be prepared to consider the relevance of the general proposal. I come back to the specific question about the auto industry, an industry in which, according to the government's own study, Canadian workers are more productive. When is the government to take action, to ensure that we shall get the jobs in Canada to which we are entitled, namely, 20,000 more jobs than we now have?

• (1430)

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, of course, I agree in part with the leader of the New Democratic Party, when he says productivity is also a question of technology and entrepreneurship. I believe that we on this side have encouraged entrepreneurship more than the hon. member—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Clark: Yes, you have encouraged them to leave.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Trudeau: I see groans in the opposition.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Canadians are all groaning.

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, I see it on the hon. member's face. There is a groan written right there. It is obvious that productivity is a matter not only for workers but for the entrepreneurial sector, too. That is why in the last budget we made substantial concessions to the entrepreneurial sector—

Mr. Broadbent: They didn't work.

Mr. Trudeau: —to create incentives to invest.

Mr. Broadbent: They have not worked.

Mr. Trudeau: I recall that the leader of the New Democratic Party opposed them at the time.

Mr. Broadbent: And they have not worked, have they?

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, the leader of the NDP must get his act together. If he wants—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Broadbent: They have not worked.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Trudeau: If he wants the private sector to increase its investment, to create more jobs, he must stop complaining when they make an honest profit.

[*Translation*]

REQUEST FOR REDUCTION OF INTEREST RATES FOR MUNICIPAL AND PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENTS

Mr. Gilles Caouette (Témiscamingue): Mr. Speaker, I want to direct a question to the right hon. Prime Minister. He has been reported as telling Canadians to learn to tighten their belts otherwise the government would have to take the necessary steps to have them do so. Does the Prime Minister consider the financial sector in Canada as Canadians, and is he

prepared to take steps in this area and demand reduced interest rates?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): The hon. member is not without knowing that for two years now, when we set up the controls system, we have been controlling not only incomes but profits as well. Those profits also applied of course to financial institutions. So I said that all sectors will have to tighten their belts, otherwise the government would feel compelled to exercise controls.

Mr. Caouette (Témiscamingue): May I ask a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker.

I was talking of interests and we have rather seen that the rates of interest have increased. But, on the same subject, following the statement made by the hon. member for Lapointe on September 20 that an interest-free loan has been granted in the municipality of Mistassini housing project, could the right hon. Prime Minister tell the House whether he is prepared to follow the same practice and apply it systematically to municipal and provincial governments?

Mr. Trudeau: I was not made aware of the precise case the hon. member is referring to, Mr. Speaker. I will get more information on this point.

POSSIBILITY OF MAKING INTEREST-FREE LOANS

Mr. Gilles Caouette (Témiscamingue): Mr. Speaker, may I ask a further supplementary?

Considering that the municipality of Mistassini has already received a loan of $36,000, I hope the right hon. Prime Minister will take notice that the announcement was made by the hon. member for Lapointe. I ask him whether he is prepared to maintain this practice for any municipality which is as underdeveloped as this one, in other areas of the country, in the same manner as interest-free loans are given to other countries.

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the leader of the Social Credit Party of Canada knows that there is no such thing as a loan without interest. When the government borrows money from citizens it has to pay interest. If the hon. member wants to buy savings bonds with his own savings, he will receive interest from the government, that is to say interest is paid when using somebody else's money. It occurs sometimes that the government helps municipalities or foreign countries by lending them money at a reduced interest rate but this means that someone must foot the bill. The difference is paid by the taxpayer. Therefore the hon. member has the choice between having the interest paid by the borrower or by the Canadian taxpayers in general. The interest must be paid some way or other.

[Mr. Caouette (Témiscamingue).]

[*English*]

POSSIBILITY OF FEDERAL-PROVINCIAL CONFERENCE TO DEAL WITH JOB-CREATION

Mr. James A. McGrath (St. John's East): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister. Given that unemployment nationally has now reached 8.3 per cent, 10.8 per cent in Quebec and 12.5 per cent in the Atlantic provinces, and given the potential that such figures hold for social unrest in the country, not to mention the potential for human suffering, I ask if it is the intention of the Prime Minister or the intention of one of his colleagues to convene a federal-provincial meeting, to deal with the various measures necessary for the reconstruction of the economy in order to produce jobs?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, a meeting was held last week between federal and provincial Ministers of Finance and they dealt with this very subject.

POSSIBILITY OF ACTION BY MINISTER OF FINANCE TO CREATE JOBS FOLLOWING SUGGESTIONS FROM PROVINCES

Mr. James A. McGrath (St. John's East): Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question, directed to the Minister of Finance, is based on the refusal of the Minister of Employment and Immigration to meet with his four Atlantic provinces counterparts next November, to discuss the serious unemployment in that region. What immediate initiatives can we expect from the government as a result of the minister's recent meeting with his provincial counterparts in Ottawa, and does he intend to act upon some of the suggestions he received from provincial ministers at that conference?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I intend to make a speech in the House on Thursday evening. I shall then tell hon. members about the decision made by the government following the meetings held last week where the provincial finance ministers and the ministers of industry, trade and commerce to study what could be done. The results will be known in Thursday evening in the House.

* * *

[*English*]

REGIONAL ECONOMIC EXPANSION

POSSIBILITY OF ACTION BY DEPARTMENT TO CREATE JOBS IN ATLANTIC PROVINCES

Mr. James A. McGrath (St. John's East): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a final supplementary question to the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion? My question is again prompted by the refusal of the Minister of Employment and Immigration to meet with the four Atlantic ministers, to discuss the very grave unemployment situation in that region. I ask, given the minister's statutory responsibilities, what initiatives can we expect from his department? Also, does he intend to meet with the governments of the four Atlantic provinces, to avert what will be a serious disaster in the region this winter?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Marcel Lessard (Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is well aware that, in my capacity as minister, I have regular meetings with my colleagues from the Atlantic provinces where we discuss the development programs we can launch together. We also exchange correspondence and suggestions. I therefore hope that in the next few weeks we shall be able to finalize some of the secondary agreements which are now under discussion and which might partly solve the problems you have mentioned.

* * *

[*English*]

FINANCE

POSSIBILITY OF CALLING ON UNITED STATES FOR FOREIGN EXCHANGE CREDIT

Mr. James Gillies (Don Valley): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Finance and relates, again, to the plunge in the value of the dollar and the effect of that on unemployment and inflation. Has the Government of Canada, through the Bank of Canada, alerted the Federal Reserve system of the United States, as it must under international agreement, that Canada may well be calling on the line of credit we have with respect to foreign exchange in the Central Bank of the United States?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, the answer is no.

[*English*]

REQUEST FOR ASSURANCE NO FOREIGN EXCHANGE CONTROLS OR TRAVEL RESTRICTIONS

Mr. James Gillies (Don Valley): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. As the government does not take defensive action in that sense, the dollar continues to plunge and we see no sign of anything being done about it, can the Minister of Finance assure the House and the people of Canada who are most concerned about this issue that this government will not introduce foreign exchange controls or restrictions on travel in the foreseeable future?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I am able to promise one thing to the House and to the hon. member. We have no intention of introducing controls over currency exchanges between Canada and other countries.

[*English*]

HOUSE OF COMMONS

SUGGESTION CERTAIN MEMBERS BE NAMED TO QUEEN'S PRIVY COUNCIL

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Prince Albert): Mr. Speaker, I must say that the experience of today would indicate a tremendous improvement, in the House, since we have come to the conclusion that what we are doing is being listened to.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, I do not want to raise any provocative question today, unaccustomed as I am to doing so. I wish to bring a question to the Prime Minister's attention. In view of Her Majesty's presence here, as in 1967, when premiers across Canada were made members of Her Majesty's Privy Council, I wonder if the government would give consideration on this occasion to naming two or three members of the House of Commons to the Privy Council: First, in the person of the Leader of the Opposition.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Diefenbaker: He may well lead an alternative government. I also want to add two hon. members, one of whom came in to the House 42 years ago. One is the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands, who served with such distinction not only in this House but in the province of Saskatchewan.

● (1440)

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Diefenbaker: The other is the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre who came to this House in 1942. These gentlemen should be given the distinction of being named members of the Privy Council. All three of these men have brought distinction to the House of Commons. I hope that on the occasion of Her Majesty's visit in this her jubilee year, the government will give serious consideration to a recommendation that these three hon. members be made members of her Canadian council.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, of course I will give consideration to this very generous suggestion by the right hon. member for Prince Albert. It is a suggestion which is generous in intent, I am sure, but possibly less optimistic than the proposed recipients are themselves about their possibility of acquiring the title by becoming members of the government some day. If the right hon. member is despairing of that possibility, I would consider discussing the matter with the proposed recipients. In the case of the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre, he has already been offered the title of honourable in the other place and he has repeatedly turned that down.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Order!

Mr. Trudeau: Perhaps the right hon. member's gesture, which was meant as an act of generosity, shows considerably less optimism than the proposed recipients themselves have about their future.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, an answer like that almost demands an equally frivolous one. Apparently the Prime Minister does not know that in past years a number of members have been made members of the Privy Council by reason of their long service in the House of Commons and the distinction of it. During my period in office, I can think of one hon. member for East York who had served here for a long while. There was widespread approval. I hope the Prime Minister will look back over the record. The Prime Minister turns to his seatmate and says, who was he? It was before the Prime Minister came here. His lack of knowledge on the subject is therefore understandable. I ask him to reconsider this. I pass it on not as a frivolous matter but to show the people of Canada that there can be people of distinction in the opposition. As far as the suggestion of not doing anything in line with this government continuing in office, I say without equivocation that I have been across Canada and I have been told everywhere—

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

* * *

INDUSTRY

SUGGESTED COMMITMENT FROM AUTOMOBILE MANUFACTURERS TO INCREASE JOB OPPORTUNITIES

Hon. Herb Gray (Windsor West): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Gray: Has he now obtained a commitment from the automobile manufacturers to increase their capital investment, research and development and purchases of auto parts in Canada to levels in line with the sales of their cars in this country, something I believe must be done. If so, what are these commitments? If they have not been obtained, exactly what is the government doing to ensure that activity in these areas will be suitably increased to deal with the current problems shown to exist by the government's own Arthur report?

Hon. Jack H. Horner (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, in answer to the hon. member's question, I want to first point out that we in Canada use about 8.9 per cent of the automotive parts manufactured on the North American continent.

Mr. Broadbent: Wrong, 12 per cent.

[Mr. Trudeau.]

Mr. Horner: No, 8.9 per cent and we produce about 7 per cent. Naturally we in this country would like to see that equal. We are having discussions with the major automotive manufacturers today to see whether that can be done. I would also to point out that while we have a surplus in trade with regard to total car assembly, we also have an advantage in the employment sector of the automotive industry. This country has 11.2 per cent of the total automotive manufacturing employment on the North American continent. We would like to hold that figure and perhaps increase it.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

* * *

GRAIN

PROPOSED EXTENSION OF CASH ADVANCES AND SHARING COST OF DRYING PROGRAM

Mr. Lorne Nystrom (Yorkton-Melville): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the minister in charge of the Canadian Wheat Board. As the minister knows, about half the crop in the northern part of the prairies has not yet been harvested because of the weather, the bad rain conditions. The prairie ministers of agriculture have appealed to the federal government for help for those who have not yet harvested. Will the minister extend the cash advances, which I point out are not a loans, to cover crops still in the field so that those farmers who need the money will have some cash this fall?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, fortunately the weather in the prairies has turned very good these past five days or so. Harvesting is going on very rapidly with combines doubling up at every opportunity. Therefore, the end result is yet to be ascertained. As a result of legislation which I proposed on behalf of this government and passed in this House several years ago, there is a standing provision for cash advances on unharvested grain, should that be necessary. Because of the possibility of harvesting taking place very late in the year, the provision is that we cannot invoke that legislation until November 15. However, we will certainly be watching the situation very closely and use that provision if it is required.

Mr. Nystrom: Will the minister consider a cost-sharing program with the prairie provinces such as Saskatchewan which now has a program to aid farmers in custom drying of tough and damp grain and also combining of grain in the fields? Will he consider a cost-sharing program to aid these farmers?

Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, the government of Saskatchewan has come forward with that kind of program with relation to the moving of machinery. That is the kind of initiative provincial governments ought to take. Whether it is the kind of thing that requires federal sharing will depend upon the total amounts involved. I am sure if those governments feel it does, we will have discussions with them later.

THE CANADIAN ECONOMY

POSSIBILITY OF FIRST MINISTERS' CONFERENCE TO DEAL WITH JOB CREATION

Miss Flora MacDonald (Kingston and the Islands): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Prime Minister. I would like to ask him if he has taken the occasion in the past few days to discuss with the provincial premiers the immediate convening of a first ministers' conference to deal specifically with the critical unemployment situation and the joint governmental initiatives that could be taken to alleviate it?

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

Miss MacDonald: It is a disappointment to learn that the Prime Minister does not seize upon every opportunity to discuss this matter with his provincial counterparts. Since the Prime Minister has not taken the opportunity to speak with them, is it his intention to write to the first ministers about the convening of a first ministers' conference to deal specifically with unemployment?

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, the hon. lady may have missed the earlier answers by the Minister of Finance who indicated that just last week he met with the provincial ministers of finance to discuss this very matter. The hon. lady might not realize that yesterday I met the premiers at a luncheon for Her Majesty. There was no question such as unemployment on the agenda.

Miss MacDonald: May I ask the Prime Minister if he understands that the first ministers, including himself, have a very real responsibility in this crisis situation.

● (1450)

[*Translation*]

POSSIBLE MEETING WITH QUEBEC MINISTER CONCERNING ECONOMIC ORIENTATION

Mr. Roch La Salle (Joliette): Mr. Speaker, I would like to put a question to the Minister of Finance to whom I would like to wish a lot more success than his predecessors have had. That cannot be difficult.

Since the newspapers were reporting last week that the Minister of Finance had met with those in charge of the economic orientation of the government of Quebec at this time could the minister say when he is to meet with a Quebec minister, Mr. Landry, and can he say whether he has concrete proposals to make to the Quebec government?

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, this morning my colleague the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion and I met three Quebec ministers interested in economic problems. They told me about a program they want to put forward. We also discussed certain initiatives we intend to take and have already taken with respect to certain sectors of the Quebec economy. The results will be announced by each government at the appropriate time. The conversation was rather cordial.

MEASURES TO ALLEVIATE UNEMPLOYMENT AMONG YOUNG PEOPLE IN QUEBEC

Mr. Roch La Salle (Joliette): Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask a supplementary question. I am pleased to see that the minister has seemingly acknowledged the need to cooperate with his counterpart of the Quebec government. If one were to judge by some of his recent announcements, it would rather seem that it was just the continuation of a policy of confrontation. Given the fact that one-fifth of Quebec youths are presently unemployed, can the finance minister give assurance to this House that in his forthcoming speech of Thursday evening he will present concrete measures to correct a situation that is almost disastrous, taking into account the prevailing unemployment rate in the province of Quebec?

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Finance): Well, Mr. Speaker, we have discussed today certain programs and I intend to make certain announcements this coming Thursday which will not directly be related to Quebec but will be directed toward all provinces of Canada, since we are responsible for the economic situation all across the country. Obviously, I made certain announcements in the past and I still intend to make others because there are particular problems in Quebec which are causing great worries to the rest of Canada and that is the political instability in that province.

* * *

[*English*]

HEALTH

SUGGESTED WARNING ON LOW CALORIE PRODUCTS CONTAINING SUGAR

Mrs. Simma Holt (Vancouver-Kingsway): Mr. Speaker, my question refers to the Minister of National Health and Welfare. Bearing in mind that a ban on the use of saccharin was implemented on October 1 and that all the so-called low calorie products presently in the marketplace contain a product, sugar, known to be dangerous to at least 400,000 Canadians as well as to tens of thousands of visitors to Canada who suffer from diabetes, will the hon. lady take action to ensure that a proper and conspicuous warning is placed on the products wrongly called low calorie products to warn consumers of their sugar content?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Monique Bégin (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, the point of my hon. colleague is well taken. I have been looking into the saccharin issue ever since I was appointed minister, but I have not yet had time to look into the sugar issue, including the health hazards which sugared food represents for diabetic patients. I shall certainly look into it. However, I suggest to my hon. colleague that no conspicuous warning about the dangers of sugared food for diabetic patients will change the situation, as long as this type of food is left on store counters, in refrigerators or in cupboards at home where children can easily reach them.

[*English*]

ANTI-INFLATION PROGRAM

REQUEST FOR CLARIFICATION OF PRIME MINISTER'S REFERENCE TO DISCIPLINING PEOPLE

Mr. Lincoln M. Alexander (Hamilton West): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I should like to direct a question to the Prime Minister related to a story by Val Sears in last Sunday's *Star*. What methods or techniques did the Prime Minister have in mind in terms of diciplining Canadians when he indicated—and I am quoting, now—that "If they don't discipline themselves we shall discipline them as we did with the controls."

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): A very simple example, and one easy to understand, would be that of the controls themselves—controls which the Leader of the Opposition is asking be removed.

Mr. Alexander: Can the Prime Minister be more definite and tell us where, in his opinion, the people of Canada have failed and in what areas they need discipline? Would he not agree that there is need for discipline to be applied to his own government, some members of which do not understand what discipline means—I have in mind flying on airplanes around the country, and so on.

Mr. Trudeau: Another simple example could be found in the first half of 1975 when there was double digit inflation and when the average increase in wage rates was some 21 per cent, much higher than the rate of growth of the economy. At that time we tried to get agreement on voluntary restraint; we did not get it and we brought in controls. That is an example of the kind of discipline the state must impose when the private decision-makers do not exercise restraint. As far as government spending is concerned, I would remind the hon. member that today, under Standing Order 43, we have heard two motions by important members of his party calling upon the government to spend more money.

* * *

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

GOVERNMENT'S VIEW OF GERMANY'S POSITION ON INTERNATIONAL TERRORISM

Mr. F. E. Oberle (Prince George-Peace River): My question is for the Secretary of State for External Affairs, Mr. Speaker. Is it the intention of the government to develop and express a position in respect of the latest round of international terrorism involving kidnappings and hijackings? More particularly, is it the intention of the government to issue a statement with respect to the dilemma in which the Federal Republic of Germany now finds itself? Has it expressed sympathy with, and support for, that government's firm position against international terrorism and is the minister prepared to say something publicly on this aspect?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Secretary of State for External Affairs): I welcome the hon. member's question because it does give me an opportunity to place on the record not only the position of the Government of Canada but, I am sure, of all members of this House. The Government of Canada condemns totally the use of terrorism and sympathizes with, and understands fully the attitude and approach of the government of West Germany. I wish to convey the sympathy of the Canadian government and people to those who are affected and to give a full undertaking that we shall seek, in all the international fora we can, to eliminate incidents of this kind. I fear there is nothing which Canada can do specifically in this case; it is one which highlights the necessity for an international agreement embracing all countries.

* * *

REGIONAL ECONOMIC EXPANSION

REQUEST FOR INCREASED SUPPORT FOR PROGRAM IN ATLANTIC PROVINCES

Mr. David MacDonald (Egmont): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister. It arises from remarks made during the summer by the Secretary of State for External Affairs, the former Minister of Regional Economic Expansion describing the DREE program as having failed in combatting regional disparities. In view of that department's frozen budget and mounting unemployment in the four Atlantic provinces, will the Prime Minister clarify the nature of the "new initiatives" he has talked about? For example, has he given an assurance to the four premiers that there will be a major change in support for the DREE program and increased support from other departments so as to effectively combat the increasing unemployment rate in those provinces?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): The intention of the government to combat unemployment in those provinces was evident in the creation of the department to which he referred. The hundreds of millions spent in the Atlantic provinces is, of itself, an indication of the government's attempts to bring down unemployment and accelerate economic expansion. However, I cannot give the hon. member the assurance that the government will engage in vastly increased spending programs in that area. The government must show restraint itself as it is asking other Canadians to show restraint.

Mr. MacDonald (Egmont): Has the Prime Minister been in contact with his colleagues or with the provincial premiers with a view to reversing the trend in those four provinces since, obviously, whatever money has been spent, it has not been successful in producing the desired effect?

Mr. Trudeau: The hon. gentleman would not, I am sure, expect me to try to make a commitment. This is an area where the government tries to encourage a greater growth in the economy but we cannot guarantee that the measures taken will work. Very much depends upon what is done by the private sector. There is, also, the question of confidence and the government is doing what it can to create confidence, in

investment in that area for example by making provision in the last budget for substantial tax incentives.

* * *

● (1500)

CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

SUGGESTION LEADERS' SPEECHES IN THRONE SPEECH DEBATE BE BROADCAST

Mr. Walter Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Secretary of State. In view of a statement that was made a few months ago by the Prime Minister in the question period to the effect that he intended to use the day after tomorrow to answer the questions raised by members of this House with respect to unemployment in the country and our economic situation, and in view of the fact that it is not the intention of the public broadcasting media, particularly the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, at this point in any event, to carry that very important speech and the speeches of the other party leaders with respect to the situation in the country, I wonder whether I could ask the Secretary of State if he would consult with the president of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation and perhaps advise the House further with respect to the intention of that corporation in regard to that very important public occasion in this parliament?

Hon. John Roberts (Secretary of State): Mr. Speaker, I should be happy, as requested by the hon. member, to explore this matter with the president of the CBC when I meet with him later on today.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

TV AND RADIO BROADCASTING OF PROCEEDINGS OF HOUSE AND ITS COMMITTEES

FIFTH REPORT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I have the honour to present the fifth report of the special committee appointed to supervise the implementation of radio and television broadcasting of the proceedings of the House and its committees. I do want to beg, as I indicated earlier, the indulgence of the House to take just a moment to make a remark or two about the changes in the House which have taken place over the intervening two months since we last sat.

With the tabling of this fifth report we complete a series of reports which cover in a rather comprehensive, although brief, way the work of that special committee which had a rather extraordinary mandate, that of implementing a decision of the House. This is a rather unusual mandate, and when we did meet as a committee to carry out this assigned task, our initial advice was that it would be at least 18 to 24 months before the

task could be accomplished. The fact that we are all here today, with the work done, when in fact we not only did not have the chamber vacated on July 1 as we had hoped but, indeed, not until the middle of August, is really remarkable.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: I want to pay just a brief tribute to the people who I feel have given absolute devotion to their tasks, above and beyond the call of duty. We have, as hon. members will notice, relocated the desks in the chamber in order to add more. We have relocated the Chair in order to increase the seating to 300 members and accommodate those redistribution changes which the House provided for in recent legislation. We have upgraded the sound system, which in fact is an entire replacement of the sound system, and I think it has proven today to be a very worth-while addition to our facilities.

Some hon. Members: Hear, Hear!

Mr. Speaker: We have, incredibly, constructed over the south gallery an entire studio which was not there two months ago. I think it is a tribute to the Department of Public Works that this was done, and particularly to their architect in charge who has the specific assignment of heritage buildings, Mr. Robert Calvert, and who I think has done the job in such a way as to preserve the dignity of the chamber.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: The fact that these many steps were taken within that space of time reflects, I think, the serious and conscientious attitude of the members of the committee, those members of the House who sat on this rather special committee and who worked quite long hours during the very brief recess that other members enjoyed. I will not try to name the members; they are known to the parties in the House.

In that work we were aided immensely by a team of advisers from the CBC upon whom we relied constantly for advice and technical assistance. On the technical side, that team was headed by Mr. Jim Landsberg, and on the production quality side the whole operation was watchdogged, to ensure the highest quality, by Mr. Cameron Graham. I think the House owes both those gentlemen a great deal of appreciation.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: During the time this work was carried out, the staff of the House, particularly the Clerk of the House, Mr. Alistair Fraser, had really to be in the building almost 24 hours a day to supervise.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: In that work, Mr. Fraser was joined, on the technical side of the radio and television installations, by Mr. Alex Small, who has been in the service of the House of Commons now for many years, and particularly by the Sergeant-at-Arms who was responsible for safeguarding the sanctity of this chamber during all this intensive reconstruction.

The Sergeant-at-Arms, Colonel Currie, really did yeoman service in that regard.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: Just a brief word about the concept that is involved. As members know, the concept under which we were operating, the mandate that we were given, was a specific one, and that was to proceed on the basis of an electronic *Hansard*. Therefore, the equipment which is in place is here, not out of an introduction of news coverage but out of the introduction of an addition to our *Hansard* reporting, the printed *Hansard* which has been here since the beginning of the sittings of this House. We are adding radio and television *Hansard*.

That concept is one by which we have been guided constantly and one which we feel sets up a fundamental relationship with the networks that may distribute this product. In other words, it has been our task to bring it into being here as a reporting device of the proceedings of the House and to make it available. This we have done, and we leave it to the networks and the publicity and media people to choose or leave alone what they wish, as has been the case in print media up to now. That seems to be a very satisfactory concept for this coverage.

There are, however, a number of questions that remain unresolved. We have temporary equipment in place now. The cameras which are to the left and right of the Chair are manually operated, as members can see. We have attempted to place them in such a way as to be as inobtrusive as possible to the proceedings of the House. Members know that in about six months' time, when the equipment is available, these cameras will be mounted underneath the galleries and operated remotely, so that there will not be even this much interference with the proceedings of the House.

During that time we will need to experiment with our capacity to use this very powerful medium to record our proceedings, for indeed there are many questions about the manner in which these cameras ought to be directed and controlled. The only way we can resolve these questions is to experiment with them, which, of course, was another very essential part of our mandate when this task was begun.

The lighting is a little higher than it absolutely needs to be, and we are hoping that it will be toned down both in temperature and intensity.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: The task generally has been a very great challenge. As I say, many questions remain unresolved, and therefore your committee will seek a mandate in the new session to be reconstituted in order to continue the assessment of this ongoing experience. We do have many questions. Many representations are being made to us about distribution and assistance by the House in distributing the film that we take. We have a number of questions about rights and immunities. In terms of hon. members, we did address ourselves to the question of the rights and immunities of members. Basically, since we are simply going on with the reporting of our own proceedings, it was not felt that there was any fundamental change in the rights and immunities already enjoyed by members.

There is, however, a question or two about the position of broadcasters, and about the position of our interpreters, which we want to see resolved. The committee will be hearing further representations on that, and perhaps will even be considering the possibility or the advisability of attempting to draft some legislation—even though the opinion may be that legislation is not absolutely necessary—on the feeling that the House and the country would benefit from removing any uncertainties that might exist.

Again I say to all of those who have worked so tirelessly during this short recess, who have performed this work on behalf of the House, in keeping with the dignity of the chamber, the very important work here and this concept of recording our own proceedings with an increased awareness and service to the Canadian public, that I think the House owes them a great debt of gratitude, and I think we are fortunate that this work has been completed in time.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Clark: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, you have, very properly, expressed the appreciation of the members of the House to everyone involved in the preparation of the transformation of this chamber, with one singular exception. That exception, sir, is yourself, who chaired the committee.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Clark: We all appreciate that that was very arduous and demanding work which has only just begun. I am sure I speak on behalf of all your colleagues in the House of Commons in expressing our very real appreciation to Your Honour for the work you did through the summer.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

PROROGATION OF PARLIAMENT

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker: Order! I have the honour to inform the House that a communication has been received on October 4, 1977 which is as follows:

Government House
Ottawa

October 4, 1977

Sir:

I have the honour to inform you that the Right Honourable Bora Laskin, P.C., Chief Justice of Canada, in his capacity as Deputy Governor General, will proceed to the Senate Chamber at 3.15 p.m. approximately on Monday, October 17th, for the purpose of proroguing the Second Session of the Thirtieth Parliament of Canada.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your obedient servant,
Edmond Joly de Lotbinière
Administrative Secretary
to the Governor General

● (1510)

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*Translation*]

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

Mr. Yvon Pinard (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): To show my gratitude for such a warm welcome, I shall answer some five hundred questions today.

Mr. Speaker, the following questions will be answered today: 41, 44, 53, 159, 163, 174, 193, 358, 625, 630, 632, 699—

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. parliamentary secretary, in an assiduous task under his new responsibilities, has provided the House with a copy of the list of questions proposed to be answered today. Under the circumstances, because the list is rather extensive and is some 2½ pages in length, I wonder if the House might be of a disposition to file the list and consider it to have been read.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Agreed.

[*Editor's Note: The numbers of the questions mentioned above are as follows:*] 41, 44, 53, 159, 163, 174, 193, 358, 625, 630, 632, 699, 745, 862, 863, 865, 976, 1,141, 1,175, 1,179, 1,214, 1,216, 1,335, 1,336, 1,412, 1,413, 1,451, 1,479, 1,492, 1,534, 1,554, 1,574 to 1,602 incl., 1,638, 1,719, 1,743, 1,788, 1,869, 1,870, 1,882, 1,915, 1,930, 1,935, 1,945, 1,955, 1,997, 1,998, 1,999, 2,008, 2,027, 2,028, 2,029, 2,044, 2,045, 2,053, 2,067, 2,068, 2,081, 2,082, 2,085, 2,154, 2,155, 2,195 to 2,202 incl., 2,232, 2,233, 2,234, 2,260, 2,304, 2,316, 2,339, 2,356, 2,368, 2,394, 2,401, 2,404, 2,405, 2,428, 2,431, 2,433, 2,434, 2,442, 2,451, 2,454, 2,456, 2,462, 2,538, 2,542, 2,547, 2,555, 2,556, 2,557, 2,646, 2,725, 2,727, 2,728, 2,735, 2,737, 2,738, 2,740, 2,741, 2,744, 2,746, 2,757, 2,762, 2,767, 2,771, 2,783, 2,785, 2,787, 2,788, 2,789, 2,794, 2,798, 2,804, 2,807, 2,809, 2,812, 2,814, 2,819, 2,820, 2,825, 2,827, 2,837, 2,842, 2,843, 2,844, 2,847, 2,848, 2,849, 2,854, 2,856, 2,857, 2,858, 2,861, 2,863, 2,864, 2,865, 2,867, 2,869, 2,870, 2,872, 2,873, 2,881, 2,884, 2,885, 2,886, 2,887, 2,889, 2,895, 2,898, 2,900, 2,901, 2,903, 2,904, 2,907, 2,909, 2,910, 2,911, 2,914, 2,915, 2,916, 2,917, 2,918, 2,921, 2,922, 2,923, 2,924, 2,926, 2,929, 2,931, 2,933, 2,936, 2,942, 2,945, 2,948, 2,949, 2,950, 2,951, 2,954,

2,956 to 3,004 incl., 3,009 as well as questions Nos. 113, 117, 326, 506, 657, 722, 723, 727, 730, 1,014, 1,168, 1,180, 1,191, 1,206, 1,207, 1,209, 1,279, 1,294, 1,298, 1,337, 1,394, 1,397, 1,409, 1,485, 1,627, 1,649, 1,829, 1,996, 2,032, 2,064, 2,065, 2,066, 2,083, 2,251, 2,270, 2,277, 2,298, 2,314, 2,346, 2,389, 2,432, 2,435, 2,460, 2,475, 2,539, 2,550, 2,675 (revised) 2,724, 2,729, 2,731, 2,750, 2,782, 2,790, 2,806, 2,833, 2,840, 2,841, 2,850, 2,868, 2,874, 2,880, 2,894, 2,896, 2,897, 2,925, 2,946, 2,952 and 3,008.

USE OF GOVERNMENT AIRCRAFT

Question No. 41—**Mr. Cossitt:**

With reference to the answer to Question No. 3,240 of the First Session of the 30th Parliament, that lists in part 32 trips by the Minister of Agriculture, his wife and members of his family by government aircraft at public expense since September 25, 1973 (a) what is the total cost of all the trips to the taxpayer (b) for what reason was this answer Tabled rather than printed in *Hansard* since answers of much greater length have been printed in *Hansard*?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): (a) See reply to question No. 2,881. (b) See Beauchesne's Citation 171 (a), (j) and (kk).

USE OF GOVERNMENT AIRCRAFT

Question No. 44—**Mr. Cossitt:**

In a letter dated October 14, 1975 to Mr. Charles S. Pringle, 500 Ouellette Avenue, Windsor, Ontario did the Minister of Agriculture state in part "For flights undertaken on behalf of the government as a whole, the Minister's budget is charged double the first class rate fare that would be chargeable by commercial carriers for the same on similar flights and trajectory of $100, whichever is greater" and, if so (a) when was the policy established by the government (b) how was such an amount to be charged arrived at (c) what was (i) the actual cost to the government of the DOT aircraft used by the Minister on a trip to Vancouver on October 17 to 19, 1975 (ii) the amount charged to the Minister's budget if the basis for charges outlined by the Minister had been followed?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): See reply to question No. 2,881.

APPOINTMENT OF 1976 CENSUS COMMISSIONERS

Question No. 53—**Mr. Cossitt:**

With reference to the answer to Question No. 5,307 of the First Session of the 30th Parliament, which stated in part that in all constituencies the name of the local contact for appointment of 1976 Census commissioners was provided to Statistics Canada by the office of the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce, in each case, what are the names and addresses of the persons, from whom the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce received such recommendations?

Mr. Hugh Poulin (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): The office of the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce advises that it received the names of the local contact for the constituencies listed from the following:

Riding	Name
1. Abitibi	Hon. André Ouellet
2. Gatineau	Mr. Gaston Clermont
3. Hull	Mr. Gaston Isabelle
4. Pontiac	Mr. Thomas H. Lefebvre
5. Témiscamingue	Hon. André Ouellet
6. Villeneuve	Hon. André Ouellet

Order Paper Questions

Riding	Name
7. Algoma	Mr. Maurice Foster
8. Cochrane	Mr. Ralph Stewart
9. Frontenac, Lennox and Addington	Hon. H. Faulkner
10. Glengarry-Prescott-Russell	Hon. H. Faulkner
11. Grenville-Carleton	Hon. John Turner
12. Kingston and the Islands	Hon. H. Faulkner
13. Lanark-Renfrew-Carleton	Hon. John Turner
14. Leeds	Hon. John Turner
15. Nickel Belt	Hon. R. Andras
16. Nipissing	Mr. J. J. Blais
17. Ottawa-Carleton	Hon. John Turner
18. Ottawa Centre	Mr. Hugh Poulin
19. Ottawa Vanier	Mr. Jean Robert Gauthier
20. Ottawa West	Mr. Lloyd Francis
21. Renfrew North-Nipissing East	Mr. Leonard D. Hopkins
22. Sault Ste-Marie	Hon. R. Andras
23. Stormont-Dundas	Mr. Ed Lumley
24. Sudbury	Hon. J. Jerome
25. Timiskaming	Hon. R. Andras
26. Timmins	Mr. Jean Roy

USE OF AIRCRAFT BY PRIME MINISTER

Question No. 113—**Mr. Cossitt:**

1. What was the total cost to the taxpayer of the Prime Minister's visit to Prince Edward Island during September 1976, including the cost of (a) transportation (b) accommodation (c) accompanying staff?

2. What are the names and job designations of all staff members accompanying him?

3. What was the exact purpose of the trip and did it result in any way from the 29% standing of the Liberal Party in the gallup poll and, if so (a) was the trip an attempt to remedy such a situation on behalf of the Liberal Party (b) what was the justification for the use of public funds for such purposes?

4. Were any government aircraft used for transportation and, if so (a) what type (b) how much flying time was involved in each case (c) what was the (i) total cost in each case (ii) overall cost?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): Transport Canada advises as follows: 1. (a), (b) and (c)—See reply to question 2,881.

2. See reply to question 2,881.

3. See reply to question 2,881.

4. (a) Transport Canada Lockheed Jetstar. (b) and (c) (i), (ii)—See reply to question 2,881.

MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE—CTV PROGRAM "QUESTION PERIOD"

Question No. 117—**Mr. Cossitt:**

Did the Minister of Agriculture state on the CTV programme "Question Period" that the government had conducted a secret poll which showed that most Canadians agree with government agricultural policies and, if so (a) on what date was the poll conducted (b) was it paid for at public expense (c) what was the amount involved (d) what was the name and address of the polling organization (e) what were the reasons that the poll was taken and who authorized it (f) is it customary for the Department of Agriculture to use public funds to poll Canadians about the Department and its policies (g) will the Minister agree to make all details of the poll public, including questions actually asked, percentage replies thereto, and all other information involved and (i) if so, on what date (ii) if not, for what reason?

Hon. E. F. Whelan (Minister of Agriculture): A transcript of the program in question reveals that the minister did not actually use the word secret relative to an awareness and attitudes study conducted for the department. Any such implication referred to the point being made by the minister that the results of the survey had not, at that time, been made public. (a) Interviewing was conducted between November 22, 1975 and December 15, 1975. (b) Yes. (c) $29,700. (d) Goldfarb Consultants Limited, Toronto, Ontario. (e) The survey was designed to ascertain the awareness and attitudes of Canadians, both rural and urban, towards farming, agriculture, food and general government policy regarding agriculture. The project was approved by the Minister of Agriculture. (f) Yes. The department uses surveys, if circumstances indicate a desirability to obtain the type of information described in the answer to part (e). Surveys also provide an opportunity for the public to express views on agriculture policies. (g) Announcement has already been made that the report of the survey and the questionnaire are publicly available from the consulting firm. As the survey was conducted person-to-person, response was 100 per cent.

LANGUAGE TRAINING FOR PUBLIC SERVANTS

Question No. 159—**Mr. Reynolds:**

How many public servants presently on (a) French (b) English language training programmes have (i) five years (ii) four years (iii) three years (iv) two years (v) one year or less, remaining in their job before qualifying for a pension?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Agriculture Canada: (a) (i) 2; (ii) 1; (iii) —; (iv) 1; (v) —. (b) —. Communications: (a) (i) —; (ii) —; (iii) 3; (iv) —; (v) 1. (b) —. Consumer and Corporate Affairs: (a) (i) 1; (ii) —; (iii) —; (iv) —; (v) —. (b) —. Energy, Mines and Resources: (a) (i) —; (ii) 1; (iii) 2; (iv) 1; (v) 3. (b) —. Finance; (a) (i) —; (ii) —; (iii) —; (iv) 1; (v) —. (b) —. Office of the Auditor General: (a) (i) —; (ii) 1; (iii) — ; (iv) —; (v) —. (b) —. Fisheries and Environment: (a) (i) 6; (ii) 4; (iii) 4; (iv) 1; (v) 5. (b) —. Industry, Trade and Commerce: (a) (i) 1; (ii) 1; (iii) 1; (iv) —; (v) 1. (b) —. Statistics Canada: (a) (i) —; (ii) —; (iii) 3; (iv) —; (v) 2. (b) —. Justice (a) (i) 1; (ii) —; (iii) 1; (iv) —; (v) —. (b) —; Labour (a) (i) 2; (ii) 1; (iii) —; (iv) 1; (v) 1. (b) —; Employment and Immigration; (a) (i) 1; (ii) 1; (iii) —; (iv) —; (v) 1. (b) —. National Defence: (a) (i) 9; (ii) 5; (iii) 4; (iv) 4; (v) 4. (b) (i) 1; (ii) —; (iii) —; (iv) —; (v) —. National Health and Welfare: (a) (i) 2; (ii) 2; (iii) 4; (iv) 3; (v). (b) —. Medical Research Council: (a) (i) —; (ii) —; (iii) —; (iv) —; (v) 2. (b) —. National Revenue: (a) (i) 3; (ii) 5; (iii) 3; (iv) 1; (v) 2. (b) —. Post Office: (a) (i) —; (ii) 3; (iii) —; (9v) 1; (v) 1. (b) —. Public Works: (a) (i) 2; (ii) 1; (iii) —; (iv) 1; (v) —. (b) —, Public Service Staff Relations Board: (a) (i) 1; (ii) —; (iii) 1; (iv) —; (v) 2. (b) —. Regional Economic Expansion: (a) (i) —; (ii) —; (iii) 1; (iv) —; (v) —. (b) —. Science and Technology: (a) (i) —; (ii) —; (iii) —; (iv) —; (v) 1. (b) —. National Research Council of Canada: (a) (i) 1; (ii) 3; (iii) 1; (iv) 1; (v) 2. (b) —. Secretary of State: (a) (i) 3; (ii) —; (iii) —; (iv) —; (v) 1. (b) —. Public Service Commission: (a) (i) 1; (ii) —; (iii) —; (iv) —; (v) —. (b) —. National Museums of Canada: (a) —. (b) (i) 1; (ii) —; (iii) —; (iv) —; (v) 2. Public Archives: (a) (i) 1; (ii) —; (iii) 1; (iv) —; (v) —; (b) —.

National Library: (a) (i) —; (ii) —; (iii) —; (iv) —; (v) 1; (b) —. National Film Board: (a) (i) —; (ii) —; (iii) —; (iv) —; (v) 2; (b) —. External Affairs: (a) (i) —; (ii) —; (iii) —; (iv) 1; (v) —; (b) —. Royal Canadian Mounted Police: (a) (i) 1; (ii) 1; (iii) —; (iv) —; (v) —; (b) —. Canadian Penitentiary Service and National Parole Service: (a) (i) 2; (ii) —; (iii) —; (iv) —; (v) —; (b) —. Supply and Services: (a) (i) —; (ii) 1; (iii) —; (iv) —; (v); (b) —. Transport Canada: (a) (i) 4; (ii) 2; (iii) —; (iv) 1; (v) 2; (b) —. Treasury Board: (a) (i) —; (ii) 1; (iii) —; (iv) —; (v) 1; (b) —. National Capital Commission: (a) (i) —; (ii) 1; (iii) 1; (iv) 1; (v) —; (b) —. Other Departments and Agencies have no information on this subject.

INTERNATIONAL TREATIES

Question No. 163—**Mr. Forrestall:**

1. How many international treaties, conventions, accords, etc., have been signed by Canada but have not been (a) ratified (b) implemented by either the (i) provinces (ii) Parliament of Canada or the executive of the government of Canada?

2. What treaties are involved and on what date did Canada sign them?

3. How many such arrangements has Canada ratified but have not implemented, if any?

4. What consideration is Canada giving to implementing the recommendation of the Special Joint Committee of the Senate and House of Commons on the Constitution of Canada (1972) that international treaties be ratified by Parliament rather than the Executive and the Crown?

Mr. Fernand E. Leblanc (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State for External Affairs): In so far as the Department of External Affairs is concerned, the answer is as follows: An identical question was asked during the last session: No. 5,359. Our answer was given on July 13, 1976, see *Hansard*, page 15297. That answer remains the same.

CENSUS COMMISSIONERS IN ATLANTIC PROVINCES

Question No. 174—**Mr. Forrestall:**

1. What was the name, address and occupation of every person appointed through the office of the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce for the purpose of nominating potential 1976 Census Commissioners to Statistics Canada, for each constituency in Atlantic Canada?

2. For each such constituency, how many Census Commissioners and Census Enumerators were appointed in total?

3. What is the best estimate of the total salaries paid for Census Enumerators and Commissioners in Atlantic Canada for the 1976 Census?

Mr. Hugh Poulin (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): 1, 2 and 3, Statistics Canada reports that it does not have information on the occupations of those persons mentioned in Question 1. However, the names and addresses of contacts and all other details are as follows:

Newfoundland

Constituency	Name	Census Commissioners Number Employed	Census Representatives Number Employed
Bonavista-Trinity-Conception	Mr. Richard Knapman Lower Island Cove, Nfld.	7	116
Burin-Burgeo	Mr. Bruce Buffett Grand Banks, Nfld.	6	86
Gander-Twillingate	Mr. George Fowlow 17 Wilcokson Cres. Gander, Nfld.	8	113
Grand Falls-WhiteBay-Labrador	Mr. Walter Fewer Grand Falls, Nfld.	7	107
Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe	Mr. Ray Pollett c/o Pollett's Realty Cornerbrook, Nfld.	6	88
St. John's East	Mr. Leonard Sterling c/o Johnson's Ltd. 95 Elizabeths Ave., St. John's, Nfld.	6	94
St. John's West	Mr. Derek Lewis, 261 Douglas St. St. John's, Nfld.	5	93
Prince Edward Island			
Cardigan	Mr. John Brehaut, Hazelbrook, P.E.I.	3	50
Egmont	Mr. George Olscamp 298 Duke St., Summerside, P.E.I.	3	51
Hillsborough	Mrs. Muriel Burgoyne 25 Kensington Road, Charlottetown, P.E.I.	3	47
Malpeque	Mr. Eric Robinson Albany, P.E.I.	3	49
Nova Scotia			
Annapolis Valley	Mr. John G. Brown, 422 Main St., Wolfville, N.S.	8	124
Cape Breton-East Richmond	Mr. George Wilson, 7 MacVicar St., Glace Bay, N.S.	5	79
Cape Breton-Canso	Mr. Ronald D. MacIsaac, Office of Secretary of State for External Affairs, 125 Sussex Drive, Ottawa, Ont.	7	103
Cape Breton-The Sydneys	Mr. Russell MacLellan, 500 Kings Road, Sydney, N.S.	4	66
Central Nova	Mr. Meritt Crawford, 111 Churchill Drive, New Glasgow, N.S.	7	100
Cumberland-Colchester North	Mr. Sam Brushett, 357 Prince St., Truro, N.S.	7	99
Dartmouth-Halifax East	Mr. Frank Forbes, 8 Landrace Drive, Dartmouth, N.S.	6	115
Halifax	Mr. Brian Fleming, 5918 Rogers Drive, Halifax, N.S.	4	61
Halifax-East Hants	Mr. Hans Burgers, 3474 St. Andrews Ave., Halifax, N.S.	7	139

Order Paper Questions

Constituency	Name	Census Commissioners Number Employed	Census Representatives Number Employed
South Shore	Mr. James J. Kinley, 80 Victoria Road, Lunenburg, N.S.	8	125
South Western Nova	Miss Coline Campbell, M.P., Room 417, Confederation Bldg., Ottawa, Ontario	7	111
New Brunswick			
Carleton-Charlotte	Mr. Donald Beattie, C.A., Woodstock, N.B.	7	118
Fundy-Royal	Mr. Gordon L. Phippen, Kiersteadville, N.B.	8	133
Gloucester	Mrs. Clare Desserud, R.R. No. 2, Grovehill, Bathurst, N.B.	6	83
Madawaska-Victoria	Mr. Albert J. Gagnon, 129 rue Bellevue, Edmunston, N.B.	6	82
Moncton	Mr. Leonide H. Cyr, 880 Main St., Moncton, N.B.	6	98
Northumberland-Miramichi	Mr. H. Graham Crocker, 503 King George Highway, Newcastle, N.B.	6	90
Restigouche	Mr. M. Harquail, M.P., House of Commons	5	65
Saint John-Lancaster	John D. MacCallum, Q.C., 50 Princess Street, Saint John, N.B.	4	66
Westmorland-Kent	Mr. Berten Leblanc, 1136 rue Main, Shediac, N.B.	6	91
York-Sunbury	Mr. John C. McNair, 92 Waterloo Row, Fredericton, N.B.	7	114

Breakdown by Province		Census Commissioners Salaries Paid	Census Representatives Salaries Paid
Breakdown by Province	Newfoundland	$135,000	$400,314
	P.E.I.	36,000	82,504
	Nova Scotia	210,000	469,904
	New Brunswick	183,000	393,680

PRIME MINISTER'S TRIP TO SOUTHERN ONTARIO

Question No. 193—**Mr. Cossitt:**

1. What was the total cost to the taxpayer of the Prime Minister's trip to Southern Ontario on or about the end of September 1976 including, cost of (a) transportation (b) accommodation (c) accompanying staff?

2. What are the names and job designations of all staff members accompanying him?

3. (a) What was the purpose of the trip (b) did the trip result in any way from the 29 p. 100 standing of the Liberal Party in the Gallup Poll and, if so, was the trip an attempt to remedy such a situation on behalf of the Liberal Party (c) what justifies the use of public funds for such purposes?

[Mr. Poulin.]

4. Were any government aircraft used for transportation and, if so (a) what type (b) how much flying time was involved in each case (c) what was the (i) total cost (ii) cost in each case?

5. (a) What are the names of all Liberal Party Groups or Associations that the Prime Minister attended during the course of the trip (b) is the Liberal Party reimbursing the Public Treasury for their share of the trip and (i) if so, in what amount (ii) if not, for what reason?

6. Did the Prime Minister or any member of his family make use of a pass on any commercial aircraft during the trip and, if so (a) did they travel first class or economy (b) what would have been the appropriate fare if a pass had not been used?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): 1 to 5. See reply to question 2,881 answered this day.

6. Not applicable.

PUBLIC SERVANTS EARNING $30,000 OR MORE IN 1975

Question No. 326—**Mr. Orlikow:**

1. How many public servants received salaries of $30,000 or more in 1975?

2. How many notified their employer that they were engaged in other financial activities as required by Privy Council Guideline of 1973 included in P.C. 1973-4065, 18 December, 1973, Part 7, "Public servants should hold no outside office or employment that could place on them demands inconsistent with their official duties in an objective manner."

3. What steps, if any, have been taken to ensure that none of these outside activities are conducted during government office hours or using government facilities such as telephone, computers or secretarial staff?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): 1. 4,522 (December 31, 1975).

2. Consumer and Corporate Affairs, 4; Statistics Canada, 5; Unemployment Insurance Commission, 3; National Health and Welfare, 2; National Revenue, 3; Privy Council Office and Federal-Provincial Relations Office, 3; Public Works, 9; Regional Economic Expansion, 1; Science Council of Canada, 1; Secretary of State for External Affairs, 18; Transport, 1; Ministry of State for Urban Affairs, 1; other departments and agencies did not receive notification of engagement in other financial activities.

3. It is generally recognized that services, equipment and facilities provided to public servants are for use only in the conduct of official business. Any personal use, whether for financial gain or otherwise, can be the subject of disciplinary action. Observance is ensured by effective management supervision within departments and agencies.

FIRST CLASS MAILINGS IN CONSTITUENCY OF VAUDREUIL

Question No. 358—**Mr. Herbert:**

1. Is the Postmaster General aware that clearly marked first class mail sent by the Member for Vaudreuil from his residence or constituency office to his Ottawa office, a distance of less than 100 miles, averages five days delivery time?

2. What steps are being taken to return first class mail delivery to an acceptable level and until these measures are in effect, will the present advertising on postal boxes be removed?

Hon. J.-J. Blais (Postmaster General): 1. The Postmaster General has been made aware of the allegations through this question.

Canada Post is constantly striving to improve its service and to remedy any deficiencies that can be isolated. A major initiative has recently been implemented to identify delays and initiate appropriate action. Information on postal boxes is designed to advise customers of the service scheduled to specific destinations. Some cases involving misunderstanding of the information have occurred, and new notices that are simpler to understand will begin to appear on mail boxes within the next few months.

POSTAGE STAMPS

Question No. 506—**Mr. Brisco:**

1. How many new design postage stamps were issued in (a) 1975 (b) 1976 to date?

2. What were the costs involved in the production of each new design?

3. How much did each artist receive for his or her designs?

4. In terms of stamp sales to foreign collectors and others, etc., is it more costly or less costly to produce several different stamp designs, rather than only one specific stamp design?

Hon. J.-J. Blais (Postmaster General): 1. (a) 35. (b) 23 as of 14 October.

2. The design and production costs for each stamp.

3. Issues are shown below.

4. While it is more costly to produce several different stamp designs rather than only one specific stamp design, the sale of stamps to collectors is of secondary consideration in determining the number of stamp designs to be produced. The purpose of a stamp is to prepay postage, and stamps with different designs are issued to help focus attention on subjects of national and international interest and concern. The principal considerations which determine whether more than one design should be produced are the importance and complexity of a subject and whether the subject is of national or international interest, or a combination of the two. Revenues generated by philatelic sales are more than sufficient to cover all design and stamp production costs.

1975 Stamp Issues

Date of Issue	Description	Cost of Design	Cost of Production
February 5	Olympic Water Sports (3 stamps)	$3,500	$108,954.83
March 14	Olympic Sculptures (2 stamps)	2,000	81,379.39
April 4	Subarctic Indians Artificats and Way of Life (2 stamps)	1,400	49,800.80
	Dress and Graphic Symbolism (2 stamps)	2,900	73,650.75
May 15	Montgomery/Hémon (2 stamps)	1,950	70,472.64
May 30	Bourgeoys	1,500	44,649.36
	Desjardins	1,500	51,013.20
	Chown/Cook (2 stamps)	3,000	79,320.64
June 11	Olympic Track and Field Sports (3 stamps)	4,500	170,539.04
July 3	Calgary Centennial	1,000	47,952.62
July 14	International Women's Year	2,000	64,736.00
August 6	Olympic Combat Sports (3 stamps)	3,500	96,623.24
September 2	Supreme Court Centenary	1,500	51,211.30
September 24	Coastal Ships (4 stamps)	5,000	108,346.56
October 22	Christmas 1975 (6 stamps)	—	336,502.04
November 10	Royal Canadian Legion	1,500	68,942.72

1976 Stamp Issues

Date of Issue	Description	Design	Cost of Cost of Production
January 7	Olympic Team Sports and Gymnastics (3 stamps)	$4,000	$76,225.80
February 6	Olympic Arts & Culture (3 stamps)	5,600	59,276.63
	Olympic Winter Games, Innsbruck	2,000	40,048.79
March 12	Olympic Site (2 stamps)	3,500	98,957.60
May 12	United Nations Settlements Conference "Habitat"	1,500	27,776.00
June 1	Royal Military College Centenary (2 stamps)	3,000	68,362.72
	United States Bicentennial	-	69,518.40
June 18	Olympic Ceremonies (3 stamps)	4,400	113,071.79
August 3	Olympiad for the Physically Disabled	2,000	32,170.72
August 17	Service/Guèvremont (2 stamps)	3,500	48,569.92
September 17	Iroquoian Indians Artifacts and Way of Life (2 stamps)	1,400	47,339.04
	Dress and Graphic Symbolism (2 stamps)	2,900	74,437.84

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Question No. 625—**Mr. Dinsdale:**

1. Could a clerk in the Post Office Department be promoted to a supervisory position after one year's experience and, if so, under what circumstances?

2. Are there any instances where automated equipment has never operated since being installed in a post office and, if so, in what location has this occurred?

3. (a) Have there been instances where staff had to be increased significantly because of breakdowns in automated equipment (b) what are the main causes of the breakdowns?

4. Are postai employees relocated from one city to another and, if so (a) under what circumstances (b) could an employee be dismissed if he refused?

5. Is an employee's place of work likely to be changed within a city and, if so (a) under what circumstances (b) are factors such as location of his home, transportation, schooling, etc. taken into consideration before such transfer is made (c) is he ever forced to transfer and threatened with dismissal if he refuses?

6. Are late pay cheques and/or incorrect pay cheques considered a cause of serious dissatisfaction amongst postal employees?

7. Has any survey been made to determine if thefts in post offices are made mainly by casual or permanent employees and, if so, what were the results?

8. Between January 1 and December 31, 1975, what was the average percentage of staff turnover in post offices where automated equipment was installed?

9. Was such percentage considered abnormally high and, if so, for what reason?

Hon. J.-J. Blais (Postmaster General): 1. A clerk in the Post Office Department can be promoted to a supervisory position after one year's experience. While this would not be common, it could occur when the clerk concerned was considered by a Rating Board to be the best qualified candidate in a competition from within the area of competition established by a responsible staffing officer.

2. There have been numerous incidents where the Department has temporarily withheld processing live mail on newly

installed equipment pending final acceptance testing by the Department or pending the fulfillment of the 120-day period of notice that must be given to the Canadian Union of Postal Workers. There have also been situations where new equipment was not promptly used in new plants, while operations were being transferred in stages from another location.

3. (a) No. (b) Not applicable.

4. (a) and (b) Postal employees may be relocated from one city to another under any of the following circumstances: (i) As the result of a request submitted by the employee for a lateral transfer, normally based on medical, economic or compassionate grounds. As the request in this circumstance would be originated by the employee, the question of refusal is not applicable. (ii) As the result of a successful application for promotion to a position at another geographical location. Again, as the application would be originated by the employee, the question as to refusal does not apply. (iii) As the result of lack of work at the original location. Every effort would be made to find alternative employment at the original location. If this is not possible, every effort would be made to find a suitable position elsewhere. If suitable employment is located at another geographical location and the employee refused to relocate, the employee would not be dismissed. Instead he/she would become a lay-off and subject to the lay—off procedures which have been established for public servants.

5. (a), (b) and (c) An employee's place of work may be changed within a city. The circumstances under which this could occur would include: (i) Phasing out of an existing facility. (ii) Decrease in the number of employees at a continuing facility. (iii) The bidding process wherein employees exercise their seniority rights in the filling of vacant positions. In (i) and (ii) above consideration would be given to such factors as home, transportation, schooling, etc. insofar as is practical. Employees are not forced to transfer and are not threatened with dismissal if they refuse to transfer. On the other hand, if there is no work for an employee at one location and that employee is not prepared to present himself at another location where there is suitable work, then that employee of necessity would become a lay-off.

6. Late pay cheques cause dissatisfaction among postal employees. If this occurs, the Post Office Department and the Department of Supply and Services work to correct the problem and minimize the risk of recurrence.

7. Although figures are available as to the number of employees involved each year in the commission of thefts or other offences in the Post Office, a breakdown is not available as to the category of employees involved.

8 and 9. The turnover rate for postal operations non-supervisory sub-groups for 1975 was approximately 7.24 percent nationally. Less than one percent (0.55 percent) of this turnover was from mechanized postal plants. Neither figure is considered abnormally high.

[Mr. Blais.]

COST OF TELEGRAMS SENT BY GOVERNMENT

Question No. 630—**Mr. Beatty:**

What was the cost to the taxpayer of telegrams sent by the government in 1975?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): For many departments and agencies, the cost of telegrams alone is not available, it includes amount spent on telegraph, cable and wireless communications. Agriculture Canada, $15,347.83; Communications, $5,091.28; Consumer and Corporate Affairs, $31,396.00*; Energy, Mines and Resources, $30,902'46; Atomic Energy Control Board, $182.02; National Energy Board, $20,540.98; Atomic Energy of Canada Limited, $36,694.00; Environment Canada, $191,474.00; Finance, $9,701.11; Anti-Inflation Board, $2,008.37; Auditor General, $142.04; Insurance, $38.00; Health and Welfare Canada, $101,585.00; Indian and Northern Affairs, $72,286.33*; Industry, Trade and Commerce, $89,966.10*; Foreign Investment Review Agency, $2,309.32*; Statistics Canada, $4,782.86; Justice (Including its agencies), $3,700.30*; Labour Canada, $1,630.30*; Canada Labour Relations Board, $1,763.46; Manpower and Immigration, $41,324.15; National Defence, $144,749.00*; Revenue Canada, $40,793.90; Post Office, $181,458.00*; Prime Minister's and Privy Council Offices, $12,644.00*; Public Service Staff Relations Board, $326.51; Public Works, $192,000.00*; Regional Economic Expansion, $6,190.85*; Science and Technology, $2,477.90; Canadian Patents and Development Limited, $160.34; National Research Council of Canada, $6,243.87; Science Council of Canada, $610.48*; Secretary of State, $17,395.22*; External Affairs, $4,462,-100.00; Other government departments generate 50% of the telegrams transmitted over the facilities of the Department of External Affairs. The total cost of operating the network in 1975 was $8,924,200.00. This includes telegraphic costs, capital cost of equipment amortized over 10 years, salaries, allowances and overtime. Canadian International Development Agency, $5,881.50; Solicitor General, $886.00; Royal Canadin Mounted Police, $9,985.14; Canadian Penitentiary Service and National Parole Service, $4,864.22; National Parole Board, $1,041.93; Supply and Services, $132,474.59; Transport Canada, $200,714.82; Treasury Board, $5,477.24; Urban Affairs, $298.46*; National Capital Commission, $581.30; Veterans Affairs, $4,810.83; other departments and agencies have submitted a Nil reply.

*Fiscal year 1975/76

USE OF GOVERNMENT AIRCRAFT

Question No. 632—**Mr. Beatty:**

1. Did the Secretary of State travel to London and Stratford on July 9, 1976, and, if so, what (a) are the details of the cost (b) was the total cost?

2. What are the names of all passengers aboard the aircraft and what was their reason for travelling to London and Stratford?

3. (a) How did the passengers travel between London and Stratford and return (b) what was the cost to the taxpayer, if any, of the ground transportation used?

4. Was the Secretary of State aware that a regularly-scheduled Air Canada aircraft which could have carried the Minister's party to London landed shortly before the Minister's jet and, if so, for what reason did the Minister feel it was necessary to travel by government aircraft?

5. At what time did the Secretary of State's aircraft leave London for the return trip and what was its destination?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): I am informed by the President of the Privy Council and the Minister of State for Science and Technology as follows: 1. (a), (b) and 2. See reply to question No. 2,881.

3. (a) Rental car and private car. (b) $34.

4. Please see reply to Part 4 of question No. 69 answered November 15, 1976.

5. (a) July 10, 1976 at 1:00 p.m. (b) Ottawa with stops at Belleville and Trenton.

POST OFFICE EMPLOYEES

Question No. 657—**Mr. Lachance:**

Between the date of the presentation of the last budget May 25, 1976 and October 12, 1976, did the Post Office Department hire, dismiss or transfer employees to other departments and, if so, how many?

Hon. J.-J. Blais (Postmaster General): (1) 5,146; (2) 1,024; (3) 145.

REGIONAL OFFICES—MINISTERIAL EXEMPTED STAFF

Question No. 699—**Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich):**

1. (a) How many regional offices have been established across Canada staffed by Ministerial exempted staff or by other appointees (b) in what locations (c) what are the names of the officers staffing them (d) from what funds are rent and other office expenses paid (e) what is the cost for each such office?

2. (a) To whose staff is each appointee attached (b) do regional officers report solely to the ministers appointing them or do they have other reporting responsibilities?

3. (a) At what salary are appointments made and with what sort of allowances for travel, etc. (b) from what funds are such salaries and allowances paid?

4. What fringe benefits are enjoyed by the officers in charge of the offices, e.g., use of services aircraft on priority or stand-by basis?

5. What are the terms of reference of the officers exercising these duties and, in what manner are such terms of reference reconciled with the normal duties exercised by Members of Parliament?

6. What are the relationships between these regional offices and Liberal Members of Parliament and their constituency offices?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): It has been the policy of numerous governments to provide an office and requisite staff for ministers of the Crown in their home communities so that they may continue to function as ministers when they are at home rather than in Ottawa. These are not regional offices—"Regional Office" being defined as one which administers all activities of the department in a particular region—but are supplementary offices intended to expedite the governing of the nation by ministers who reside normally in many different areas of the country. The Minister of Agriculture, as a result of the particularly great importance of agriculture to the western economy, maintains this type of supplementary office in Regina. In so far as that office is concerned, the answer is as follows: 1. (a) 1; (b) Regina; (c) Special Assistant—vacant; Mrs. I. Lamothe; (d) Departmental appropriations; (e) 1975-76—$34,572.00 (including salaries and expenses except for accommodation).

2. (a) Minister's staff; (b) Report to minister.

3. (a) In accordance with salary scales and ranges established for exempt staff and public servants with no allowances. (b) Departmental appropriations.

4. None.

5. Special assistant to the minister with specific responsibility for Western Canada.

6. No formal relationship exists between the offices.

DREE PROJECTS IN QUEBEC

Question No. 722—**Mr. Coates:**

1. How many specific projects in Quebec has the Department of Regional Economic Expansion been financially involved in since its inception and, in each case, what was the financial involvement?

2. Of the total number of projects, what was the estimated employment figure given at the time of the announced involvement of DREE and for those firms still operating, what is the employment figure actually attributable to the financial assistance in each case, as of this date?

3. Of DREE's financial assistance to each project, what is the breakdown between outright grants and loans?

4. How many of the projects have failed and, in each case (a) on what date was the grant and loan approved (b) on what date did it fail?

5. How many employees lost employment as a result of the failure of the project at the date of the closure?

Hon. Marcel Lessard (Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): The reply for the Department of Regional Economic Expansion is as follows: 1. As of October 31, 1976, 2,143 projects in the province of Quebec had accepted offers of financial assistance from DREE under the regional development incentives program. The total value of these incentives offers is estimated to be $246.0 million. The names of the firms and respective amounts of incentives are available from the reports on the program that are submitted monthly to Parliament.

2. For the 2,143 projects, the estimated employment figure at the time of the announced involvement of DREE was 78,918. Of this total number of projects, 864 were completed as of October 31, 1976. The number of direct jobs actually created at the completion of the control period for these 864 projects, was 29,367 compared to the 31,612 jobs forecasted when the offers of financial assistance were announced. In this context, a "completed project" is one on which the full amount of the development incentive authorized by the minister under the statute has been paid to the applicant. This definition includes (a) a project which has successfully completed its control period, irrespective of any subsequent actions, and (b) a project involving a bankruptcy or total cessation of operations due to fire or other circumstances which requires the department to institute action to recover only part of the incentive paid to the applicant. With respect to this latter type of project, it is to be noted that the statute entitles the

applicant to payment of an incentive on the grounds that the project achieved some success.

3. The Regional Development Incentives Act does not authorize the department to make loans, but does provide for offers of "loan guarantees" and "repayable incentives". As of October 31, 1976 DREE had approved $18,878,000 in loan guarantees to sixteen projects in the province of Quebec. As of October 31, 1976, two of the 2,143 projects referred to in Part 1 had been undertaken as a result of repayable grants estimated at $1,251,000.

4. As of October 31, 1976, 84 of the 2,143 projects which had accepted inventives offers were discontinued before receiving their final grant payment. The dates of failure are not recorded since firms normally shut down and go through a period of attempted reorganization before announcing failure. The remaining 1,195 projects were still active at that time. In this context, a "discontinued project" is one on which the department has made a payment but in which there has subsequently been a bankruptcy, total cessation of operations, contravention of section 9 of the Regional Development Incentives Act, or other circumstance which requires the department to institute action to recover the full amount of the incentive paid to the applicant.

5. The number of employees who lost employment at the time of closure is not known. Gradual shut down of the facility, normal seasonal employment fluctuations, and even rehiring of employees by a receiver after closure in order to complete unfinished inventories make it virtually impossible to provide accurate information of this kind.

DREE PROJECTS IN ATLANTIC CANADA

Question No. 723—**Mr. Coates:**

1. How many specific projects in Atlantic Canada has the Department of Regional Economic Expansion been financially involved in since its inception and, in each case, what was the financial involvement?

2. Of the total number of projects, what was the estimated employment figure given at the time of the announced involvement of DREE and for those firms still operating, what is the employment figure actually attributable to the financial assistance in each case, as of this date?

3. Of DREE's financial assistance to each project, what is the breakdown between outright grants and loans?

4. How many of the projects have failed and, in each case (a) on what date was the grant and loan approved (b) on what date did it fail?

5. How many employees lost employment as a result of the failure of the project at the date of the closure?

Hon. Marcel Lessard (Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): The reply for the Department of Regional Economic Expansion is as follows: 1. As of October 31, 1976, 780 projects in Atlantic Canada had accepted offers of financial assistance from DREE under the regional development incentives program. The total value of these incentives offers is estimated to be $151.7 million. The names of the firms and respective amounts of incentives are available from the reports on the program that are submitted monthly to parliament.

2. For the 780 projects, the estimated employment figure at the time of the announced involvement of DREE was 25,889. Of this total number of projects, 256 were completed as of October 31, 1976. The number of direct jobs actually created at the completion of the control period for these 256 projects, was 6,387 compared to the 7,572 jobs forecasted when the offers of financial assistance were announced. In this context, a "completed project" is one on which the full amount of the development incentive authorized by the minister under the statute has been paid to the applicant. This definition includes (a) a project which has successfully completed its control period, irrespective of any subsequent actions, and (b) a project involving a bankruptcy or total cessation of operations due to fire or other circumstance which requires the department to institute action to recover only part of the incentive paid to the applicant. With respect to this latter type of project, it is to be noted that the statute entitles the applicant to payment of an incentive on the grounds that the project achieved some success.

[Mr. Lessard.]

3. The Regional Development Incentives Act does not authorize the department to make loans, but does provide for offers of "loan guarantees" and "repayable incentives". As of October 31, 1976, DREE had approved $4,555,000 in loan guarantees to five projects in Atlantic Canada. As of October 31, 1976, two of the 780 projects referred to in part I had been undertaken as a result of repayable grants estimated at $1,455,000.

4. As of October 31, 1976, 37 of the 780 projects which had accepted incentives offers discontinued before receiving their final grant payment. The dates of failure are not recorded since firms normally shut down and go through a period of attempted reorganization before announcing failure. The remaining 487 projects were still active at that time. In this context, a "discontinued project" is one on which the department has made a payment but in which there has subsequently been a bankruptcy, total cessation of operations, contravention of section 9 of the Regional Development Incentives Act, or other circumstance which requires the department to institute action to recover the full amount of the incentive paid to the applicant.

5. The number of employees who lost employment at the time of closure is not known. Gradual shut down of the facility, normal seasonal employment fluctuations, and even rehiring of employees by a receiver after closure in order to complete unfinished inventories makes it virtually impossible to provide accurate information of this kind.

ANTI-INFLATION BOARD ADVERTISING

Question No. 727—**Mr. Coates:**

1. How much, to date, has the AIB expended on advertising, in any form, and what is the breakdown?

2. (a) What agencies are involved in the advertising (b) in what manner did the AIB make the selection of the agencies (c) were public tenders called before contracts were awarded?

3. In each case, what have the agencies received in fees and commissions?

4. By agency, what is the estimated cost for advertising for the fiscal year 1976-77 and, in each case, what will be the fees and commissions paid to each agency in the fiscal year?

Mr. Bob Kaplan (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Finance): 1. To date the board has spent $348,487.13. The breakdown is as follows: Fiscal 75/76, $230,705.38; Fiscal 76/77, $117,781.75. This was all print advertising done to inform Canadians about AIB requirements and programs.

2. (a) MacLaren Advertising Limited, Canadian Advertising Agency Limited. (b) On the recommendation of the communications branch of the AIB. (c) No.

3. MacLaren Advertising Ltd: Fiscal 75/76, $41,525.78; Fiscal 76/77, Nil. Canadian Advertising Agency Ltd: Fiscal 75/76, Nil; Fiscal 76/77, Nil.

4. Fiscal year 76/77: MacLaren Advertising Ltd: $250,000, Canadian Advertising Agency: $50,000. The fees will be the normal 15 per cent paid by the media for advertising placed by agencies.

PRIME MINISTER'S TRIPS OUTSIDE CANADA

Question No. 730—**Mr. Coates:**

1. How many trips outside Canada has the Prime Minister taken since he assumed his present position in 1968?

2. How many were for (a) business (b) business and pleasure (c) pleasure?

3. How many were made by (a) government aircraft (b) commercial aircraft (c) using both types of aircraft?

4. What were the specific trips when government aircraft were involved?

5. In each case, what was the total period of time the Prime Minister was away from Canada?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): See replies to questions Nos. 29 and 30 answered this day.

PRESENT COMPLEMENT EMPLOYEES DEVCO INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT DIVISION

Question No. 745—**Mr. Muir:**

1. What is the present complement of employees in the Industrial Development Division of the Cape Breton Development Corporation?

2. What (a) are the names of the chief officers of the division (b) are their specific responsibilities (c) is the salary of each?

3. What was the complement of the Division in each fiscal year 1969-70 to date and how many projects did it have under consideration?

Mr. Ed. Lumley (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): For the Cape Breton Development Corporation the answer is as follows: 1. 34 (December 31, 1976).

2. (a) David I. Miller, Vice President, Industrial Development Division John L. Dodge, Vice President, Planning and Marketing. (b) Mr. Miller is responsible for the Industrial Development Division's operations in the Tourism, Primary and Secondary sectors. Mr. Dodge is responsible for the planning of activities for the Industrial Development Division and the marketing function of the Coal Division. (c) It is not the policy of the corporation to disclose individual salaries.

3. The complement of the division in each fiscal year was: March 1970, 7; March 1971, 7; March 1972, 9; March 1973, 20; March 1974, 28; March 1975, 30; March 1976, 34. As of December 31, 1976, there were 99 projects under consideration. It is not possible to give precise numbers for particular dates in earlier years, but the volume has been markedly increasing, as has the work of implementing projects.

ESTIMATED COST OF RELOCATION

Question No. 862—**Mr. Herbert:**

What is the estimated cost of the relocation of the Canadian Pension Commission, the Pension Review Board, the War Veterans Allowance Board and the Bureau of Pension Advocates as well as veterans services, treatment services and administration services of the Department of Veterans Affairs to Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island?

Hon. Daniel J. MacDonald (Minister of Veterans Affairs): Subject to more detailed studies the total estimated cost of the relocation of the Department of Veterans Affairs to Charlottetown, P.E.I. is 8.5 million dollars.

NEW FEDERAL BUILDING—CHARLOTTETOWN, P.E.I. TO HOUSE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

Question No. 863—**Mr. Herbert:**

What is the (a) estimated cost (b) approximate number of square feet of the new federal building which is to be constructed in Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island, to house the Canada Pension Commission, the Canadian Review Board, the Veterans Allowance Board and the Bureau of Pension Advocates as well as veterans services, treatment services and administration services of the Department of Veterans Affairs?

Mr. Alexandre Cyr (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Public Works): (a) and (b) Not known at this time as detailed accommodation requirements have not yet been identified by Department of Veterans Affairs.

LAND ACQUISITION, CHARLOTTETOWN, P.E.I.—NEW FEDERAL BUILDING FOR DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

Question No. 865—**Mr. Herbert:**

Has land been purchased or has an option been taken on land in Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island for the construction of the new building for the Canadian Pension Commission, the Pension Review Board, the War Veterans Allowance Board and the Bureau of Pension Advocates as well as veterans services, treatment services and administration services of the Department of Veterans Affairs?

Mr. Alexandre Cyr (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Public Works): No.

LIQUOR PURCHASES—1975

Question No. 976—**Mr. Beatty:**

How much money was spent by the government to purchase liquor in 1975?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Agriculture Canada, $1,956.00. Communications, $1,717.54. Consumer and Corporate Affairs, $4,235.24. Atomic Energy of Canada Limited, $2,200. Finance, $1,223.73. Anti-Inflation Board, $289.67. Office of the Auditor General, $412.35. Indian Affairs and Northern Development, $1,026.56. Statistics Canada, $197.00.

Canada Labour Relations Board, $87.55. Employment and Immigration, $4,399.07. Unemployment Insurance Commission, $999. National Defence, $5,978.88. (These costs represents the liquor purchases mainly for the treatment of geriatric veteran patients). National Revenue, $3,637. Post Office, $509.10. Prime Minister's Residence, $1,925.77. Public Works, $950. Regional Economic Expansion, $4,004.85. Science Council of Canada, $84.30. Secretary of State, $567.26. Public Archives, $1,624.95. National Library, $669.40. National Film Board, $7,326.15. External Affairs, $12,115.95. Transport Canada, $19,941.21. Treasury Board Secretariat, $46.70. Urban Affairs, $3,879.51. National Capital Commission, $251.60. Veterans Affairs, $17,205. (Treatment Services Program for medical purposes). Records are not kept for purchases of liquor perse. Such purchases, if made, would be included in the hospitality expenses claims of individual officers and not as a separate item. However, for the purpose of this question, we have given the costs of liquor for occasions such as conventions, receptions, official dinners, etc. Other departments and agencies have reported that their accounting systems do not provide a breakdown of expenditures on liquor alone. Therefore, the information requested is not readily available.

FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE FOR URBAN TRANSPORTATION

Question No. 1,014—**Mr. Howie:**

1. Is any financial assistance available or under consideration for a publicly-owned urban transportation system such as the bus system in Fredericton, New Brunswick?

2. Is any such assistance available or under consideration for inter-city systems?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): I am informed by the Ministry of State for Urban Affairs as follows: 1. No financial assistance is currently available from the federal government for a publicly-owned urban transportation system such as the bus system in Fredericton, New Brunswick. A proposed urban transit assistance program is being discussed with the provinces at the present time by officials of the Ministry of Transport and the Ministry of State for Urban Affairs.

2. As far as inter-city bus systems are concerned, there is no financial assistance available from the federal government at the present time, nor is assistance being considered.

DESIGNATED MOVES TO HULL

Question No. 1,141—**Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton):**

1. Which departments or agencies are designated to be moved, in whole or in part, to Hull and, in each case, what is the estimated cost?

2. Has the government commissioned studies respecting the moving of departments or parts thereof to Hull and, if so, in each case (a) who prepared it (b) what were its terms of reference (c) is the study available for release to the public?

3. By what amount will the total floor space, occupied in Ottawa, be reduced by (a) the move to Hull (b) decentralization of government operations from the National Capital Region?

[Mr. Goodale.]

4. (a) What consultation has been undertaken with Hull to determine the best means of maximizing benefits and minimizing harmful effects on the City (b) what consultation has taken place with the City of Ottawa to minimize possible harmful effects on the City?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): I am informed by the Department of Public Works and the National Capital Commision as follows: 1. Treasury Board has approved the relocation of the following departments to Hull: Department of Supply & Services Department of Indian & Northern Affairs Canadian Radio-Television and Telecommunications Commission Canadian International Development Agency Department of Regional Economic Expansion Ministry of Solicitor General Manpower and Immigration Secretary of State Canadian Labour Relations Board Unemployment Insurance Commission Canadian Transport Commission. The estimated cost to move DSS is $250,000. Estimates for the other departments have not been finalized as yet.

2. No. (a) No applicable (b) Not applicable (c) Not applicable.

3. (a) Approximately 3.5 million sq. ft. (b) In the order of 1.2 million sq. ft. The Total amount of floor space occupied in Ottawa will not be proportionately reduced by the foregoing due to the growth of the public service, the 1.6 million sq. ft. of new Crown-owned office accommodation that will be coming on stream in Ottawa, the demolition of 2 million sq. ft. of obsolete and uneconomical temporary buildings over the period, and other interrelated factors.

4. (a) Extensive consultation were held with the city of Hull and the provincial government. As a result a number of projects have been undertaken and are being funded in part or in whole by the federal government to maximize benefits and minimizearterial roads, a demonstration housing project in the "secteur Fournier", a major regional sewerage collection and treatment system. Joint Planning with the Hull, Outaouais Regional and provincial authorities is currently underway for the continued development of the centre town of Hull, for local industrial relocation, as for a number of other elements of urban development. (b) In addition to continuing consultation with city of Ottawa officials on a variety of development issues, the relocation of federal departments to Hull and its implications for the development of the city of Ottawa have been discussed on a number of occasions: for example, when the "Torontow's Capital" concept was being prepared (meeting with Ottawa Planning Board, in 1974). More recently the Hon. Jean Chrétien, Minister for Industry, Trade and Commerce, and the Hon. J. Buchanan, Minister for Public Works, have held discussions with the mayor of Ottawa.

WRITS OF ASSISTANCE

Question No. 1,168—**Mr. Forrestall:**

1. In each year since 1967, how many writs of assistance were issued and under what statutes?

2. How many were issued to (a) RCMP members (b) employees of government departments and agencies (c) employees of provincial governments and agencies (d) employees of municipalities including municipal police forces?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): 1. The identification of the actual number of writs of assistance issued to RCMP members under each statute for each of the years in question is rendered impractical by the extensive research required; the average number of writs of assistance in use during each year follows and takes into consideration yearly issues, cancellations and those that are carried onward from one year to the next:

Customs Act		Excise Act	
Year	Number in use	Year	Number in use
1968	Not available	1968	Not available
1969	Not available	1969	Not available
1970	296	1970	293
1971	256	1971	243
1972	258	1972	240
1973	243	1973	219
1974	251	1974	230
1975	219	1975	203
1976 November	221	1976 November	192

Narcotic Control Act		Food and Drugs Act	
Year	Number in use	Year	Number in use
1968	135	1968	134
1969	168	1969	166
1970	242	1970	242
1971	205	1971	205
1972	163	1972	163
1973	233	1973	233
1974	271	1974	271
1975	325	1975	325
1976	268	1976	268

Customs Act	
Year	Number in use
1967	58
1968	63
1969	69
1970	70
1971	72
1972	74
1973	72
974	83
1975	80
1976	79

2. (a) See Part 1. (b) In so far as the Department of National Revenue is concerned:

In so far as the Department of National Health and Welfare is concerned: None. (c) Not applicable. (d) Not applicable.

DISMISSAL OF PUBLIC SERVANTS

Question No. 1,175—**Mr. Herbert:**

1. In the past five years, how many public servants have been dismissed for waste, extravagance or misuse of public funds?

2. What are the salary ranges of the public servants dismissed for these reasons?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Communications: 1 1.

2 $8,743—$9,608.

Energy, Mines and Resources 1—1

2—$17,700-$22,100.

Indian Affairs and Northern Development: 1 4.

2, $17,000—$20,000; $15,000—$17,000; $14,000—$16,000; $16,000—$18,000.

Employment and Immigration: 1 4.

2 $9,363—$10,232; $10,394—$11,364; $15,459—$17,523; $16,516—$20,646.

National Defence: 1 1.

2 $2.80 per hour

National Revenue: 1 9.

2 $9,000—$14,000.

Post Office: 1 489.

2 $7,905—$17,523.

Public Archives; 1 1.

2 %15,070—$17,080.

National Film Board; 1 1.

$7,496—$8,238.

Supply and Services: 1 1.

2 $7,777—$8,499.

Transport Canada; 1 3.

2 $18,137—$20,400.

Urban Affairs: 1 1.

2 $14,812—$16,836.

Veterans Affairs: 1 2.

2 $8,700—$12,500; $17,887—$20,291.

Other Departments and Agencies have no information on this subject.

DEPARTMENT OF FISHERIES AND THE ENVIRONMENT—RETIRED PUBLIC SERVANTS REHIRED

Question No. 1,179—**Mr. Crouse:**

1. Have any retired public servants previously in the employ of the Department of Fisheries and of the Environment been rehired by the Department and, if so, what (a) are their names (b) are their duties (c) are their terms and period of employment (d) is the amount of their salary (e) is their retirement pension?

2. Were the positions advertised to the public or were the appointments made by the Minister?

Mr. Jim Fleming (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Fisheries and the Environment): 1. Yes; (a) to (d)—See table below. (e) Information personal.

Order Paper Questions

(a) Names	(b) Duties	(c) Terms and periods of employment	(d) Salary	2.
L. A. Bradbury	Consultation on Program Development for the Atlantic Coast Saltfish Industry.	April 1, 1976 to March 31, 1977 39 days at $250. per day	$ 9,750.	The individual was employed under contract with the approval of the Minister of Fisheries and the Environment.
P. Brunavs	Generalized algorithm to accurately predict the retardation of radio signals, etc.	June 22, to November 31, 1976 68 days at $125. per day	8,500.	The individual was employed under contract with the approval of the Minister of Fisheries and the Environment.
S. W. Tibbo	Consulting services, Fisheries and Marine Service.	April 1, 1976 to January 7, 1977 33 days at $175. per day	5,775.	The individual was employed under contract with the approval of the Minister of Fisheries and the Environment.
A. W. H. Needler	Consultation of Fisheries at Law of the Sea ICNAF.	April 1, 1976 to March 31, 1977 45 days at $210. per day	9,450.	The individual was employed under contract with the approval of the Minister of Fisheries and the Environment.
T. H. Turner	Research and editing of History of Fisheries Management in Canada.	May 1, 1976 to December 31, 1977 40 days at $125. per day	5,000	The individual was employed under contract with the approval of the Minister of Fisheries and the Environment.
A. Bickerstaff	Services "as and when required" to act as Executive Secretary of the Canadian Forestry Advisory Council.	June 17, 1976 to March 31, 1977 $150 per day not to exceed 75 days	11,250.	Negotiated through D.S.S. with referred supplier.
	To complete a draft manuscript on the growth and yield of Canadian forests in bibliography format, and to supervise preparation and submit statistics summary of areas of forest sections in Canada.	August 12, 1976 to September 30, 1976	1,500.	Negotiated through D.S.S. with referred supplier.
J. E. McDonald	To obtain data on growth and bud production and related phenological forms with respect to Christmas tree production or growth.	April 1, 1976 to March 30, 1977	700.	Negotiated through D.S.S. with referred supplier.
B. H. Phelps	Investigation & certification on conifer seeds for control of forest reproduction materials moving in international trade.	July 1, 1976 to March 31, 1977 23 days at $65. per day	1,495.	Negotiated through D.S.S. wich referred supplier.
J. A. Turner	To carry out a study of the Canadian Forest Fire Danger Rating System and prepare a text under Fire Weather Section of the C.F.F. D.R.S.	October 14, 1976 to January 31, 1977 32 days at $125. per day	4,000	Negotiated through D.S.S. with referred supplier.
P. W. Strilaeff	Provide technical consultation in matters related to planning and management of Water Quantity Data Survey Program. The end result will be an annual tabulation of stream flow and water level data for B.C. Yukon Network of gaging stations.	September 13, 1976 to March 31, 1977 135 days at $150. per day	20,250.	Negotiated through D.S.S. with referred supplier.
	To review, evaluate and recommend organizational changes in I.W.D.	October 15, 1976 to December 31, 1976	5,300.	Negotiated through D.S.S. with referred supplier.
D.Storr	Production of reports on wind and water balance data at Marmot Creek.	March 18, 1976 to February 28, 1977	4,800.	Appointed to the position by the Atmospheric Environment Service.
A. Nurklik	Translation of scientific Paper from Russian to English.	October 1, 1976 to September 30, 1977	12,000.	Appointed to the position by the Atmospheric Environment Service.

GOVERNMENT AIRCRAFT

Question No. 1,180—**Mr. Beatty:**

1. How many times since he became a member of the Cabinet has the Minister of Agriculture personally made use of government aircraft and, in each case, what was the (a) purpose (b) point of departure and destination (c) type of aircraft (d) cost to the taxpayer?

2. What was the total cost to the taxpayer of all such trips?

3. Which trips were for (a) personal (b) political business?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): See replies to questions Nos. 29 and 30 answered this day.

[Mr. Fleming.]

TAXI EXPENDITURES BY GOVERNMENT

Question No. 1,191—**Mr. Beatty:**

What was the total amount paid by the government for taxis in (a) 1975 (b) the first ten months of (i) 1975 (ii) 1976?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Agriculture Canada: (a) $18,894.83. (b)(i) $15,289.91; (ii) $10,381.05. Communications: (a) $26,772.05. (b)(i) $22,340.50; (ii) $15,117.62. Consumer and Corporate Affairs: (a) $38,126.83. (b)(i) $21,513.73; (ii) $12,126.25. Energy, Mines and Resources: (a) $37,182.00. (b)(i) $26,669.00; (ii) $36,443.00. Atomic Energy of Canada Limited: (a) $117,295.00. (b)(i) $96,467.00; (ii) $100,098.00. Atomic Energy Control Board: (a) $451.00.

(b)(i) $377.00; (ii) $628.00. National Energy Board: (a) $3,434.00. (b)(i) $2,670.00; (ii) $4,700.00. Environment: (a) $199,995.00. (b)(i) $165,701.00; (ii) $147,340.00. Finance: (a) $38,408.48. (b)(i) $30,768.92; (ii) $31,309.82. Anti-Inflation Board: (b)(i) Nil; (ii) $33,493.09. Office of the Auditor General: (a) $224.25. (b)(i) $193.70; (ii) $754.20. Insurance: (a) $988.00. (b)(i) $593.00; (ii) $541.00. Tariff Board: (a) $78.75. (b)(i) $53.25; (ii) $61.35. Indian Affairs and Northern Development: (a) $80,165.00. (b)(i) $68,325.00; (ii) $44,735.00. Industry, Trade and Commerce: (a) $154,892.31. (b)(i) $110,310.30; (ii) $125.018.13. Foreign Investment Review Agency: (a) $4,604.74. (b)(i) $1,710.00; (ii) $4,606.44. Statistics Canada: (a) A specific account for taxi costs was not maintained during that period. (b)(i) $52,019.00; (ii) $53,157.30. Justice: (a) $29,447.63. (b)(i) $23,749.68; (ii) $25,168.15. Law Reform Commission: (a) $6,575.37. (b)(i) $6,132.88; (ii) $3,075.15. Tax Review Board: (a) $126.35. (b)(i) $83.65; (ii) $113.50. Canadian Judicial Council: (a) $15.60; (b)(i) $15.60; (ii) Nil. Labour: (a) $9,510.24. (b)(i) $7,288.85; (ii) $6,963.19. Canada Labour Relations Board: (a) $7,165.49. (b)(i) $5,632.34; (ii) $5,516.91. Employment and Immigration: (a) $52,613.44. (b)(i) $43,777.40; (ii) $29,642.71. Unemploymnt Insurance Commission: (a) See reply to question No. 191 answered August 4, 1977. (b)(i) $27,168.00; (ii) Same as (a) above. National Defence: (a) $8,936.46. (b)(i) $7,744.65; (ii) $4,680.65. National Health and Welfare: (a) $157,095.00. (b)(i) $122,274.00; (ii) $135,095.00. Medical Research Council: (a) $1,292.00. (b)(i) $952.00; (ii) $809.00. Office of the Co-ordinator, Status of Women: (a) and (b)(i) Not applicable; (b)(ii) $110.00. National Revenue: (a) $77,499.72. (b)(i) $63,119.02; (ii) $73,151.92. Post Office: (a) $44,538.40. (b)(i) $39,037.80; (ii) $26,524.72. Prime Minister's office, the Privy Council office, the office of the President of the Privy Council and the office of the leader of the government in the Senate. (a) $28,219.93. (b)(i) $23,417.14; (ii) $11,771.18. April to October 1976. Public Works: (a) $32,736.00. (b)(i) $27,427.00; (ii) $21,901.00. Regional Economic Expansion: (a) $65,815.75. (b)(i) $53,786.21; (ii) $45,983.62. Science and Technology: (a) $7,768.52. (b)(i) $6,402.94; (ii) $6,014.66. Canadian Patents and Development Limited: (a) $245.50. (b)(i) $214.75; (ii) $174.70. National Research Council of Canada: (a) $2,067.90. (b)(i) $1,533.40; (ii) $1,651.35. Science Council of Canada: (a) $3,543.29. (b)(i) $2,623.50; (ii) $3,712.73. Secretary of State: (a) $69,686.33. (b)(i) $56,711.21; (ii) $57,423.73. External Affairs: (a) $22,811.11. (b)(i) $18,729.95; (ii) $22,160.91. Canadian International Development Agency: (a) $48,008.56. (b)(i) $36,839.99; (ii) $34,922.52. Solicitor General: (a) $23,807.23. (b)(i) $18,648.29; (ii) $19,715.50. Royal Canadian Mounted Police: (a) $47,410.97. (b)(i) $39,916.10; (ii) $47,916.43. National Parole Board: (a) $6,500.00. (b)(i) $5,410.00; (ii) $1,570.00. Supply and Services: (a) $131,764.24. (b)(i) $102,743.28; (ii) $117,786.19. Transport Canada: (a) $119,372.00. (b)(i) $97,757.00; (ii) $106,759.00. Treasury Board Secretariat: (a) $42,686.37. (b)(i) $35,516.49; (ii) $28,924.08. Urban Affairs: (a) $91,032.00. (b)(i) $63,886.00; (ii) $40,491.00. National Capital Commission: (a) $909.60. (b)(i) $829.90; (ii) $802.55. Veterans Affairs: (a) $37,529.97. (b)(i) $31,845.55; (ii) $21,504.10. These amounts do not include the transportation of veterans for treatment purposes. All of the expenditures exclude charges for taxis included on employee travel claims. The cost to search travel claims would be prohibitive.

GOVERNMENT AIRCRAFT

Question No. 1,206—**Mr. Cossitt:**

1. How many times since he became a member of the Cabinet has the Minister of Justice personally made use of government aircraft and, in each case, what was the (a) purpose (b) point of departure and destination (c) type of aircraft (d) cost to the taxpayer?

2. What was the total cost to the taxpayer of all such trips?

3. Which trips were for (a) personal (b) political (c) government business?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): See replies to questions Nos. 29 and 30 answered this day.

GOVERNMENT AIRCRAFT

Question No. 1,207—**Mr. Cossitt:**

1. How many times since he became a member of the Cabinet has the Minister of Health and Welfare personally made use of government aircraft and, in each case, what was the (a) purpose (b) point of departure and destination (c) type of aircraft (d) cost to the taxpayer?

2. What was the total cost to the taxpayer of all such trips?

3. Which trips were for (a) personal (b) political (c) government business?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): See replies to questions Nos. 29 and 30 answered this day.

"GUIDELINES ON CONFLICT OF INTEREST AND STANDARD OF CONDUCT"

Question No. 1,209—**Mr. Beatty:**

1. How many departments or agencies have printed material on conflict of interest similar to the booklet published by Statistics Canada entitled "Guidelines on Conflict of Interest and Standard of Conduct"?

2. In each case, on what date was the material printed and what is the government's policy concerning its distribution to employees?

3. In each case, from whom may a copy of the material be obtained?

Hon. Robert K. Andras (President of the Treasury Board): P.C. 1973-4065, December 18, 1973, contained guidelines to be observed by public servants concerning conflict of interest situations. Following promulgation of the guidelines, the Treasury Board issued a circular (No. 1973-183) drawing them to the attention of deputy heads and instructing deputy heads to apply the guidelines to their departmental operations. The guidelines were re-issued as part of the Personnel Management Manual in June, 1975. The guidelines may be obtained from the directors of personnel of government departments or from the personnel policy branch of the Treasury Board secretariat.

Order Paper Questions

USE OF GOVERNMENT AIRCRAFT

Question No. 1,214—**Mr. Skoreyko:**

1. From 1972 to October 31, 1976, what are the names of the Members of Parliament who have travelled on DND aircraft and, in each case, what was the (a) point of departure and destination (b) purpose of the flight?

2. For the same period, what are the names of the family members of Members of Parliament who have travelled on DND aircraft, either with the Member or separately and, in each case, what was the (a) point of departure and destination (b) purpose of the flight?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): See reply to question No. 2,881.

USE OF GOVERNMENT AIRCRAFT

Question No. 1,216—**Mr. Cossitt:**

With reference to the answer to Question No. 50 which stated in part, that the Minister of Transport made use of DOT aircraft 133 times since April 1973, of the specific trips listed (a) on which ones was the Minister accompanied by other than DOT employees (b) what were the names, addresses and job designations of all such persons and what were the reasons that they were on board?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): See reply to question No. 2,881.

MERCURY—CHLOR-ALKALI PLANTS

Question No. 1,279—**Mr. Leggatt:**

1. Have any chlor-alkali plants in Canada been out of compliance with chlor-alkali mercury effluent regulations brought into effect in June 1972 and, if so, in each case, on how many days?

2. How many prosecutions have been launched against Canadian chlor-alkali plants for non-compliance with the regulations?

3. What are the (a) companies charged (b) specific violations for which charges were laid (c) results of the prosecutions to date?

Mr. Jim Fleming (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Fisheries and the Environment): 1. Compliance data regarding individual plants are not provided herein, as requested. Plants subject to the Chlor-Alkali Mercury Regulations must submit monthly compliance reports. Information contained in these reports is statutorily compellable, but only for the purpose of enabling the minister and the officials charged with the administration and enforcement of the Fisheries Act and Regulations to determine whether the plant is in compliance with the effluent regulations. It may only be released as required for court proceedings or when the originating chlor-alkali plant consents to its being released. In total, however, from May 1972 through December 1975, there were 972 plant-days of what is considered to be actual non-compliance; 516 plant-days of theoretical non-compliance resulting from small amounts of mercury being discharged during days of no, or very low, production; and 12,820 plant-days of compliance. (Non-compliance results when daily mercury discharges to liquid effluents exceed 0.005 pounds per ton of chlorine produced.) The annual frequency of "actual" violations has been decreasing; during 1975 there were 122. As an additional, general observation, total mercury discharges to liquid effluents from chlor-alkali plants were reduced from an estimated 148,000 pounds per year prior to 1970, to approximately 2,200 pounds from May through December 1972, 900 pounds during 1973 and 1974, and 600 pounds during 1975. Also, for each plant during 1975, the ratio of total mercury discharged (in pounds) to liquid effluents, to total chlorine produced (in tons), was less than 0.005; the overall ratio, averaging those for all plants, was 0.002.

2. Two.

3. (a) Standard Chemicals Ltd. and American Can of Canada Ltd. (b) Charges were laid for the following discharges which are given in pounds of mercury per ton of chlorine produced on the day specified (i) Standard Chemicals Ltd.: 0.030 on September 2, 1972; 0.038 on September 3, 1972; 0.032 on September 4, 1972; 0.027 on September 5, 1972; 0.016 on September 24, 1972; 0.018 on September 25, 1972; 0.120 on September 26, 1972; 0.205 on September 27, 1972; 0.205 on September 28, 1972; 0.219 on September 29, 1972; 0.078 on September 30, 1972; 0.045 on October 1, 1972; 0.048 on October 2, 1972; 0.081 on October 3, 1972; 0.214 on October 4, 1972; 0.099 on October 5, 1972; 0.091 on October 6, 1972; 0.045 on October 7, 1972; 0.154 on October 8, 1972; 0.058 on October 9, 1972. (ii) American Can of Canada Ltd.: 0.013 on August 1, 1975; 0.011 on August 30, 1975; 0.020 on October 24, 1975; 0.066 on October 28, 1975; 0.012 on December 14, 1975; 0.011 on April 26, 1976; 0.031 on May 5, 976; 0.032 on May 14, 1976; 0.014 on May 15, 1976; 0.093 on May 17, 1976; 0.012 on May 31, 1976; 0.143 on June 4, 1976; 0.052 on June 27, 1976; 0.013 on June 30, 1976; 0.010 on July 18, 1976; and 0.012 on July 21, 1976. (c) Standard Chemicals Ltd. pleaded guilty and was fined $3,000; the case involving American Can of Canada Ltd. is currently before the courts.

GOVERNMENT AIRCRAFT

Question No. 1,294—**Mr. Cossitt:**

1. How many times since he became a member of the Cabinet has the Minister of State for Science and Technology personally made use of government aircraft and, in each case, what was the (a) purpose (b) point of departure and destination (c) type of aircraft (d) cost to the taxpayer?

2. What was the total cost to the taxpayer of all such trips?

3. What was the number of times an aircraft was used to or from the Peterborough area?

4. Does the government own a King Air aircraft and, if so, how many times was it used by the Minister?

5. Which trips were for (a) personal (b) political (c) government business?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): See replies to Questions No. 29 and 30 answered this day.

GOVERNMENT AIRCRAFT

Question No. 1,298—**Mr. Cossitt:**

1. How many times since he became a member of the Cabinet has the Minister of Labour personally made use of government aircraft and, in each case, what was the (a) purpose (b) point of departure and destination (c) type of aircraft (d) cost to the taxpayer?

2. What was the total cost to the taxpayer of all such trips?

3. Which trips were for (a) personal (b) political (c) government business?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): See replies to questions Nos. 29 and 30 answered this day.

INTRA-PROVINCIAL FERRY SERVICES

Question No. 1,335—**Mr. McCain:**

1. By province, how many intra-provincial ferries receive federal subsidies and what is the name of each such company?

2. What are the ports of call for each intra-provincial ferry?

3. For each of the past ten years, by province, what was the amount of federal subsidy paid to each intra-provincial ferry?

4. For each of the next ten years, by province, what is the projected amount of subsidy to be given to each intra-provincial ferry?

5. On what basis is a decision made with respect to whether or not an intra-provincial ferry will receive federal assistance and on what basis is the amount determined?

6. Have any alterations been made to the amounts of federal subsidies paid to intra-provincial ferries in each province as a result of inflation in the past ten years and, if so, what (a) was the amount of the alteration for each intra-provincial ferry (b) are the ports of call for each intra-provincial ferry where alteration in subsidy amount was made?

7. Do any intra-provincial ferries which receive federal subsidies also receive supplementary assistance from any provincial authority or from any other source and, if so (a) from what other sources are subsidies paid (b) what are the ports of call for each intra-provincial ferry receiving supplementary assistance (c) what was the amount of subsidy from other sources other than the government for each intra-provincial ferry for each of the past ten years?

8. What is the amount of deficit or profit from each intra-provincial ferry operated by a department or agency of the government?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): The Canadian Transport Commission advises as follows: Ferries under C.T.C. jurisdiction: Newfoundland: Carmanville, Nfld.—Fogo Island, Nfld. Fogo Transport (1973) Limited; Cobb's Arm, Nfld.—Change Islands, Nfld. Chaffey's Shipping Limited; Greenspond, Nfld.—Badger's Quay, Nfld. Beothic Fish Processors Limited; Portugal Cove, Nfld.—Bell Island, Nfld. The Newfoundland Transportation Company Limited; Burnside, Nfld.—St. Brendan's, Nfld. Saunders Shipping Limited; St. Patrick's, Nfld.—Little Bay Island, Nfld. GreenBay Transport Lmited; New Brunswick: Grand Manan, N.B.—Black's Harbour, N.B. Coastal Transport Limited; Ontario: Pelee Island, Ont.—The Mainland, Ont. The Pelee Shipping Company Limited.

2. See answer to Question 1.

3. Newfoundland Carmanville—Fogo Island 1976-77, 173,-081; 1975-76, 155,251; 1974-75, 144,500; 1973-74, 78,334; 1972-73, 45,000; 1971-72, 37,057; 1970-71, 41,269; 1969-70, 45,000; 1968-69, 27,674; 1967-68, 27,500. Cobb's Arm—Change Islands: 1976-77, 86,100; 1975-76, 58,000; 1974-75, 26,500; 1973-74, 19,000; 1972-73, 17,000; 1971-72, 15,000; 1970-71, 13,750; 1969-70, 10,750; 1968-69, 10,750; 1967-68, 17,500. Greenspond—Badger's Quay: 1976-77, 55,750; 1975-76, 53,522; 1974-75, 40,000; 1973-74, 36,000; 1972-73, 32,000; 1971-72, 32,000; 1970-71, 29,875; 1969-70, 27,000; 1968-69, 27,000; 1967-68, 53,750. Portugal Cove—Bell Island: 1976-77, 1,000,000; 1975-76, 993,424; 1974-75, 704,-366; 1973-74, 387,000; 1972-73, 354,000; 1971-72, 339,000; 1970-71, 298,683; 1969-70, 262,543; 1968-69, 265,234; 1967-68, 267,925. Burnside—St. Brendan's: 1976-77, 82,475; 1975-76, 69,307; 1974-75, 47,000; 1973-74, 28,776; 1972-73, 23,130; 1971-72, 17,500; 1970-71, 17,500; 1969-70, 15,000; 1968-69, 15,000; 1967-68, 14,500. St Patrick's—Little Bay Islands: 1976-77, 209,886; 1975-76, 160,000; 1974-75, 113,-000; 1973-74, 22,916; 1972-73, —; 1971-72, —; 1970-71, —; 1969-70, —; 1968-69, —; 1967-68, —; Grand Manan—Black's Harbour: 1976-77, 259,000; 1975-76, 259,000; 1974-75, 259,000; 1973-74, 259,000; 1972-73, 259,000; 1971-72, 259,000; 1970-71, 259,000; 1969-70, 259,000; 1968-69, 259,-000; 1967-68, 259,000. Ontario: Pelee Island—The Mainland: 1976-77, 142,265; 1975-76, 142,265; 1974-75, 126,368; 1973-74, 98,695; 1972-73, 88,695; 1971-72, 88,432; 1970-71, 88,695; 1969-70, 86,817; 1968-69, 87,550; 1967-68, 87,342.

4. The terms of the recently developed Federal Government's Water Transportation Assistance Policy have not yet been finalized and, as a result, it is not possible at this time to project, for the next ten years, the amount of subsidy to be given to each intra-provincial ferry service.

5. For the same reason as given in answer to Question No. 4, the first part of this question cannot be answered. The amount of subsidy is calculated as the difference between the estimated operating costs and revenues, as agreed following secrutiny by officials, and making allowance for an appropriate level of management fee/profit.

6. The answer to this question (a) and (b) can be readily seen in the answer given to Question No. 3.

7. Grand Manan, N.B.—Black's Harbour, N.B.; (a) Provincial Government; (b) Grand Manan, N.B.—Black's Harbour, N.B. (c) 1976-77, 320,000*; 1975-76, 301,953; 1974-75, 265,-578; 1973-74, 168,498; 1972-73, 136,723; 1971-72, 100,277; 1970-71, 95,692; 1969-70, 95,100; 1968-69, 87,465; 1967-68, 50,000. *Estimated.

8. No intra-provincial ferries are operated by departments or agencies of the Federal government.

INTERPROVINCIAL FERRY SERVICES

Question No. 1,336—**Mr. McCain:**

1. By province, how many interprovincial ferries receive federal subsidies and what is the name of each such company?

2. What are the ports of call for each interprovincial ferry?

3. For each of the past ten years, by province, what was the amount of federal subsidy paid to each interprovincial ferry?

4. For each of the next ten years, by province, what is the projected amount of subsidy to be given to each interprovincial ferry?

5. On what basis is a decision made with respect to whether or not an interprovincial ferry will receive federal assistance and on what basis is the amount determined?

6. Have any alterations been made to the amounts of federal subsidies paid to interprovincial ferries in each province as a result of inflation in the past ten years and, if so, what (a) was the amount of the alteration for each interprovincial ferry (b) are the ports of call for each interprovincial ferry where alteration in subsidy amount was made?

7. Do any interprovincial ferries which receive federal subsidies also receive supplementary assistance from any provincial authority or from any other source and, if so (a) from what other sources are subsidies paid (b) what are the ports of call for each interprovincial ferry receiving supplementary assistance (c) what

was the amount of subsidy from other sources other than the government for each interprovincial ferry for each of the past ten years?

8. What is the amount of deficit or profit from each interprovincial ferry operated by a department or agency of the government?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): Transport Canada advises as follows: 1. No interprovincial ferries are in receipt of subsidies.

2. Prince Edward Island: Borden; Cape Tormentine. Newfoundland: North Sydney; Port aux Basques; Argentia.

3. See No. 1.

4. The terms of the recently developed Federal Government's Water Transportation Assistance Policy have not yet been finalised and, as a result, it is not possible at this time to project, for the next ten years the amount of subsidy, if any, to be given to each interprovincial ferry service.

5. Interprovincial Ferry Services are operated by the Canadian National Railway Company under "Entrustment Order" on behalf of the Government of Canada. These services are a federal responsibility under the Terms of Confederation with Prince Edward Island and the Terms of Union with Newfoundland.

6. See No. 1.

7. Not applicable.

8. The deficits by service for the year ending December 31, 1976 are: Newfoundland Gulf Service, $48,914,611; Prince Edward Island Service, $13,047,315.

INTERNATIONAL FERRY SERVICES

Question No. 1,337—**Mr. McCain:**

1. By province, how many international ferries receive federal subsidies and what is the name of each such company?

2. What are the ports of call for each international ferry?

3. For each of the past ten years, by province, what was the amount of federal subsidy paid to each international ferry?

4. For each of the next ten years, by province, what is the projected amount of subsidy to be given to each international ferry?

5. On what basis is a decision made with respect to whether or not an international ferry will receive federal assistance and on what basis is the amount determined?

6. Have any alterations been made to the amounts of federal subsidies paid to international ferries in each province as a result of inflation in the past ten years and, if so, what (a) was the amount of the alteration for each international ferry (b) are the ports of call for each international ferry where alteration in subsidy amount was made?

7. Do any international ferries which receive federal subsidies also receive supplementary assistance from any provincial authority or from any other source and, if so (a) from what other sources are subsidies paid (b) what are the ports of call for each international ferry receiving supplementary assistance (c) what was the amount of subsidy from other sources other than the government for each international ferry for each of the past ten years?

8. What is the amount of deficit or profit from each international ferry operated by a department or agency of the government?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): Transport Canada advises as follows: 1. None.

2. Yarmouth—Bar Harbor, Maine. Yarmouth—Portland, Maine. The Yarmouth—Bar Harbor service was a year round service until the fall of 1976 at which time it was terminated and a service from Yarmouth to Portland was inaugurated replacing a foreign carrier who withdrew for the winter months. The Bar Harbor service will recommence May 1, 1977.

3. No subsidies are paid.

4. See answer to part 4, question 1336 answered this day.

5. The Yarmouth services are deficit funded. The decision to operate this service was made in the early 1950's on the basis of developmental prospects for the maritime provinces. A service was operated by an American company in the prewar years but was terminated when the vessels were commandeered for military service and was not reactivated following the war.

6. Not applicable.

7. (a) No (b) N/A (c) N/A.

8. Yarmouth—Bar Harbor ferry service—(deficit): 1967, 426,262; 1968, 260,718; 1969, 381,910; 1970, 472,832; 1971, 586,141; 1972, 572,205; 1973, 774,030; 1974, 1,336,954; 1975, 1,503,220; 1976, 1,415,419—(11 months). Yarmouth to Portland figures are not available at this time for the period operated to December 31, 1976.

THUNDER BIRD LODGE

Question No. 1,394—**Mr. Murta:**

1. Was an amount of money awarded to the Thunder Bird Lodge of Northern Manitoba and, if so (a) on what date (b) which department awarded the money (c) was it in the form of a grant or a loan?

2. Did Mr. Courchène or his son put up any money for the Lodge?

3. Who is the owner of the Lodge?

4. What was the number of jobs created?

5. What is the relationship of the employees to Mr. Courchène?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): I am informed by the Departments of Indian Affairs and Northern Development and Regional Economic Expansion as follows:

1. Yes, as follows:

(c)	(a)		I.E.D.F
Loans	April 1975		$87,439
	May 1975		15,000
	March 1976		98,482
		Total	$200,921
Contributions	May 1975		10,000
	June 1975		4,000
	May 1976		55,000
		Total	$69,000
Grants	March 1976		50,000
		Total	$319,921

(b) The above funding was awarded by the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development under the Indian Economic Development Fund. Yes. The Department of Regional Economic Expansion entered into a contract with Thunderbird Lodge Ltd. under the Canada-Manitoba ARDA Agreement. (a) An offer of financial assistance was made on

February 28, 1975 and amended on December 18, 1975 and July 5, 1976 (b) The total amount of the offer from DREE is $148,797.00 (c) The assistance offered is in the form of a grant.

2. Mr. Courchène put in a cash equity of $25,000 plus an approximate additional $15,000 from cut logs and equipment for a total equity of approximately $40,000.

3. The Directors are: David Courchène, Gerald Courchène, Brian Courchène, D. W. Gallager. The Officers are: David Courchène, President, Gerald Courchène, Vice-President, Brian Courchène, Secretary-Treasurer.

4. In the construction phase, there were 20 jobs created. In season, there will be 15-22 jobs created, depending on the number of guests.

5. The lodge is a family business. Five employees are immediate family.

TRAVEL BY THE MINISTER

Question No. 1,397—**Mr. Crosbie:**

1. During the period August 1, 1976 to October 18, 1976, on how many occasions did the Secretary of State for External Affairs visit the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador and, in each case (a) what was the date (b) the duration of the visit (c) what was the (i) purpose (ii) point of departure and return (iii) mode of transportation used (iv) cost to the taxpayer?

2. What was the total cost to the taxpayer of all such trips?

3. On each trip, did the Minister use a (a) government helicopter or other aircraft (b) helicopter or aircraft not owned by the government, to travel from the airport at which he landed to Swift Current or Sound Island, Placentia Bay and, in each case, what was the cost to the taxpayer of the transportation?

4. In each case, was the visit for (a) personal (b) political (c) government business and, if it was on government business, what was the nature of the business?

Mr. Fernand E. Leblanc (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State for External Affairs): 1 (a) (b) and (c), 2, 3 (a), and 4. (a) (b) and (c) See replies to questions 29 and 30.

3. (b) Ministerial use of Provincial helicopters: August 2, 1976: Gander to Swift Current; August 13, 1976: Swift Current to St. John's; St. John's to Swift Current; October 3, 1976: Swift Current to St. John's.

GOVERNMENT AIRCRAFT

Question No. 1,409—**Mr. Cossitt:**

1. How many times since he became a member of the Cabinet has the Minister of Supply and Services personally made use of government aircraft and, in each case, what was the (a) purpose (b) point of departure and destination (c) type of aircraft (d) cost to the taxpayer?

2. What was the total cost to the taxpayer of all such trips?

3. Which trips were for (a) personal (b) political (c) government business?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): See replies to questions Nos. 29 and 30 answered this day.

Order Paper Questions

USE OF GOVERNMENT AIRCRAFT

Question No. 1,412—**Mr. Cossitt:**

With reference to questions presently on the Order Paper concerning the use of government aircraft by certain Cabinet Ministers, will the government present answers compiled and calculated on the (a) same basis as the answer to Question No. 50 concerning the Minister of Transport's expenses (b) basis of the system outlined by the Minister of Transport in his letter to certain Members of Parliament and, if so, what are the reasons for such a change?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): See reply to question No. 2,881.

USE OF GOVERNMENT AIRCRAFT

Question No. 1,413—**Mr. Cossitt:**

Do Ministers reply to Order Paper questions in the House in one way and subsequently issue a completely different answer in a confidential letter to members of the government caucus and, if so (a) is this government policy and on what date was it adopted (b) what is the identity of any Cabinet Minister who has done this including the date and subject involved?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): See Beauchesne's Citation 171 (a), (b), (f), (h) and (i).

MATHEW CHARLES LAMB

Question No. 1,451—**Mr. Epp:**

Was Lance Corporal Mathew Charles Lamb, killed while serving in the security forces of Southern Rhodesia, a Canadian citizen and, if so, was he (a) issued a valid Canadian passport and, if so, on what date and in what location was it issued (b) at any time committed to a mental institution in Canada (c) tried and acquitted of murder by reason of insanity in a Canadian Court?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): I am informed by the Departments of External Affairs and the Solicitor General as follows: (a) Mathew Charles Lamb was issued a valid Canadian passport on April 26, 1976, from the Passport Office, Department of External Affairs, Ottawa, Ontario. (b) This information is not within the administrative responsibility to the Government of Canada. As mental institutions come under provincial jurisdiction, it would therefore be necessary to contact all provincial governments. (c) The RCMP cannot confirm a criminal record based on a name check.

INCOME TAX OWING BY CORPORATIONS AND INDIVIDUALS

Question No. 1,479—**Mr. Howie:**

1. As of January 1, 1976, how many corporations had unpaid income tax owing to the Crown in excess of (a) $1,000,000 (b) $100,000 and, in each case, how much did they owe?

2. On January 1 in each year 1971 to 1977, how many corporations have had unpaid income tax owing to the Crown in excess of $100,000?

3. On January 1 in each year 1971 to 1977, how many individuals have had unpaid income tax owing to the Crown in excess of $10,000?

4. Since January 1, 1971, in how many cases and representing what amounts, have taxes owed to the Crown been written off as uncollectable from (a) corporations (b) individuals?

Hon. Monique Bégin (Minister of National Revenue): 1. and 2. Statistical computations are not available at the dollar

levels requested for all years. A system change was introduced in the fiscal year 1974/75 that changed the highest dollar level of reporting from over $100,000 to over $25,000. Also, statistical computations are completed on a fiscal rather than calendar year base; therefore available information is supplied as of a March 31 date for the years in question.

Over $100,000	Date	Number of Accounts
	31 March/71	184
	31 March/72	220
	31 March/73	233
	31 March/74	251
Over $25,000	31 March/75	856
	31 March/76	1093

3.	Date	Number of Accounts
	31 March/71	1368
	31 March/72	1926
	31 March/73	2806
	31 March/74	3336
	31 March/75	4058
	31 March/76	5449

4. (a)	Fiscal Year	Number of Accounts	Dollars
	1971/72	2315	$7,788,962.49
	1972/73	2161	7,098,392.53
	1973/74	1841	7,162,120.36
	1974/75	1593	5,607,882.61
	1975/76	1874	8,072,739.53

(b)	Fiscal Year	Number of Accounts	Dollars
	1971/72	4342	$4,915,181.90
	1972/73	6481	8,840,210.74
	1973/74	6796	5,146,596.88
	1974/75	4540	5,100,804.38
	1975/76	4014	3,648,130.48

GOVERNMENT AIRCRAFT

Question No. 1,485—**Mr. Cossitt:**

1. On how many occasions have Department of National Defence and/or Department of Transport aircraft been used by the Government Leader in the Senate and, in each case, what was the (a) purpose (b) point of departure and destination (c) type of aircraft (d) cost to the taxpayer?

2. What was the total cost to the taxpayer of all such trips?

3. Which trips were for (a) personal (b) political (c) government business?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): See replies to questions Nos. 29 and 30 answered this day.

GRANT QUALICON CONCRETE

Question No. 1,492—**Mr. Dick:**

1. Was a Department of Regional Economic Expansion grant made on January 3, 1974 to Qualicon Concrete of Arnprior, within the specially designated Renfrew-Pembroke area and, if so (a) prior to the grant, how many persons were employed by the company (b) how many persons are presently employed (c) who are the directors of the company (d) who owns the majority of shares in the company?

2. Is there any relationship between Qualicon Concrete and Permacon Limited of Hull, Quebec and, if so, what is the relationship?

[Miss Bégin.]

3. Is Qualicon Ltd. in the process of closing down or has it closed down and, if so (a) what is happening to the equipment (b) has any of the equipment been transferred to Permacon Ltd.?

4. To the knowledge of the government, does Qualicon Ltd. consider Permacon to be a continuing business?

Mr. Ed. Lumley (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): The reply for the Department of Regional Economic Expansion is as follows: 1. Yes, an offer of incentive assistance was made to the company on January 2, 1974. (a) The facility was not operating at the time the grant was made and therefore there were no employees. (b) As the plant is presently closed there are no employees. On March 6, 1975 there were 12 employees. (c) As at June 7, 1974 the directors of the company were J. R. Coone, P. Blaikie and Y. Laurin. (d) Details on the company's corporate ownership are supplied to DREE for evaluation purposes only, based on an understanding with the company that they will be treated as confidential information.

2. The company is related to Permacon Limited through common ownership.

3. The company is not operating at this time. (a) The department is advised that all equipment is on-site. (b) The department has been advised that no equipment has been transferred to Permacon Limited.

4. The government does not know whether Qualicon Limited considers Permacon Limited to be a continuing business. However, to the extent that the offer of incentive assistance to Qualicon is affected, operation of the Permacon facility in Hull, Quebec does not constitute continuance of operation of the Qualicon facility.

PART-TIME AND FULL-TIME EMPLOYEES RECRUITED PRIVATE AGENCIES FOR POST OFFICE

Question No. 1,534—**Mr. McKenzie:**

1. Has the Post Office Department obtained (a) part-time (b) full-time employees from private employment agencies in (i) British Columbia (ii) Alberta (iii) Saskatchewan (iv) Manitoba (v) Ontario (vi) Quebec (vii) New Brunswick (viii) Nova Scotia (ix) Prince Edward Island (x) Newfoundland and, if so, in each case, how many?

2. Are such employees paid from supplementary estimates and, if not, from what estimates are they paid?

3. By province, what was the (a) average hourly rate paid to employment agencies (b) average hourly rate paid to employees (c) total amount paid by the Department in (i) 1975 (ii) 1976?

Hon. J.-J. Blais (Postmaster General): 1. Yes, the Post Office Department has obtained both part-time and full-time employees from private employment agencies. Permanent employees are not recruited through such agencies. (Full-time means a full working day for the period of hire. Part-time means less than a full day).

	Part-time		Full-time	
	FY 74-75	FY 75-76	FY 74-75	FY 75-76
(i) British Columbia	1	5	Nil	Nil
(ii) Alberta	Nil	Nil	Nil	Nil
(iii) Saskatchewan	Nil	Nil	Nil	Nil
(iv) Manitoba	Nil	Nil	Nil	10

(v)	Ontario	1	1	10	17
(vi)	Quebec	14	10	Nil	16
(vii)	New Brunswick	Nil	Nil	Nil	Nil
(viii)	Nova Scotia	1	2	18	33
(ix)	Prince Edward Island	Nil	Nil	Nil	Nil
(x)	Newfoundland	Nil	Nil	Nil	Nil

2. All such employees are paid out of the regular budget.

3.

Province	Year	Hourly Rate Paid Agency	Totals Paid
British Columbia	1975	6.00	3,096.83
	1976	8.78	100.73
Alberta	1975	0	0
	1976	4.65	1,230.41
Saskatchewan	1975	0	0
	1976	0	0
Manitoba	1975	0	0
	1976	5.67	5,513.37
Ontario	1975	5.80	2,579.36
	1976	5.80	6,083.95
Quebec	1975	4.50	11,853.00
	1976	4.50	11,577.52
New Brunswick	1975	0	0
	1976	0	0
Nova Scotia	1975	5.10	6,824.00
	1976	5.70	9,743.00
Prince Edward Island	1975	0	0
	1976	0	0
Newfoundland	1975	0	0
	1976	0	0

LAWYERS RETAINED BY CMHC

Question No. 1,554—**Mr. Marshall:**

1. What are the names of individual lawyers who are employed by (a) CMHC (b) the Federal Business Development Bank in the Constituency of Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe and how was each selected?

2. How much did each lawyer or law firm receive in fees and expenses each fiscal year 1970-71 to date?

3. Do individuals or corporations who secure financing through (a) CMHC (b) the Federal Business Development Bank have to use law firms determined by the agencies in the legal work associated with the loans in question and, if so, for what reason?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): I am informed by the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation and the Federal Business Development Branch as follows: 1 and 2. The following lawyers were retained by CMHC to process mortgage documentation for direct loans approved by CMHC in Census Divisions 5 and 9, Newfoundland, between 1970 and 1976: 1970, Corner Brook: Kevin J. Barry; Gordon G. Easton, Q.C. 1971, Corner Brook: Gordon G. Easton, Q.C. 1972, Corner Brook: Gordon G. Easton, Q.C.; Clyde K. Wells. 1973, Corner Brook: Gordon G. Easton, Q.C. Clyde K. Wells. 1974, Corner Brook: Gordon G. Easton, Q.C.; Clyde K. Wells. 1975, Corner Brook: Gordon G. Easton, Q.C.; Clyde K. Wells. 1976, Corner Brook: Gordon G. Easton, Q.C.; Clyde K. Wells. Legal fees in connection with CMHC direct loans are paid by the borrower, and CMHC, therefore, has no record of the amounts paid to these lawyers.

Note: Data on activities under the NHA are compiled by CMHC on the basis of municipalities and Census Divisions in Newfoundland, and not on federal electoral constituencies. Census Divisions 5 and 9 correspond approximately to the constituency of Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe.

For the method of selection of lawyers, see the answer to question 736 (3), *Hansard,* January 24, 1977, page 2285. The following lawyers were retained by CMHC to handle legal action arising from arrears on direct loans approved in Census Divisions 5 and 9 in Newfoundland: Legal Costs and Fees: 1970-71-72-73-74, nil, nil, nil. 1975-76, Corner Brook, Martin, Easton, Woodridge and Poole, nil. Where actions are settled prior to trial, the costs are paid by the borrower and CMHC has no record of the amounts.

3. See answer to question 716 (3), *Hansard,* January 25, 1977, page 2350.

1, 2 and 3. The Federal Business Development Bank makes use of the services of lawyers to act for it in the taking of security for loans and to undertake litigation on its behalf. In certain cases the lawyer is selected by the bank, in other cases the lawyer may have been chosen by the borrower. In either event, the legal fees and expenses for security preparation and registration are paid by the borrower rather than by the bank. The selection of lawyers is regarded by the FBDB as a matter of internal administration, the responsibility for which rests with the board of directors, according to the FBDB Act. For this reason, the names of solicitors employed are not made public.

PUBLIC SERVANTS UNDER CONTRACT

Question No. 1,574—**Mr. McKenzie:**

1. How many (a) retired public servants (b) others are under contract to the Department of Agriculture?

2. What was the total amount paid in (a) 1975 (b) 1976 to (i) retired public servants (ii) others, under contract to the Department?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): 1 (a), 2. (a) and (b) (i) See reply to Question No. 725 answered this day.

Agriculture Canada: 1. (b) 615.

2. (a) (ii) $2,087,516.80; (b) (ii) $1,187,545.81.

Communications: 1. (b) 8.

2. (a) (ii) $643,345.30; (b) (ii) $160,722.47.

Consumer and Corporate Affairs: 1. (b) 40.

2. (a) (ii) $518,688.46; (b) (ii) $528,406.89.

Energy, Mines and Resources: 1. (b) 50.

2. (a) (ii) $282,346; (b) (ii) $308,402.13.

Finance: 1. (b) 12.

2. (a) (ii) $287,339; (b) (ii) $447,712.

Office of the Auditor General: 1. (b) 15.

2. (a) (ii) $31,108.10; (b) (ii) $136,596.46.

Fisheries and the Environment: 1. (b) 439.

2. (a) (ii) $1,773,110; (b) (ii) $2,097,826.

Indian Affairs and Northern Development: 1. (b) 562.

2. (a) (ii) $9,115,008.73; (b) (ii) $6,581,587.92.

Industry, Trade and Commerce: 1. (b) 6.

2. (a) (ii) Nil; (b) (ii) $18,657.50.

Justice: 1. (b) 34.

2. (a) (ii) $251,351.08; (b) (ii) $362,777.20.

Labour: 1. (b) 7.

2. (a) (ii) $479,754.20; (b) (ii) $296,970.65.

Employment and Immigration: 1. (b) 234.

2. (a) (ii) $1,653,478.85; (b) (ii) $1,206,295.64.

National Defence: 1. (b) 12.

2. (a) (ii) $243,077; (b) (ii) $238,672.

National Health and Welfare: 1. (b) 198.

2. (a) (ii) $1,143,493; (b) (ii) $1,195,526.

National Revenue: 1. (b) 230.

2. (a) (ii) $257,392.75; (b) (ii) $127,258.59.

Post Office: 1. (b) 32.

2. (a) (ii) $137,445; (b) (ii) $385,042.

Public Works: 1. (b) 56.

2. (a) (ii) $854,700; (b) (ii) $670,565.

Regional Economic Expansion: 1. (b) 21.

2. (a) (ii) $313,518; (b) (ii) $250,921.

Science and Technology: 1. (b) 6.

2. (a) (ii) $44,549.39; (b) (ii) $35,585.30.

Secretary of State: 1. (b) 28 (excluding translation services).

2. (a) (ii) $3,355,530 (including translation services); (b) (ii) $3,076,813 (including translation services).

Secretary of State for External Affairs: 1. (b) 24.

2. (a) (ii) $199,598; (b) (ii) $301,662.

Canadian International Development Agency: 1. (b) 738.

2. (a) (ii) $38,637,228; (b) (ii) $42,250,144.

Solicitor General: 1. (b) 31.

2. (a) (ii) $185,313; (b) (ii) $149,450.

Supply and Services: 1. (b) 22.

2. (a) (ii) $227,730; (b) (ii) $731,625.

Transport Canada: 1. (b) 185.

2. (a) (ii) $542,736; (b) (ii) $460,003.

Air Canada: 1. (b) None.

2. (a) (ii) Not applicable; (b) (ii) Not applicable.

Canadian National Railways: 1. (b) 45.

2. (a) (ii) $503,000; (b) (ii) $501,000.

Urban Affairs: 1. (b) 36.

2. (a) (ii) $1,117,110; (b) (ii) $441,045.

Veterans Affairs: 1. (b) 4.

2. (a) (ii) $9,294.88; (b) (ii) $16,965.

NOTE: 1. (b) Interpreted as "Personal Services Contracts". For other contracts such as agency personnel, professional and consultant services, please refer to Question No. 207 tabled August 5, 1977, Questions Nos. 127 to 154, 286 to 296 answered separately in 1976 and 1977 and Question No. 715 tabled this day.

[Mr. Goodale.]

PUBLIC SERVANTS UNDER CONTRACT

Question No. 1,575—**Mr. McKenzie:**

1. How many (a) retired public servants (b) others are under contract to the Auditor General's Office?

2. What was the total amount paid in (a) 1975 (b) 1976 to (i) retired public servants (ii) others, under contract to the Auditor General's Office?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): See Question No. 1,574.

Question No. 1,576—**Mr. McKenzie:**

1. How many (a) retired public servants (b) others are under contract to the Department of Communications?

2. What was the total amount paid in (a) 1975 (b) 1976 to (i) retired public servants (ii) others, under contract to the Department?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): See Question No. 1,574.

Question No. 1,577—**Mr. McKenzie:**

1. How many (a) retired public servants (b) others are under contract to the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs?

2. What was the total amount paid in (a) 1975 (b) 1976 to (i) retired public servants (ii) others, under contract to the Department?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): See Question No. 1,574.

Question No. 1,578—**Mr. McKenzie:**

1. How many (a) retired public servants (b) others are under contract to the Department of National Defence?

2. What was the total amount paid in (a) 1975 (b) 1976 to (i) retired public servants (ii) others, under contract to the Department?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): See Question No. 1,574.

Question No. 1,579—**Mr. McKenzie:**

1. How many (a) retired public servants (b) others are under contract to the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources?

2. What was the total amount paid in (a) 1975 (b) 1976 to (i) retired public servants (ii) others, under contract to the Department?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): See Question No. 1,574.

Question No. 1,580—**Mr. McKenzie:**

1. How many (a) retired public servants (b) others are under contract to the Department of the Environment?

2. What was the total amount paid in (a) 1975 (b) 1976 to (i) retired public servants (ii) others, under contract to the Department?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): See Question No. 1,574.

Question No. 1,581—**Mr. McKenzie:**

1. How many (a) retired public servants (b) others are under contract to the Department of External Affairs?

2. What was the total amount paid in (a) 1975 (b) 1976 to (i) retired public servants (ii) others, under contract to the Department?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): See Question No. 1,574.

Question No. 1,582—**Mr. McKenzie:**

1. How many (a) retired public servants (b) others are under contract to the Department of Finance?

2. What was the total amount paid in (a) 1975 (b) 1976 to (i) retired public servants (ii) others, under contract to the Department?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): See Question No. 1,574.

Question No. 1,583—**Mr. McKenzie:**

1. How many (a) retired public servants (b) others are under contract to the Department of National Health and Welfare?

2. What was the total amount paid in (a) 1975 (b) 1976 to (i) retired public servants (ii) others, under contract to the Department?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): See Question No. 1,574.

Question No. 1,584—**Mr. McKenzie:**

1. How many (a) retired public servants (b) others are under contract to the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development?

2. What was the total amount paid in (a) 1975 (b) 1976 to (i) retired public servants (ii) others, under contract to the Department?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): See Question No. 1,574.

Question No. 1,585—**Mr. McKenzie:**

1. How many (a) retired public servants (b) others are under contract to the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce?

2. What was the total amount paid in (a) 1975 (b) 1976 to (i) retired public servants (ii) others, under contract to the Department?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): See Question No. 1,574.

Question No. 1,586—**Mr. McKenzie:**

1. How many (a) retired public servants (b) others are under contract to the Department of Justice?

2. What was the total amount paid in (a) 1975 (b) 1976 to (i) retired public servants (ii) others, under contract to the Department?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): See Question No. 1,574.

Question No. 1,587—**Mr. McKenzie:**

1. How many (a) retired public servants (b) others are under contract to the Department of Labour?

2. What was the total amount paid in (a) 1975 (b) 1976 to (i) retired public servants (ii) others, under contract to the Department?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): See Question No. 1,574.

Question No. 1,588—**Mr. McKenzie:**

1. How many (a) retired public servants (b) others are under contract to the Department of Manpower and Immigration?

2. What was the total amount paid in (a) 1975 (b) 1976 to (i) retired public servants (ii) others, under contract to the Department?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): See Question No. 1,574.

Question No. 1,589—**Mr. McKenzie:**

1. How many (a) retired public servants (b) others are under contract to the Post Office Department?

2. What was the total amount paid in (a) 1975 (b) 1976 to (i) retired public servants (ii) others, under contract to the Department?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): See Question No. 1,574.

Question No. 1,590—**Mr. McKenzie:**

1. How many (a) retired public servants (b) others are under contract to the Department of Public Works?

2. What was the total amount paid in (a) 1975 (b) 1976 to (i) retired public servants (ii) others, under contract to the Department?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): See Question No. 1,574.

Question No. 1,591—**Mr. McKenzie:**

1. How many (a) retired public servants (b) others are under contract to the Department of Regional Economic Expansion?

2. What was the total amount paid in (a) 1975 (b) 1976 to (i) retired public servants (ii) others, under contract to the Department?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): See Question No. 1,574.

Question No. 1,592—**Mr. McKenzie:**

1. How many (a) retired public servants (b) others are under contract to the Department of National Revenue?

2. What was the total amount paid in (a) 1975 (b) 1976 to (i) retired public servants (ii) others, under contract to the Department?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): See Question No. 1,574.

Question No. 1,593—**Mr. McKenzie:**

1. How many (a) retired public servants (b) others are under contract to the Ministry of State for Science and Technology?

2. What was the total amount paid in (a) 1975 (b) 1976 to (i) retired public servants (ii) others, under contract to the Ministry?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): See Question No. 1,574.

Question No. 1,594—**Mr. McKenzie:**

1. How many (a) retired public servants (b) others are under contract to the Department of the Secretrary of State?

2. What was the total amount paid in (a) 1975 (b) 1976 to (i) retired public servants (ii) others, under contract to the Department?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): See Question No. 1,574.

Order Paper Questions

Question No. 1,595—**Mr. McKenzie:**

1. How many (a) retired public servants (b) others are under contract to the Department of the Solicitor General?

2. What was the total amount paid in (a) 1975 (b) 1976 to (i) retired public servants (ii) others, under contract to the Department?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): See Question No. 1,574.

Question No. 1,596—**Mr. McKenzie:**

1. How many (a) retired public servants (b) others are under contract to the Department of the Supply and Services?

2. What was the total amount paid in (a) 1975 (b) 1976 to (i) retired public servants (ii) others, under contract to the Department?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): See Question No. 1,574.

Question No. 1,597—**Mr. McKenzie:**

1. How many (a) retired public servants (b) others are under contract to the Department of Transport?

2. What was the total amount paid in (a) 1975 (b) 1976 to (i) retired public servants (ii) others, under contract to the Department?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): See Question No. 1,574.

Question No. 1,598—**Mr. McKenzie:**

1. How many (a) retired public servants (b) others are under contract to the Ministry of State for Urban Affairs?

2. What was the total amount paid in (a) 1975 (b) 1976 to (i) retired public servants (ii) others, under contract to the Ministry?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): See Question No. 1,574.

Question No. 1,599—**Mr. McKenzie:**

1. How many (a) retired public servants (b) others are under contract to the Department of Veterans Affairs?

2. What was the total amount paid in (a) 1975 (b) 1976 to (i) retired public servants (ii) others, under contract to the Department?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): See Question No. 1,574.

Question No. 1,600—**Mr. McKenzie:**

1. How many (a) retired public servants (b) others are under contract to Air Canada?

2. What was the total amount paid in (a) 1975 (b) 1976 to (i) retired public servants (ii) others, under contract to Air Canada?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): See Question No. 1,574.

Question No. 1,601—**Mr. McKenzie:**

1. How many (a) retired public servants (b) others are under contract to Canadian National Railways?

2. What was the total amount paid in (a) 1975 (b) 1976 to (i) retired public servants (ii) others, under contract to Canadian National Railways?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): See Question No. 1,574.

[Mr. Goodale.]

Question No. 1,602—**Mr. McKenzie:**

1. How many (a) retired public servants (b) others are under contract to the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA)?

2. What was the total amount paid in (a) 1975 (b) 1976 to (i) retired public servants (ii) others, under contract to CIDA?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): See Question No. 1,574.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT IN THE PROVINCE OF QUEBEC

Question No. 1,627—**Mr. Coates:**

1. What is the total number of employees of the Post Office Department in the Province of Quebec and what is the estimated payroll for the fiscal year 1976-77?

2. What is the estimated value of property and equipment owned by the Department in the Province?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): I am informed by the Departments of Post Office and Public Works as follows: 1. Total number of employees, 16,223; Estimated payroll for 1976-77, $228.4 million.

2. Value of property—See answer to Part 2 of Question No. 1,620 answered April 1, 1977. Total cost of mechanization equipment installed for letters and flats processing and owned by Canada Post is as follows: Installed, $3,493,300; In process of installation, $14,060,000; Total, $17,553,300.

SOVIET DIPLOMATS

Question No. 1,638—**Mr. Jelinek:**

1. How many Soviet diplomats restricted to the confines of the National Capital Region have asked for special permits to travel in other parts of Canada in the past (a) six months (b) year (c) two years (d) three years (e) five years?

2. What are their names and what was their position?

3. How many (a) times did each apply (b) applications were (i) approved (ii) rejected?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): 1. In so far as can be determined by the Department of External Affairs, the number of Soviet diplomats restricted to the confines of the National Capital Region who asked for special permits to travel in other parts of Canada in the past (a) six months (b) year (c) two years (d) three years (e) five years are as follows: (a) 345; (b) 692; (c) Records not retained; (d) Records not retained; (e) Records not retained.

2 and 3. See Annex A.

In so far as the Department of National Defence is concerned: 1. Soviet Military Attachés must file a "Notice of Intent to Travel" forty-eight hours in advance of any journeys outside the National Capital area except for trips to Montreal where only twenty-four hours advance notice is required. The number of Soviet Military Attachés who have filed notices in the periods specified is: (a) Five; (b) Five; (c) Five; (d) Seven; (e) Eight.

2 and 3. See Annex B.

The listing below shows the name of the applicant (a) the number of times each applied (b) the number of times applications were (1) approved and (2) rejected. As each application was counted singly each time, the numbers shown represent the number of applications and approvals.

As all applications were approved there were no rejections.

Name	Position	February-August 1976	August 1976-January 1977
N. A. Makarov	Minister-Counsellor	16	14
A. V. Enguibarov	Counsellor (Commercial)	28	20
G. Beliaev	Counsellor	4	11
V. I. Gavriouchkine	Counsellor	19	8
D. I. Ivanov	Counsellor	9	13
I. F. Kovalenko	Counsellor	8	8
V. I. Mikheev	Counsellor	19	25
N. M. Talanov	Counsellor	15	13
M. S. Reva	First Secretary	10	7
G. I. Zolotov	First Secretary	14	17
V. Skofenko	First Secretary	11	13
A. I. Soubekhin	First Secretary	15	19
L. N. Zaitsev	First Secretary	9	7
B. A. Soukharev	First Secretary	12	17
V. N. Maiorov	Second Secretary	11	25
I. P. Vartanian	Second Secretary	26	15
V. P. Veber	Second Secretary	44	40
I. V. Zakharov	Second Secretary	4	12
A. A. Medvedev	Second Secretary	2	4
M. Khavatov	Second Secretary	2	4
V. Souvorov	Second Secretary	5	
S. V. Ivanov	Third Secretary	10	8
E. Krioukov	Third Secretary	3	5
G. V. Ivashkevitch	Third Secretary	3	
V. Borichpolets	Attaché	11	9
S. Y. Gritchouk	Attaché	12	11
O. Reztsov	Attaché	24	17
G. Zaberejyni	Attaché	1	3
	Totals	347	345

	Name	Position
2.	Colonel N. I. Neborachko	Mil, Nav & Air Attaché
	Captain E. A. Smirnov	Asst Nav Attaché & Mil, Nav, & Air Attaché
	Captain I. A. Bardeev	Mil, Nav, & Air Attaché
	Commander V. N. Smirnov	Asst Nav Attaché
	Major S. S. Ignatov	Asst Mil Attaché
	Lieutenant-Colonel V. A. Povetiev	Asst Mil Attaché
	Major A. G. Kovalev	Asst Air Attaché
	Major V. M. Vassiliev	Asst Air Attaché

3. The number of notices filed by each attaché over the past five years is:

	(a) Applied	(b) (i) Approved	(b) (iii) Rejected
Colonel Neborachko	19	19	Nil
Captain Smirnov	55	54	1
Captain Bardeev	4	4	Nil
Major Ignatov	47	45	2
Lieutenant Colonel Povetiev	20	18	2
Commander Smirnov	29	28	1
Major Kovalev	31	30	1
Major Vassiliev	21	18	3

Order Paper Questions

TERMINATION OF AGREEMENTS BY THE GOVERNMENT OF QUEBEC

Question No. 1,649—**Mr. Herbert:**

1. Has the present Government of Quebec terminated, before its expiration date and without prior discussion or notification, any agreement with the government?

2. Will the government consider terminating that part of its language instruction programme which pays monies to the Government of Quebec for the teaching of English to children attending English language schools?

3. Will the government introduce in the Province of Quebec at an early date, a programme to assist the instruction of the French language to English language students?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): I am informed by the Departments of Finance and the Secretary of State as follows: 1. On March 16, the Government of the Province of Quebec terminated the Memorandum of Agreement with the Government of Canada relating to the Anti-Inflation Program pursuant to Section 9 of that Agreement. The Government of Quebec on that date terminated the provincial act respecting anti-inflation measures (Chapter 30 of the Statutes of Quebec, 1975) by Order-in-Council, this being sufficient grounds to cause the Memorandum of Agreement to expire. This action followed a decision of the Government of Quebec, on January 14, 1977, to accept the resignation of the administrator of the provincial anti-inflation administration thereby eliminating the mandatory provisions of this administration. This action unilaterally altered the application of the Memorandum of Agreement between the governments of Canada and Quebec.

2. No.

3. Under the present federal-provincial agreement for Bilingualism in Education, the Federal Government makes financial contributions to all provinces towards the costs of minority official language education and second official language instruction. Under the terms of the agreement signed with the province of Quebec, that province may, at its discretion, use these funds for the teaching of either official language as a second language. Also under this federal-provincial agreement, several projects have been cost-shared by the Quebec and Federal Governments relative to the teaching of either official language as a second language. Other Departments and Agencies are not aware that a formal federal-provincial agreement was terminated.

ILLEGAL STRIKES

Question No. 1,719—**Mr. Howie:**

1. For the fiscal year 1975-76, how many strikes occurring within the federal jurisdiction were illegal or represented a breach of contract on the part of one of the parties to a collective agreement?

2. As a result of such strikes (a) how many man-days of employment were lost by (i) the strikers (ii) other workers (b) what were the financial damages suffered by the government?

3. In how many of the strikes did the government initiate legal action against the strikers and, in each case, what was the outcome?

Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of Labour): 1. 17 (Strikes occurring during the term of the agreements and presumed illegal).

2. (a)(i) 21,850 man-days lost; (ii) Not known. (b) Not known.

3. None. Includes workers under the Public Service Staff Relations Act and under the Canada Labour Code Part V.

AMOUNT PAID TO GOVERNMENT BY QUEBEC

Question No. 1,743—**Mr. Allard:**

What was the total amount paid to the government by the Province of Quebec in (a) 1973-74 (b) 1974-75 (c) 1975-76 (d) 1976 to date?

Mr. Bernard Loiselle (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): The only available published information on the subject of amount paid to the federal government by the province of Quebec can be extracted from Statistics Canada's Provincial Economic Accounts, 1961-1974—Experimental Data*. Estimations are on a calendar rather than fiscal year basis and the most recent year for which these figures are available is 1974. In line with the general concepts of national accounting, federal revenues have been allocated to provinces according to where production that can be associated with such revenues takes place. For example, indirect taxes—such as federal sales and excise taxes and customs duties—have been allocated on the basis of where goods subject to tax are deemed to have been produced rather than on the basis of where they were consumed.

*Subject to methodological and data revisions.

Federal Government Revenues
Province of Quebec

	1972	1973	1974
	(millions of dollars)		
Direct Taxes on Persons	1789	2035	2562
Direct Taxes on Corporate and Government Enterprises[1]	650	763	1037
Direct Taxes on Non-Residents	65	65	93
Indirect Taxes	1667	1805	2139
Other Current Transfers from Persons	1	1	2
Investment Income	387	401	460
Total Revenue	4559	5070	6293

[1] Direct corporate taxes are tabulated according to accrual rather than collection basis.

Source: Statistics Canada, Provincial Economic Accounts 1961-1974, pp. 44-45.

REPORT ON REVIEW OF PUBLIC SERVICE EMPLOYMENT ACT

Question No. 1,788—**Mr. Herbert:**

1. Is it the intention of the President of the Privy Council to refer to a standing or special committee, the public report which is to be prepared by the review body which will examine staffing, appointments and training in the public service?

2. What mechanism is envisaged to request and receive comments and suggestions from individuals and groups who have good reason to be interested in any proposed revisions to the Public Service Employment Act?

3. Has any date been set for the introduction in the House of legislative changes considered necessary as a result of the reports on the review of the Public Service Employment Act?

[Mr. Munro (Hamilton East).]

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): 1. 2. and 3. This question cannot be answered until the report of the review body is received.

APPOINTMENT OF JUDGES

Question No. 1,829—**Mr. Lambert (Bellechasse):**

1. On December 31, 1976, by province, how many judges had been appointed by the government and what was the amount of their (a) remuneration (b) fringe benefits, if any, and what were they?

2. By province, during the last fiscal year, what amount did the government spend on the judiciary?

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Justice):

Court or Province	Number of Judges as of December 31/76	Salaries 1975/76	Fringe Benefits-1975/76 Annuities	Gsmip*	Province Medical and Hospital Institution
Supreme Court of Canada	9	$649,977.04	$77,282.64	$119.79	$998.47
Federal Court of Canada	16	$974,942.91	$137,391.36	$212.96	$1,757.28
Alberta	51	$2,437,265.10	$437,934.96	$678.81	$5,601.33
British Columbia	71	$3,477,443.89	$609,674.16	$945.01	$7,797.93
Manitoba	26	$1,398,582.89	$223,260.96	$346.06	$2,855.58
New Brunswick	17	$1,017,775.81	$145,978.32	$226.27	$1,867.11
Newfoundland	14	$532,115.29	$120,217.44	$186.34	$1,537.62
Nova Scotia	18	$1,044,498.72	$154,565.28	$239.58	$1,976.94
Northwest Territories	1	$64,499.92	$8,586.96	$13.31	$109.83
Ontario	166	$7,847,775.54	$1,425,435.52	$2,209.72	$18,221.96
Prince Edward Island	6	$395,666.64	$51,521.76	$79.86	$658.98
Quebec	129	$7,352,397.20	$1,107,717.84	$1,716.99	$14,168.07
Saskatchewan	29	$1,547,109.74	$249,021.84	$385.99	$3,185.07
Yukon	1	$64,499.92	$8,586.96	$13.31	$109.83

*Group Surgical Medical Insurance Plan

2.

Court or Province	1975/76
Supreme Court of Canada	$736,313.63
Federal Court of Canada	$1,255,737.19
Alberta	$3,073,892.00
British Columbia	$4,295,472.42
Manitoba	$1,719,656.41
New Brunswick	$1,241,148.81
Newfoundland	$665,409.62
Nova Scotia	$1,276,234.68
Northwest Territories	$109,740.97
Ontario	$9,820,370.12
Prince Edward Island	$458,531.59
Quebec	$8,758,217.20
Saskatchewan	$1,882,156.19
Yukon	$83,035.62

USE OF GOVERNMENT AIRCRAFT

Question No. 1,869—**Mr. Allard:**

Since 1968, how many official trips did the Prime Minister make abroad and, in each case, what was the cost?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): The information requested is not readily available. To provide an accurate reply would entail a lengthy and costly examination of the accounts of the department, which cost in manpower and time would be exorbitant or prohibitive.

USE OF GOVERNMENT AIRCRAFT

Question No. 1,870—**Mr. Allard:**

Since 1974, how much did each minister spend on each official trip?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): The information requested it not readily available. To provide an accurate reply would entail a lengthy and costly examination of the accounts of every department, which cost in manpower and time would be exorbitant or prohibitive.

POSTAL INSTALLATIONS AT RIVERVIEW, NEW BRUNSWICK

Question No. 1,882—**Mr. Jones:**

1. Did the then Postmaster General reply "soon" to an oral question in the House on October 7, 1974 about the establishment of postal facilities in Riverview, New Brunswick and, if so, on what date will a postal station be erected in Riverview?

2. What has been the real cause of the delay in the erection of a postal station in Riverview?

Hon. J.-J. Blais (Postmaster General): 1. A new mail-processing plant is to be constructed which will serve the city of Moncton, the town of Riverview and the town of Dieppe. It is to be located in the Dieppe Industrial Park and is scheduled for completion late in 1979. Future plans call for construction of postal station in the Riverview area in 1980. This is subject to change depending on further investigation once the new mail-processing plant in Dieppe becomes operational.

2. As stated above, further investigation of postal facility requirements will be necessary following the introduction of the Dieppe mail-processing plant.

AVENUE ROAD, TORONTO, ONTARIO

Question No. 1,915—**Mr. McKinnon:**

What is the target date for closing or disposing of 1107 Avenue Road, Toronto, Ontario?

Hon. Barney Danson (Minister of National Defence): The target date for closing is Sept., 1979.

FLAXSEED

Question No. 1,930—**Mr. Hnatyshyn:**

Is the government aware of reports that a recent research mission to eastern and western Europe found a definite market for Canadian flax because of its high oil and iodine content and, if so (a) is the government prepared to assist western Canadian flax growers ship their flax directly to these European markets (b) is the government considering offering encouragement for greater flax production and use in Canada?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): In so far as the Canadian Wheat Board is concerned: The Government is aware that a recent flaxseed mission to Eastern and Western Europe reported definite market opportunities for Canadian flaxseed. This is not a new development; the European Economic Community has been our primary flaxseed market in recent years. (a) Flaxseed exports are handled by private grain exporting companies who have the necessary facilities to assemble and clean large quantities for export shipment. The Government is prepared to offer normal assistance to flax growers in serving available export markets. (b) The government is not considering incentives to promote flaxseed production and use in Canada. Production in recent years has been adequate to meet domestic and export demand and excess production would depress prices to growers.

THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A BLOOD FRACTIONAL PLANT IN CANADA BY THE RED CROSS

Question No. 1,935—**Mr. Clarke:**

1. Does the government intend to support plans of the Red Cross to build a fractional plant in Canada?

2. Are blood components donated by Canadians being sold overseas by the CDC controlled Connaught Laboratories of Toronto and, if so (a) which components (b) is there a surplus in Canada at the present time?

3. What is the total value of payments Connaught Laboratories received for blood components sold overseas since the Company began its relationship with the Red Cross and over how many years does this relationship extend?

4. Is any percentage of the payments received given to the Red Cross and, if so, what (a) was it at the beginning of the relationship (b) is it at the present time?

5. Is the CDC under orders to make a profit from its operation of Connaught Laboratories in all areas including negotiations with the Canadian Red Cross?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): I am informed by the Departments of Industry, Trade and Commerce, National Health and Welfare and Finance as follows: 1. At the present time Connaught Laboratories is the only Canadian fractionator of blood and undertakes this work in cooperation with the Red Cross. While a Red-Cross-Sponsored feasibility study to determine the cost involved in building its own fractionation plant is being undertaken, no decision by government concerning support for it will be made until this study is completed and a full analysis of the Canadian blood products situation is made, particularly as it relates to Canadian needs, to the activities of the Red Cross, Connaught Laboratories and others involved in the blood biologics field. It is expected to be at least 18 months before any such analysis would be complete.

2 to 5. The CDC operates under a management which was expressly set up in an independent capacity. In these circumstances, it is not considered appropriate to provide details on its internal administration.

DANIEL COATES—EDUCATIONAL EXPENSES

Question No. 1,945—**Mr. O'Sullivan:**

Has the government or any of its agencies ever paid for educational expenses incurred by Daniel Coates and, if so, in each case (a) what was the amount (b) to whom, or what institution was payment made (c) what was the purpose of any such instruction (d) where and on what date were such expenses incurred (e) under whose prior authorization were the charges incurred (f) under whose authorization were the expenses reimbursed?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): I am informed by the Department of Employment and Immigration as follows: Yes (a) $12,660. (b) Algonquin College, Ottawa. (c) French language instruction. (d) Ottawa, July 7, 1975 to January 31, 1976. (e)

Executive Director, Administration (through DSS Contract 65-25001-5-0814 Serial No. OGS5-0051). (f) See part (e). Several other departments, i.e. Consumer and Corporate Affairs, Prime Minister's and Privy Council offices and Urban Affairs, have no information regarding this question.

VANCOUVER OFFICE—REVENUE CANADA (TAXATION)

Question No. 1,955—**Mr. Clarke:**

1. Has the Department of National Revenue (Taxation) in Vancouver consolidated all of its offices at 1166 West Pender Street?

2. Does the government own the property and, if not (a) what is the name and address of the owner (b) what are the terms of the lease including length, rental, renewal, etc. (c) is the whole building leased to the Department (d) how many square feet are leased (e) were any leasing fees or commissions paid on the leasing transaction and, if so (i) on what basis was the commission calculated (ii) how much was paid (iii) what is the name, address and occupation of the payee?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): I am informed by the Departments of National Revenue and Public Works as follows: 1. At the present time the operations of the District Office are located in the Montreal Trust Building, 789 West Pender Street, the Pacific Palisades Building, 747 Bute Street and 1166 West Pender Street. It is expected that the new Processing Centre to be located in Surrey, British Columbia, will enable the operations of the District Office to be consolidated in the one building at 1166 West Pender Street.

2. No. (a) Daon Development Corporation, 1050 West Pender Street, Vancouver, B.C. (b) Five years from December 1, 1975 to November 30, 1980 with one option for three years and one option for a further two years; at rental of $1,348,-898.20 per annum; all services included (gross lease) plus normal escalations for operation and taxes. (c) The whole building is leased to the Department of Public Works with the exception of the Building Service areas. (d) 150,372 sq. ft. rentable area plus 28 covered parking stalls. (e) No; this was a public tender call. (i) (ii) (iii) Not applicable.

CABINET MINISTERS' TRIP TO THE CONSTITUENCY OF MATANE, QUEBEC

Question No. 1,996—**Mr. Cossitt:**

1. For the fiscal year (a) 1972-73 (b) 1973-74 (c) 1974-75 (d) 1975-76 (e) 1976-77 to the date the answer to this question is prepared, how many Cabinet Ministers have travelled to the Constituency of Matane, Quebec and, in each case, what was the (i) nature and purpose of the trip (ii) date of the trip (iii) name of the Minister (iv) method of transportation used and the total cost (v) name and address of all persons accompanying the Minister and their job designation, if any, with the government (vi) entire cost of the trip including transportation and all expenses incurred by the Minister and any persons accompanying him/her?

2. What has been the total cost to the taxpayer for all the years and items mentioned in Part 1?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): See replies to questions Nos. 29 and 30 answered this day.

TRAVEL BY MEMBER FOR MATANE TO MATANE

Question No. 1,997—**Mr. Cossitt:**

1. During the fiscal year (a) 1972-73 (b) 1973-74 (c) 1974-75 (d) 1975-76 (e) 1976-77 to the date the answer to this question is prepared (i) what was the total amount paid by the Department of Supply and Services for trips to and from Ottawa to the Constituency of Matane by the honourable Member for Matane (ii) what was the total number of trips involved and, in each case, what were the dates and the amount of each cheque paid?

2. What was the total spent by the Department for all the years and trips mentioned in Part 1?

Hon. Jean-Pierre Goyer (Minister of Supply and Services):
1. Nil.

2. Not applicable.

TRAVEL BY PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARY TO MINISTER OF STATE FOR URBAN AFFAIRS

Question No. 1,998—**Mr. Cossitt:**

1. Did the Department of Supply and Services, the Ministry of State for Urban Affairs or any other department of government pay from public funds any costs whatsoever pertaining to travel by the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Urban Affairs during the period of time the honourable Member for Matane served as Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Urban Affairs and, if so, what was (a) the purpose and nature of each trip (b) point of departure and destination (c) the cost to the taxpayer and the means of transportation used (d) all costs incurred on each trip along with the exact cost of any entertainment, official or otherwise to the taxpayers (e) the date of the commencement and conclusion of each trip?

2. Were any costs charged to the taxpayers for any person accompanying the honourable Member and, if so, in each case, what was the name, address and job designation of such persons?

3. What was the total cost of all items mentioned in Parts 1 and 2?

Hon. André Ouellet (Minister of State for Urban Affairs):
1. (a), (b), (c), (d) and (e) See following statement.

2. No.

3. $1,305.51.

(a) Purpose and nature of trip	(b) Point of departure and destination		(c) Cost and means of transportation	(d) Other costs		(e) Dates
To speak to the Quebec Provincial Builders Association	Ottawa	Quebec	$70.00—Plane	Hospitality Hotel and Taxis	14.23 81.77	Nov. 10-12/74
Member of Parliamentary delegation	Ottawa	Washington	None—Gov't Plane	Hospitality Taxi and Tel.	120.00 28.70	Jan. 15-17/75
To meet with Honourable G. Pelletier and others	Ottawa	Montreal	$44.00—Plane	Hospitality Hotel and Taxi	20.00 72.00	Feb. 2-3/75

(a) Purpose and nature of trip	(b) Point of departure and destination		(c) Cost and means of transportation	(d) Other costs		(e) Dates
To meet with Mayor Drapeau	Ottawa	Montreal	$44.00—Plane	Hotel	60.00	Feb. 16-17/75
Ministry meeting at L'Esterel	Ottawa	L'Esterel	$64.00—Private vehicle	Hospitality Hotel	80.25 44.00	May 6-8/75
Inauguration of Centre Bois de Boulogne	Ottawa	Montreal	$52.00—Plane	Hotel and Taxi	65.00	May 29/75
To attend "Colloque sur les affaires urbaines" at Laval University	Ottawa	Quebec	$70.00—Plane	Hotel	132.00	June 3-4/75
To attend meetings of Habitat Canadian National Committee	Ottawa	Quebec and Montreal	$46.25—Private vehicle	Hotel and meals	197.31	Oct. 7-9/75

EXPENSES OF P. DE BANÉ WHILE PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARY TO SECRETARY OF STATE FOR EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

Question No. 1,999—**Mr. Cossitt:**

1. Did the Department of Supply and Services, the Department of External Affairs or any other department of government pay from public funds any costs whatsoever pertaining to travel by the Parliamentary Secretary to the Secretary of State for External Affairs between December 22, 1972 and December 21, 1973 and, if so, what was (a) the purpose and nature of each trip paid for (b) point of departure and point of destination (c) cost to the taxpayer of transportation and the means of transportation used (d) all costs incurred on each trip along with the exact cost of any entertainment, official or otherwise to the taxpayers (e) the date of the commencement and conclusion of each trip?

2. Were any costs charged to the taxpayers for any person accompanying the honourable Member and, if so, in each case, what was the name, address and job designation of such persons?

3. What was the total cost of all items mentioned in Parts 1 and 2?

Mr. Fernand E. Leblanc (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State for External Affairs): 1. (a)(i) Attended meeting of the Organization of American States. (ii) Attended funeral of Captain Laviolette. (iii) Participated in Radio program. (iv) Participated in T.V. program. (v) Greeted Canadian mission from Vietnam. (vi) Official visit to Morocco, Tunisia and Algeria. (vii) Attended United Nations General Assembly. (viii) Participated in seminar at Laval University. (ix) Attended Conference of Ministers on Youth and Sports. (x) Speaker at meeting of Middle East Association. (b)(i) Ottawa—Washington. (ii) Ottawa—Quebec. (iii) Ottawa—Montreal. (iv) Ottawa—Montreal. (v) Ottawa—Vancouver. (vi) Ottawa—Morocco—Tunisia—Algeria. (vii) Ottawa—New York. (viii) Ottawa—Quebec. (ix) Ottawa—Abidjan. (x) Ottawa—Montreal. (c)(i) $215 Commercial. (ii) — (iii) 28 Commercial. (iv) 38 Commercial. (v) — (vi) — (vii) 120 Commercial. (viii) 48 Commercial. (ix) 1,481 Commercial. (x) 28 Commercial. No expense claims were submitted for transportation costs in respect of items (ii), (v) and (vi). (d)(i) $567 including $50 for entertainment. (ii) 25. (iii) 70 including 6 for entertainment. (iv) 92. (v) 63. (vi) 318 including 32 for entertainment. (vii) 30 including 18 for entertainment. (viii) 90.80. (ix) 490 including 130 for entertainment. (x) 87. (e)(i) April 5—13, 1973. (ii) April 14, 1973. (iii) July 7, 1973. (iv) July 13, 1973. (v) July 30, 1973. (vi) September 6—22, 1973. (vii) October 2—10, 1973. (viii) October 13—14, 1973. (ix) November 3—11, 1973. (x) November 28—29, 1973.

2. There is no indication that costs were incurred for other persons accompanying the Parliamentary Secretary.

3. $3,790.80.

BARLEY GRADED AS FEED BARLEY

Question No. 2,008—**Mr. Malone:**

1. For each of the past eight years, what was the number of bushels of barley graded as "feed barley" and sold by the Canadian Wheat Board as "malting barley"?

2. For the same years, what was the average price for (a) feed barley (b) malting barley?

3. In cases where malting barley sold for a higher amount than feed barley, was the value of the additional price received by the Canadian Wheat Board or the farmer?

1.

Crop Year	Bushels (No. 1 Feed, Selected for Malting, Pot or Pearling)
1970-71	7,449,769.2
1971-72	6,123,064.7
1972-73	10,445,451.6
1973-74	7,748,619.5
1974-75	14,949,082.0
1975-76	18,625,250.4

Data for crop years prior to 1970-71 are not available.

2. (a)

Crop Year	Grade	Average Price	Basis
1972-73	1 Feed	$2.04 ½ per bushel	Instore St. Lawrence
1973-74	1 Feed	$2.85 per bushel	Instore St. Lawrence
1974-75	1 Feed	$2.68 ½ per bushel	Instore St. Lawrence
1975-76	1 Feed	$2.79 per bushel	Instore St. Lawrence

(b)

Crop Year	Grade	Average Price	Basis (Thunder Bay)
1972-73	3-2Row	$1.66 ⅝ per bushel	Winnipeg Commodity Exchange Barley Futures Market
	3-6Row	$1.66 ⅝ per bushel	Winnipeg Commodity Exchange Barley Futures Market
1973-74	2-2Row	$3.22 ½ per bushel	Flat
	2-6Row	$3.13 ⅝ per bushel	Flat
1974-75	2-2Row	$3.59 per bushel	Winnipeg Commodity Exchange Barley Futures Market
	2-6Row	$3.59 per bushel	Winnipeg Commodity Exchange Barley Futures Market
1975-76	2-2Row	$3.36 ⅞ per bushel	Flat
	2-6Row	$3.27 ¾ per bushel	Flat

The above prices are simple unweighted averages and do not account for volumes traded at different price levels. Price data for crop years prior to 1972-73 are not available.

Order Paper Questions

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): In so far as the Canadian Wheat Board is concerned:

3. In cases where malting barley was sold by the Canadian Wheat Board for a higher amount than feed barley, the additional money received went into the CWB pool accounts and was distributed to producers as part of the final payment.

EXPENSES PAID TO THE HON. MEMBER FOR SASKATOON-HUMBOLDT

Question No. 2,027—**Mr. Cossitt:**

1. What is the total of all expenses paid by the Department of Supply and Services and any other branch of the government, directly or indirectly, for the honourable Member for Saskatoon—Humboldt while (a) Minister of Manpower and Immigration (b) Minister of Justice (c) Minister of Transportation?

2. What is the total of all expenses paid for the Minister while serving in the three portfolios?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): See Public Accounts of Canada (Volume II, Sections 35 and 36).

EXPENSES PAID TO HON. MEMBER FOR BURIN-BURGEO

Question No. 2,028—**Mr. Cossitt:**

1. What is the total of all expenses paid by the Department of Supply and Services and any other branch of the government, directly or indirectly, for the honourable Member for Burin—Burgeo while (a) Minister of Transport (b) Minister of Regional Economic Expansion (c) Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce (d) Secretary of State for External Affairs?

2. What is the total of all expenses paid for the Minister while serving in the four portfolios?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): See reply to Question No. 2,027 answered this day.

EXPENSES PAID TO HON. MEMBER FOR DOLLARD

Question No. 2,029—**Mr. Cossitt:**

1. What is the total of all expenses paid by the Department of Supply and Services or any other branch of the government, directly or indirectly, for the honourable Member of Dollard while (a) Solicitor General of Canada (b) Minister of Supply and Services?

2. What is the total of all expenses paid for the Minister while serving in the two portfolios?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): See reply to Question No. 2,027 answered this day.

POSTAL DEFICITS

Question No. 2,032—**Mr. Herbert:**

1. Has the Postmaster General in the US reported that postal revenues have exceeded expenditures in each of the last two quarters?

2. Is it intended to work toward elimination of the government subsidy for postal service in Canada and, if so, by what date is it estimated that revenues will equal expenditures in the Canadian postal system?

[Mr. Malone.]

3. What has been the amount of the loss in the postal system in each of the past ten years?

4. What is the estimated amount of the loss in the current fiscal year and in the next fiscal year?

Hon. J.-J. Blais (Postmaster General): 1. Yes.

2. The objective for the Post Office as published in the main estimates is to provide postal service without incurring subsidization from general taxation. Although this has not been achieved for a number of years, it continues to represent a long term objective. No date can be forecast for an equalization of postal revenues and expenditures.

3.

	Deficit $000's
1966-67	47,764
1967-68	67,191
1968-69	88,187
1969-70	52,948
1970-71	100,592
1971-72	76,993
1972-73	90,897
1973-74	177,172
1974-75	320,939
1975-76	546,202
1976-77	671,582
1977-78	567,622

4. The Blue Book of estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1978 forecast deficits as follows: 1976-77, 671,582; 1977-78, 567,622.

STUDIES RELATING TO CAPITAL GAINS TAX

Question No. 2,044—**Mr. Howie:**

Have there been studies relating to the upward adjustment of real property where V-day coincided with a demonstrable period of abnormally depressed values in the region?

Mr. Bob Kaplan (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Finance): It would be extremely difficult to adjust the 1971 values of certain properties to what may be considered by some to be more realistic levels. Any modification to 1971 values would require careful consideration to ensure that all taxpayers are treated similarly. Readjusting valuation day values for one particular type of property would create a dangerous precedent and perhaps a bias by treating such property more favourably than others. Such a change might not be acceptable to a majority of Canadians.

STUDIES RELATING TO CAPITAL GAINS TAX

Question No. 2,045—**Mr. Howie:**

Have financial studies been done concerning deferral of capital gains on transfer or inheritance of assets of family farm incorporations or partnerships?

Mr. Bob Kaplan (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Finance): Less than 2 percent of all farms in Canada are held in corporate form. Therefore incorporated farms are a small part of the total family farm picture. In terms of policy, there

would have to be clear and compelling reasons to justify special rollover treatment for farm corporations and partnerships, and not for other family businesses or perhaps the whole range of capital properties passing between generations on death. The deferral of capital gains tax on individually-owned farms is a very special exception to the general framework of income tax legislation. It was introduced only for very compelling reasons which stem for the continuing importance of the small family farm to our country and the disruptive effect which this feature of the income tax system could have where the family was not organized to deal with it.

DEMURRAGE PAID FOR GRAIN SHIPS

Question No. 2,053—**Mr. Schellenberger:**

1. For the crop year (a) 1974-75 (b) 1975-76, what was the total number of grain ships delayed in (a) Vancouver (b) Thunder Bay (c) Prince Rupert?

2. Since August 1, 1975 to date (a) what demurrage was paid for grain ships (b) what was the total number of grain ships delayed in each harbour?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): In so far as the Canadian Wheat Board is concerned: 1. The Canadian Wheat Board has information only on the amount of demurrage claimed and cannot provide statistics on the actual number of ships delayed in Vancouver, Thunder Bay and Prince Rupert, for the crop years 1974-75 and 1975-76.

2. (a) In the period August 1st 1975 to March 15th, 1977, the amount of demurrage paid by the Canadian Wheat Board was $12,606,048.67. (b) The actual number of ships delayed is not available.

MINISTER OF MANPOWER AND IMMIGRATION—PROPOSED VISIT TO LEEDS

Question No. 2,064—**Mr. Cossitt:**

1. Did the Minister of Manpower and Immigration visit the proposed Constituency of Leeds—Grenville under redistribution this year and, if so (a) on what date (b) for what purpose?

2. Is the Minister aware of press reports attributing to the Minister a statement that the Prime Minister has personally asked him to look after electing a member of the Liberal Party to represent the proposed Constituency of Leeds—Grenville in the next Parliament and, if so (a) on what date did the Prime Minister make such a request (b) what was the purpose of the request?

3. Is it the policy of the government, in certain cases, to assign a Cabinet Minister to direct the Liberal Party election campaign on behalf of the government in a specific constituency presently represented by members of the Progressive Conservative Party and, if so (a) on what date and for what reason did this become a government policy (b) does this constitute a new government policy of extending specific honours to certain constituencies by giving them specific Prime Ministerial attention?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): In so far as the Department of Employment and Immigration and the President of the Privy Council are concerned: 1. Yes—(a) January 26, 1977; (b) To address the founding meeting of the Leeds-Grenville Liberal Association.

2. No—(a) N/A; (b) N/A.

3. See Beauchesne, fourth edition, citation 171 (a), (b), (f), (g), (h), (i) and (dd).

Order Paper Questions

GOVERNMENT AIRCRAFT

Question No. 2,065—**Mr. Cossitt:**

1. Since the preparation of the answer to Question No. 50, have there been further occasions where the Minister of Transport has used government owned aircraft and, if so (a) what was the (i) point of departure and destination (ii) cost to the taxpayer (iii) purpose of the flight (b) what is the name, address and job designation of all persons who accompanied the Minister?

2. What was the total cost to the taxpayer of all such flights?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): See replies to questions Nos. 29 and 30 answered this day.

AIRCRAFT IN STORAGE AT SASKATOON

Question No. 2,066—**Mr. Cossitt:**

1. With reference to the answer to Question No. 47, concerning government aircraft in storage at Saskatoon Municipal Airport, has any change occurred in the status of any of the aircraft including, in each case (a) transfer and, if so, to what location (b) sale and, if so, what is the name, address and price involved and all other pertinent details of the sale (c) negotiations or agreements for sale and, if so, with whom, at what address and all other pertinent details?

2. Are any of the hangars presently empty or about to become empty as a result of the disposal of the aircraft?

3. Have any of the hangars been rented or sold and, if so (a) to whom (b) at what address (c) at what price?

4. Is it the intention of the government to open a larger recruiting depot in Saskatoon and, if so, what are the details?

5. Will a larger military presence be established in Saskatoon and, if so, what are the details?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): I am informed by the Departments of National Defence, Transport and Supply and Services as follows:

1. Yes. (a) The following aircraft have been transferred:

Type of Aircraft	Quantity	Transferred to
Tracker CP 121 Patrol	3	Dartmouth, N.S.
Tracker CP 121 Patrol	9	Mountain View, Ont.
T33 Jet Trainer	8	Mountain View, Ont.
Dakota CC 129 Transport	2	CFB Winnipeg, Man.
Dakota CC 129 Transport	8	Crown Assets Disposal Corporation
Otter CF 123 Transport	7	Crown Assets Disposal Corporation

(c) All aircraft that have been declared surplus have been sold.

2. Yes. Three buildings are now empty and the fourth building will be empty by the end of October, 1977.

3. The Department of National Defence hangars known as No. 3, 4, 5, and 6 and building No. 86 at Saskatoon Airport will be transferred to the Department of Transport as soon as vacated by the Department of National Defence. Transport Canada intends to declare the hangars surplus to its requirements. Transport Canada is prepared to enter into a 10 year lease with any purchaser of hangar No. 3 after which time the building is to be removed from the site. Hangars Nos. 4 and 5 will also be sold but are required to be removed from the site. Transport Canada is prepared to offer to the purchaser of

hangar No. 6, a 5 year lease renewable for three further periods of 5 years each. Building 86 will be used by Transport Canada for operational purposes at the airport.

4. Yes. The staff of the recruiting centre at Saskatoon will be increased slightly as of 1 August, 1977.

5. No.

EXPENSES PAID TO HON. MEMBER FOR ESSEX-WINDSOR

Question No. 2,067—**Mr. Cossitt:**

What is the total of all expenses paid by the Department of Supply and Services or any other branch of the government, directly or indirectly, for the honourable Member for Essex—Windsor while serving as Minister of Agriculture?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): See reply to Question No. 2,027 answered this day.

EXPENSES PAID TO HON. MEMBER FOR HAMILTON EAST

Question No. 2,068—**Mr. Cossitt:**

1. What is the total of all expenses paid by the Department of Supply and Services or any other branch of the government, directly or indirectly, for the honourable Member for Hamilton East while (a) Minister of National Health and Welfare (b) Minister of Labour?

2. What is the total of all expenses paid for the Minister while serving in the two portfolios?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): See reply to Question No. 2,027 answered this day.

COST OF RUNNING EACH MAXIMUM SECURITY PRISON

Question No. 2,081—**Mr. Howie:**

1. What was the cost of running each maximum security prison for (a) 1974 (b) 1975 (c) 1976?

2. For the year 1976, in each such prison (a) how many guards were employed (b) what was the total of guard's salaries and what proportion of the amount was overtime?

Hon. Francis Fox (Solicitor General): 1. (a), (b) and (c) See Annex A.

2. (a) and (b) See Annex B.

Annex A

Operating and Maintenance Costs
Maximum Security Institutions

Institution	(a) 1974-75	(b) 1975-76	(c) 1976-77
Dorchester Penitentiary	$5,800,320	$6,593,180	$6,422,809
Regional Psychiatric Centre—Quebec	2,879,700	3,822,734	3,871,917
Laval Institution	2,796,389	3,882,526	6,129,633
Archambault Institution	5,680,395	4,669,193	5,140,313
Regional Reception Centre—Quebec	2,616,869	3,368,083	4,193,527
Correctional Development Centre—Quebec	127,863	1,212,487	296,432
Regional Psychiatric Centre—Ontario	1,610,917	1,974,247	1,790,618
Regional Reception Centre—Kingston	3,948,595	4,789,784	5,636,324
Millhaven Institution	4,339,389	6,773,608	8,435,074
Stony Mountain Institution	4,837,782	5,821,104	6,749,667
Saskatchewan Penitentiary	5,410,863	5,984,169	6,887,460
British Columbia Penitentiary	5,243,725	6,593,294	7,932,604
Regional Psychiatric Centre—Pacific	2,905,695	3,153,324	3,697,935
Total	$48,198,502	$58,637,733	$67,184,313

Annex B

Number of Guards in Maximum Security Institutions

Institution	Correctional Officers	Total Salaries	Overtime
Dorchester Penitentiary	160	$2,124,160	$165,036
Regional Psychiatric Centre—Quebec	58	770,008	319,965
Laval Institution	179	2,376,404	559,509
Archambault Institution	175	2,323,300	566,019
Regional Reception Centre—Quebec	122	1,619,672	256,189
Correctional Development Centre—Quebec	Nil	N/A	N/A
Regional Psychiatric Centre—Ontario	12	159,312	—
Regional Reception Centre—Ontario	165	2,190,540	453,884
Millhaven Institution	188	2,495,888	1,263,051
Stony Mountain Institution	120	1,593,120	313,089
Saskatchewan Penitentiary	139	1,845,364	689,979
British Columbia Penitentiary	175	2,323,300	773,822
Regional Psychiatric Centre—Pacific	75	995,700	58,017
Total:		$20,816,768	$5,418,560

*NOTE: The facilities of the Correctional Development Centre (Quebec) were used in 1976, on an interim basis, as a Regional Psychiatric Centre and after the Laval Institution incidents of October as a temporary maximum facility.

While used as a Psychiatric Centre the salary and overtime cost for guards was accounted for by the Regional Psychiatric Centre.

Guards employed since October 1976 had been on loan from the Leclerc Institution (Medium) and the Federal Training Centre (Medium) and their salary and overtime cost was accounted for by their respective institutions.

1977 CANADA POST CALENDAR

Question No. 2,082—**Mr. Johnston:**

1. What was the cost of printing the 1977 Canada Post Calendar?

2. How many were printed?

3. To whom and by what means are they distributed?

4. What is the justification for this type of advertising for a government service that has a captive market?

Hon. J.-J. Blais (Postmaster General): 1. $112,000.

2. 800,000

3. The calendars were made available to the general public at post office counters. A small number of recipients such as members of parliament, senators and large volume mailers received calendars through the mail.

4. Canada Post's calendar is not a type of advertising. Rather it is a customer service—a mailer's guide that gives postal rates, mailing deadlines, and provides information on codes and standards and proper addressing packaged in a form that is retained and displayed by over 90 per cent of the recipients.

MINISTER'S TRAVEL

Question No. 2,083—**Mr. Wise:**

1. Did the Minister of Agriculture travel to Columbus, Ohio in the past six months and, if so (a) on what date (b) for what purpose (c) what group, association or organization did the Minister meet with (d) in what manner did the Minister travel?

2. What was the cost of travel for the trip and, how was it paid?

3. What are the names, addresses and responsibilities of all persons accompanying the Minister?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): See replies to Questions No. 29 and 30 answered this day.

TAX STATUS OF CHARITABLE ORGANIZATIONS

Question No. 2,085—**Mr. Whiteway:**

1. Is it the policy of the government to deny or evoke or threaten to evoke the tax status enjoyed by charitable organizations to those organizations who use receipted funds for the purpose of lobbying or bringing pressure to bear upon the government?

2. Is it the policy of the government to deny or evoke or threaten to evoke the tax status enjoyed by charitable organizations who encourage or direct its members or patrons to write to Members of Parliament for the purpose of lobbying or bringing pressure to bear upon the government?

3. Has the Minister of National Revenue or any member of the Department denied, evoked or threatened to evoke the tax status of a charitable organization to any organization which used its receipted funds or encouraged its membership to oppose either by petition to the government or by writing Members of Parliament for the purpose of lobbying or bringing pressure to bear upon the government with reference to the hunting of baby harp seals?

Hon. Monique Bégin (Minister of National Revenue): 1. and 2. The legal interpretation of charity provided by common law judicial decisions does not recognize lobbying and bringing pressure to bear upon the government, by any means, as a charitable purpose or a charitable activity. However, the presentation of briefs to the government is an accepted activity of a charity. Under the Income Tax Act, a registered charity subjects itself to possible revocation of its registration, and thus its tax exemption, whenever non-charitable activities are undertaken, because it would be failing to comply with the basic requirement that all its activities be charitable. Lobbying and pressure activities do not necessarily result in revocation. Where such activities were a relatively minor part of a charity's activities, the charity was not aware that such activities would prejudice their registered status and the charity agrees not to participate in such activities in future, registration would usually not be revoked.

3. My officials, in applying the provisions of the Income Tax Act, in line with the relevant judicial decisions, have written to one registered charity which involved itself in non-charitable activities with reference to animal welfare. The charity was informed that such activities were contrary to the common law interpretation of charitable activities and that continued involvement in such an activity could result in the loss of its registration number and tax exempt status. Subsequently the charity voluntarily requested revocation and the Department was not obliged to decide upon the imposition of revocation.

LANGEVIN BUILDING—CARPET FOR PRIME MINISTER AND STAFF

Question No. 2,154—**Mr. Cossitt:**

1. With reference to the answer to Question No. 2, which stated in part that $89,000 was the cost of carpet installed in the Langevin Building with no portion of this applying to the area occupied by the Prime Minister and his staff, is there carpet on the floor in the area occupied by the Prime Minister and his staff and (a) if not, for what reason (b) if so (i) where did it come from (ii) what was the total cost (iii) what was the cost per square yard?

2. Did the Prime Minister and his staff bring their own old carpet from the East Block for reuse or did anyone do it on their behalf and, if so, is this a new policy by the Prime Minister and the government to save money for the taxpayer by implementing restraint in government purchases for the Prime Minister and members of the Cabinet?

Hon. Judd Buchanan (Minister of Public Works): The answer to Question 2 (a) and 2 (b) stated that the total cost of carpeting installed in the Langevin Building was $89,000 which included the carpeting of space occupied by the Prime Minister and his staff. 1 (a), (b)(i), (b)(ii), (b)(iii) and 2 are not applicable.

LANGEVIN BUILDING—AREA OCCUPIED BY PRIME MINISTER AND STAFF

Question No. 2,155—**Mr. Cossitt:**

With reference to the answer to Question No. 2, which stated in part that $4,336,489.16 was spent on renovations to the Langevin Building, with no portion of this applying to the area occupied by the Prime Minister and his staff (a) is the Prime Minister and his staff occupying a section of the building that was not renovated and, if so, what is the area (b) was a portion of this amount spent on the area occupied by the Prime Minister and his staff and, if so, what was the amount?

Hon. Judd Buchanan (Minister of Public Works): See reply to Question No. 2,154 answered this day.

NUMBER OF INMATES ADMITTED TO INSTITUTIONS IN QUEBEC REGION, 1970-1976

Question No. 2,195—**Mr. Hnatyshyn:**

1. For the years 1970 to 1976, what was the number of inmates admitted to the Quebec Federal Training Centre?

2. How many had (a) been admitted to a federal institution for the first time (b) at one time been convicted under the Juvenile Delinquents Act?

Order Paper Questions

Hon. Francis Fox (Solicitor General): 1. Normally, all admissions in the Quebec Region have been through the Regional Reception Centre. The population movement data on Annex A illustrates total entries into the above institutions, i.e., admissions from outside and institutional transfers.

2. (a) With reference to inmates admitted to a federal institution with no previous penitentiary incarceration, this information is available on a regional basis only for the years 1975 and 1976. 1975—756; 1976—783; (b) This information is not available from the Inmate Record System, but part of the information requested can be found in Statistics Canada Publication (Catalogue No. 85-207) entitled "Correctional Institution Statistics" under the heading "Previous Commitments by previous institutional history".

Admissions Quebec Region—1970-1976

	1970	1971	1972	1973	1974	1975	1976
Federal Training Centre	365	367	424	371	345	452	380
Regional Psychiatric Centre	—	—	—	273	216	318	278
St. Vincent de Paul Institution	*1623	*1702	1453	—	—	—	—
Regional Reception Centre	—	—	—	1035	941	1270	1350
Archambault Institution	624	481	559	475	314	427	574
Cowansville Institution	443	411	433	300	240	295	285
Leclerc Institution	546	504	459	503	424	435	452
Ste-Anne-des-Plaines Institution	145	250	254	260	224	288	265

*These figures include the Industrial Annex

NOTE: The above figures do not include temporary detainees.

Question No. 2,196—**Mr. Hnatyshyn:**

1. For the years 1970 to 1976, what was the number of inmates admitted to the Quebec Regional Psychiatric Centre?

2. How many had (a) been admitted to a federal institution for the first time (b) at one time been convicted under the Juvenile Delinquents Act?

Hon. Francis Fox (Solicitor General): See Question No. 2,195.

Question No. 2,197—**Mr. Hnatyshyn:**

1. For the years 1970 to 1976, what was the number of inmates admitted to the Quebec Regional Medical Centre?

2. How many had (a) been admitted to a federal institution for the first time (b) at one time been convicted under the Juvenile Delinquents Act?

Hon. Francis Fox (Solicitor General): See Question No. 2,195.

Question No. 2,198—**Mr. Hnatyshyn:**

1. For the years 1970 to 1976, what was the number of inmates admitted to the Quebec Regional Reception Centre?

[Mr. Hnatyshyn.]

2. How many had (a) been admitted to a federal institution for the first time (b) at one time been convicted under the Juvenile Delinquents Act?

Hon. Francis Fox (Solicitor General): See Question No. 2,195.

Question No. 2,199—**Mr. Hnatyshyn:**

1. For the years 1970 to 1976, what was the number of inmates admitted to Archambault Institution?

2. How many had (a) been admitted to a federal institution for the first time (b) at one time been convicted under the Juvenile Delinquents Act?

Hon. Francis Fox (Solicitor General): See Question No. 2,195.

Question No. 2,200—**Mr. Hnatyshyn:**

1. For the years 1970 to 1976, what was the number of inmates admitted to Cowansville Institution?

2. How many had (a) been admitted to a federal institution for the first time (b) at one time been convicted under the Juvenile Delinquents Act?

Hon. Francis Fox (Solicitor General): See Question No. 2,195.

Question No. 2,201—**Mr. Hnatyshyn:**

1. For the years 1970 to 1976, what was the number of inmates admitted to Leclerc Institution?

2. How many had (a) been admitted to a federal institution for the first time (b) at one time been convicted under the Juvenile Delinquents Act?

Hon. Francis Fox (Solicitor General): See Question No. 2,195.

Question No. 2,202—**Mr. Hnatyshyn:**

1. For the years 1970 to 1976, what was the number of inmates admitted to Ste. Annes des Plaines Institution?

2. How many had (a) been admitted to a federal institution for the first time (b) at one time been convicted under the Juvenile Delinquents Act?

Hon. Francis Fox (Solicitor General): See Question No. 2,195.

EXPENSES PAID TO HON. MEMBER FOR OUTREMONT

Question No. 2,232—**Mr. Cossitt:**

What is the total of all expenses paid by the Department of Supply and Services or any other branch of the government, directly or indirectly, for the honourable Member for Outremont while serving as Minister of National Health and Welfare?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): See reply to Question No. 2,027 answered this day.

EXPENSES PAID TO HON. MEMBER FOR VANCOUVER CENTRE

Question No. 2,233—**Mr. Cossitt:**

1. What is the total of all expenses paid by the Department of Supply and Services or any other branch of the government, directly or indirectly, for the honourable Member for Vancouver Centre while Minister of (a) Consumer and Corporate Affairs (b) Urban Affairs (c) National Revenue (d) Justice and Attorney General?

2. What is the total of all expenses paid for the Minister while serving in the four portfolios?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): See reply to Question No. 2,027 answered this day.

EXPENSES PAID TO HON. MEMBER FOR ST. BONIFACE

Question No. 2,234—**Mr. Cossitt:**

1. What is the total of all expenses paid by the Department of Supply and Services or any other branch of the government, directly or indirectly, for the honourable Member for St. Boniface while (a) Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion (b) Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Transport (c) Minister without Portfolio?

2. What is the total of all expenses paid for the Minister while serving in the three positions?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): See reply to Question No. 2,027 answered this day.

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE COMMISSION

Question No. 2,251—**Mr. Fortin:**

Can a Regional Director of the Unemployment Insurance Commission (a) rent (b) lend computer services and personnel to private companies and, if not, are civil servants willing to testify in this regard, bound by an oath of office?

Hon. Bud Cullen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): (a) and (b) Yes.

GROUND TRANSPORTATION POLICY FOR AIRPORTS

Question No. 2,260—**Mr. Mazankowski:**

1. Do the regulations respecting ground transportation fees at airports state that "The annual fee for a permit to operate a taxicab or limousine at Toronto International Airport is $875," and, if so, has the Department of Transport collected such moneys or parts thereof and, if not, for what reason?

2. Have any legal questions of a discriminatory basis or otherwise been raised with regard to the collection of such fees and, if so (a) what are the details (b) which group, person or individual made such representation (c) what specific action is being taken or will be taken to respond?

3. Do the government airport concession operations regulations state in part, that any person may pick up or transport passengers in a commercial passenger vehicle from a place outside the airport to a destination at the airport and, if so, does Blue Line Taxi adhere to the regulation at the Ottawa International Airport and, if not, for what reason?

4. Are Gloucester Township taxis, under city regulations, allowed to pick-up a fare in Ottawa and transport the passenger to the Airport and, if so, has Mr. Montgomery, President of Blue Line Taxis Limited, on occasion fined the Carleton Taxi Association members for doing so and is this in contradiction of section 7(1)(a) of the government airport concession operations regulations?

5. Does the license (file no. 5156-464-6 Vol.3) between the Department of Transport and Blue Line Taxis Limited (formerly Red Line Taxis Limited) state at section 5 "that the Licensee shall in all respects abide by and comply with all lawful rules, regulations and by-laws of municipalities and other governing bodies, in any manner affecting the operations conducted by the Licensee hereunder" and, if so, has Blue Line Taxis Limited complied faithfully to this section and, if not, for what reason?

6. Does the Department collect 5 per cent of the gross revenue derived by Blue Line Taxis Limited from the operation of the bus and limousine service to and from Ottawa International Airport and such other special ground transportation services from the Airport, and fifteen cents for each taxicab from the Airport, all as established to the satisfaction of the Minister, payable in monthly installments on or before the fifteenth day of each succeeding month?

Order Paper Questions

7. For each year since Blue Line Taxis has been operating out of the Airport, what is the amount of gross revenue the Department received from the (a) taxicab (b) bus (c) limousine service?

8. With reference to Part 7, is there any cross subsidy among the taxicab, bus and limousine service at the Airport and, if so (a) which modes are being cross subsidized (b) what is the specific amount of the cross subsidy for each year that Blue Line Taxis has been operating?

9. Does Appendix B of the August 1976 Ground Transportation Policy for Airports state "where a bus service operator also provides limousine service the limousine service must be on a self-supporting basis and not subsidized by revenue from the bus operator" and, if so (a) is the (i) limousine service (ii) bus service at Ottawa International Airport on a self-supporting basis (b) does the bus service at Ottawa International Airport subsidize the limousine service and, if so, to what extent?

10. What is the last date that public tenders were called on the taxi, bus and limousine service at Ottawa International Airport?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): 1. The airport ground transportation regulations state that the annual fee for a permit to operate a taxicab or limousine at Toronto International Airport is $875. The regulations were promulgated to stipulate this fee in anticipation of the proclamation of Toronto International Airport as a designated airport pursuant to section 4 of the Airport Concession Operations Regulations. No moneys have been collected since the airport has not yet been designated and the $875 fee is therefore not applicable. The implementation of the designation system is still under consideration.

2. No legal questions of any nature have been raised with the Department of Transport by any person or group regarding the collection of such fees.

3. The Government Airport Concession Operations Regulations state, in part, that any person may pick up or transport passengers in a commercial passenger vehicle from a place outside the airport to a destination at the airport. Blue Line Taxi adheres to this regulation at the Ottawa International Airport, and is accorded the right to pick up passengers at the airport for carrying off the airport pursuant to the terms of its agreement with the Department of Transport.

4. Any taxi operating in a municipality in a manner that is in accord with the regulations of that municipality and such other municipalities as it operates in can transport a passenger to the airport and not be in conflict with Section 7(1)(a) of the Government Airport Concession Operations Regulations. The Department does not have privity of contract with any arrangements Blue Line Taxi Limited may have with the Carleton Taxi Association members.

5. Yes, Blue Line Taxi Limited complies fully with Section 5 of its Licence as far as the Department is aware.

6. Yes, Blue Line Taxi Limited pays the fees as is stated.

7. The amount of gross revenue paid by Blue Line Taxi Limited or any other concession operator is confidential to the parties involved, unless the licence between Blue Line Taxi Limited and the Department does not contain such a provision.

8. The financial statements filed by Blue Line Taxi Limited in accordance with the terms of its licence do not indicate any cross subsidization among the taxicab, bus and limousine service.

9. While Blue Line Taxi Limited has the right to do so, it has not operated a limousine service for a number of years. The bus service is on a self-supporting basis.

10. While public tenders are called at regular intervals at Transport Canada airports in respect to most concession activities in order to provide prospective concessionaires with the opportunity to bid on airport concessions and to permit Transport Canada to optimize its revenues, the optimization of revenues is however a secondary consideration when choosing a ground transportation operator. The Department's policy is to invite proposals from the ground transportation industry to respond to specific ground transportation service requirements. The successful operator is chosen by a committee comprised of Transport Canada representatives and representatives of the airlines serving the airport. The company judged to be the most capable of providing the level of service specified in the invitation is selected. Red Line Taxi Limited acquired the ground transportation concession in accordance with this general policy at a time when no other company was capable of providing the service. Blue Line Taxi Limited subsequently acquired the interests of Red Line Taxi and in so doing acquired the airport transportation licence. Proposals have not been invited from the industry as it is considered that Blue Line Taxi is providing an adequate level of service.

SPORT AND RECREATION FACILITIES FOR SENIOR CITIZENS

Question No. 2,270—**Mr. Patterson:**

1. For the 1975-76 fiscal year, what was the cost to taxpayers of construction, maintenance and repairs to federal penal institutions?

2. For the same year, what was the average cost to the taxpayer for maintaining one inmate in an institution?

3. For the same year, what was the total cost to the taxpayer for maintenance of all inmates in institutions?

4. For the same year, what was the total cost to the taxpayer for (a) education of inmates (b) sport and recreation facilities in institutions?

5. For the same year, what was the total cost to the taxpayer for sport and recreation facilities for senior citizens?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): I am informed by the Canadian Penitentiary Service and Health and Welfare Canada as follows:

1. Cost of construction: $23,173,654. Repair and upkeep: $2,242,089.

2. $17,438.

3. $150,374,365.

4. (a) $1,292,248. (b) $303,334.

5. An amount of $11,338,188 was spent in 1975-76 for projects funded by the New Horizons Program. These funds were used to enable senior citizens to participate in a wide variety of meaningful activities of their own choice. New Horizons does not fund capital construction, however, some part of project grants may be used for minor renovations to existing activity centres.

[Mr. Lang.]

ORDER PAPER QUESTION

Question No. 2,277—**Mr. Cossitt:**

Was Question No. 41 placed on the *Order Paper* on October 12, 1976 and previously placed on the *Order Paper* in the 1st Session of the 30th Parliament on May 11, 1976 forwarded by the Privy Council Office to the department for answer and, if so (a) on what date (b) what persons forwarded it (c) who received it (d) who was assigned and what was his/her job designation to answer the question and on what date (e) is the answer ready and (i) if so, for how long and for what reason has it not been forthcoming (ii) if not, for what reason?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): The government takes responsibility for the answers it provides to questions and for the process involved in replying to such questions. It is not appropriate therefore to provide information about internal administrative arrangements.

PORT OF HALIFAX—ECONOMIC IMPACT STUDY

Question No. 2,298—**Mr. Forrestall:**

1. Will the government table the final copy of the Task Force Report on the requirements for a second container terminal at the Port of Halifax?

2. (a) Will the government table the economic impact study undertaken for the Port of Halifax and financed partly by the National Harbours Board (b) what consulting company undertook the study (c) on what date was it completed (d) what was the total cost of the study?

3. On what date was a copy made available to (a) NHB Halifax staff (b) staff of the Halifax Dartmouth Port Commission (c) the Halifax Port Authority?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): The National Harbours Board advises as follows: 1. A Task Force on the requirements for a second container terminal at the Port of Halifax was a co-operative venture between the National Harbours Board and the Province of Nova Scotia. Although the complete report contains certain confidential data, the co-chairmen of the task force have agreed to release an executive summary of the report.

2. (a) Distribution of a study of the Economic Evaluation of the Halifax Containerport Expansion Project commissioned by the Province of Nova Scotia or any related information would require consent of the Province. (b) Same as 2(a). (c) Same as 2(a).

3. (a) As party to the Task Force, a copy of the report referred to in 2(a) above was provided to the National Harbours Board. Further distribution would have been made by the Province of Nova Scotia. (b) Same as 3(a). (c) Same as 3(a).

TELECOMMUNICATIONS

Question No. 2,304—**Mr. O'Sullivan:**

1. With reference to the answer to Question No. 1,943 which stated in part that the total costs of charges on other than local communications in the Department of Manpower and Immigration included in the Estimates for 1975-76 was $2,307,052, of this stated cost, how is the amount divided between (a) communications within Canada (b) overseas communications and, in each case (i) what communications methods were used (ii) what were the percentage costs of each method (iii) what amount and percentage of these costs was paid to communications companies other than Canadian?

2. With reference to the answer to Question No. 1,943 which stated in part that the total estimated costs of charges on other than local communications in

the Department of Manpower and Immigration included in the Estimates for 1976-77 is $2,092,197, of this stated cost, how is the amount divided between (a) communications within Canada (b) overseas communications and, in each case (i) what are the anticipated modes of communication (ii) what are the estimated percentage costs of each method (iii) what is the estimated amount and percentage of these costs to be paid to communications companies other than Canadian?

Hon. Bud Cullen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): 1. (a) and (b) Our departmental records do not differentiate between communications within Canada and Overseas communication. (i) Long distance—telegrams—cables; (ii) Long distance—$2,277,051—98.7 per cent; Telegrams—cables—$30,001—1.3 per cent; (iii) Nil.

2. (a) and (b) Our departmental records do not differentiate between communications within Canada and Overseas communication. (i) Long distance—telegrams—cables; (ii) Long distance—$2,070,883—99 per cent; Telegrams—cables—$21,314—1 per cent; (iii) Nil.

LUBRICATING OILS REPROCESSING

Question No. 2,314—**Mr. O'Sullivan:**

1. Was it government policy during wartime (1939 to 1945) to encourage the re-use, after a degree of reprocessing and purification, of automotive lubricating oils as fuels for home heating in an attempt to conserve scarce fossil fuel reserves?

2. Is the government (a) aware of (b) currently commissioning studies into the efficacy of this type of policy and, if so (i) on what date were such studies instituted (ii) have they been completed and, if not, on what date are they expected to be completed?

3. What have been the findings and recommendations of the studies?

4. Has official notice been taken of the studies, their findings and recommendations and, if so, in what form?

5. Has any action been taken on the recommendations and, if so, what specific action?

6. Will the studies be Tabled in the House of Commons or referred to a committee of the House and, if so, on what date?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): I am informed by the Departments of Energy, Mines and Resources and Fisheries and the Environment as follows: 1. During the 1939 to 1945 war, the reprocessing of used lubricating oil for re-use as lubricating oils was Canadian government policy, but not for use as home heating fuels.

2. Studies of the reprocessing of automotive lubricating oil for re-use were initiated in 73. Much of the work has been completed but it still being evaluated by EMR and Environment Canada. The latter department published two reports in June 1975 entitled "Experimental burning of waste oil as a fuel in cement manufacture" as well as "A preliminary review of used lubricant oils in Canada".

3. It was found that the reprocessing of lubricating oils was feasible but in many cases had to be done by processes which were liable to cause pollution. It was recommended by Environment Canada that an optimum use of the reclaimed lubricating oil would be for use as a fuel in cement manufacture. In this use it would replace heavy fuel oil or other fuels and would not result in environmental pollution. Reclamation for use as lubricating oil was also recommended provided that proper environmental precautions were taken by the reprocessor. Several Canadian companies are presently reprocessing oil in this manner. Since a shortage of new lubricating oil is not envisaged, it was found that there is no specific incentive to reprocess the used lubricating oil to make new lubricating oil, provided that the used oil was used in some way to conserve energy. A major problem was the difficulty of collecting the used lubricating oil from many dispersed points. The use of reprocessed lubricating oil as home heating fuel was not recommended due to environmental hazards and to the fact that reprocessing for this purpose would be completely uneconomic.

4. Official notice has been taken of the studies by way of publication and wide dissemination of the results and recommendations in the Department of Fisheries and the Environment technical information series.

5. Tests have been run on cement manufacture using reclaimed lubricating oil and have been found successful. These result have been passed on to the cement industry which has been encouraged to use reclaimed oil in this manner. Further work is being planned by the Department of Fisheries and Environment in cooperation with industry and the provinces to encourage the establishment of systems for the collection and use of waste oil.

6. The reports mentioned in part 2 are available on request.

CUBAN USE OF CANADIAN AIRSPACE

Question No. 2,316—**Mr. Coates:**

1. Since January 1, 1975, have Cuban aircraft, other than those using airspace for commercial purposes into either Dorval, Mirabel or Toronto, used Canadian airspace and, if so (a) on how many occasions (b) in each case (i) what airport or airports were used (ii) were the planes commercial or military (iii) what was the origin and destination (iv) was prior approval sought and secured from the government by the Cuban Government (v) was approval granted and, if so, by what agency of the government (vi) what are the specific dates?

2. In each case (a) were government officials from the Departments of National Revenue and Manpower and Immigration or the Canadian Armed Forces used to check out the aircraft (b) is information available to the government that each met all national and international regulations associated with such landings and (i) if so, who has this information at this time (ii) if not, for what reason?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): I am informed by the Departments of External Affairs, Transport, National Revenue, Employment and Immigration and National Defence as follows: 1. Since January 1, 1975, two Cuban aircraft, other than those using airspace for commercial purposes into either Dorval, Mirabel or Toronto, have used Canadian airspace. (a) Two flights, although technically classed as commercial and approved by the Air Transport Committee, were more of state or diplomatic nature. (b) (i) Ottawa, September 23/September 28/75—State visit Vancouver, May 30/June 13/76 Cuban Committee on Human Settlements—("Habitat" Conference in Vancouver) (ii) Civil commercial aircraft of "Cubana". (iii) Havana—Ottawa—Havana—(State Visit) Havana—Vancouver—Havana—Habitat Conference. (iv) Yes. (v) External affairs, in consultation with Canadian Transport Commission,

Department of National Defence and Transport Canada. (vi) September 23 return September 28, 1975 (Ottawa) May 30 return June 13, 1976 (Vancouver).

2. (a) National Defence: No; National Revenue: Yes; Employment and Immigration: Yes. As a rule, the Immigration Division does not check aircraft. It is done by customs. If passengers need to be examined for immigration purposes, they are directed to an immigration officer. Since January 1975, two flights from Cuba, both of a state or diplomatic nature arrived in Canada. Immigration officials examined 43 passengers who arrived from Cuba on September 23, 1975 in Ottawa on a state visit and also examined 31 passengers who arrived from Cuba on May 30, 1976 in Vancouver for the "Habitat Conference". (b) Yes. (i) This information is on file at Gander and Halifax International airports. (ii) N/A.

PREPARATION OF POST OFFICE REPORTS

Question No. 2,339—**Mr. Dinsdale:**

1. With reference to the answer to Question No. 1,301, who prepared the report under (a) Item 1—Organization (b) Item 2—Environmental Forecast (c) Item 3—Management Practices (d) Item 5—Management Information Systems (e) Item 6—Summary Report (Blueprint for change) and, in each case, what was the cost?

2. What was the cost of the report under Item 13—Presorting mail, Sortation and Distribution?

3. For what reasons were reports involving Hay Associates Limited of Toronto in 1975 not included in the answer?

Hon. J.-J. Blais (Postmaster General): 1. (a), (b), (c), (d) and (e). The individual reports as mentioned were prepared by Kates, Peat, Marwick & Co. Cost for each study is not available. The total cost as mentioned in question 1,301 for the six reports was $258,627.

2. Cost of report under item 13 not available. The total cost as mentioned in question 1,301 for reports under items 12 and 13 was $35,051.

3. In the context of my speech, I was referring only to the 15 reports mentioned in the reply to question 1,301.

GOVERNMENT AIRCRAFT

Question No. 2,346—**Mr. Cossitt:**

1. (a) What was the entire cost to the taxpayer of Prime Minister Trudeau's Easter visit to the Western United States including all costs of any persons accompanying him at any time (b) was the sole official purpose of the visit to make a speech at a university in the San Francisco area?

2. What is a full description of any government-owned aircraft used at any time including the entire cost, number of flying hours and the cost per hour of flying time and waiting time, dates and times of all points of departure and arrival including any aircraft flying to or from Canada with the names and job designations of any persons on board whether or not the Prime Minister was on board?

3. What are the names and job designations of government personnel who accompanied the Prime Minister at any time during the visit?

4. What was the total cost of accommodation and food paid by the taxpayer for the Prime Minister and any persons at any time accompanying him, including aircraft crews?

[Mr. Goodale.]

5. What was the entire cost of accommodation, food, etc. paid by the taxpayer on behalf of the Prime Minister and what is a breakdown of this total showing locations, to whom the money was paid, etc.?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): See replies to Questions Nos. 29 and 30 answered this day.

COST OF MAINTENANCE DREDGING

Question No. 2,356—**Mr. Forrestall:**

1. What was the cost of maintenance dredging at the Port of (a) Montreal (b) Trois Rivières (c) Quebec for the year (i) 1970 (ii) 1971 (iii) 1972 (iv) 1973 (v) 1974 (vi) 1975 (vii) 1976 and, in each case, what department or agency paid for such dredging?

2. For the year 1976, what amount was spent on dredging at (a) Cap Santé (b) Cap à la Roche (c) Cap Charles (d) Curve No. 1 (e) the Yamachiche bend in the St. Lawrence River and, in each case, what department or agency paid for such dredging?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): The National Harbours Boards advises as follows: 1. (a) Montreal: (i) 1970—$241,676; (ii) 1971—$263,675; (iii) 1972—$297,006; (iv) 1973—$374,247; (v) 1974—$423,091; (vi) 1975—$510,-912; (vii) 1976—$522,552. (b) Trois Rivières: (i) 1970—$45,885; (ii) 1971-$27,000; (iii) 1972—Nil; (iv) 1973—$107,-440; (v) 1974—$22,000; (vi) 1975—$60,500; (vii) 1976—$26,145. (c) Quebec: (i) 1970—$8,544; (ii) 1971—Nil; (iii) 1972—$48,640; (iv) 1973—Nil; (v) 1974—$49,920; (vi) 1975—$164,175; (vii) 1976—Nil.

Transport Canada advises as follows: 2. (a) Cap Santé—$190,000 paid by Transport Canada. (b) Cap à la Roche and (c) Cap Charles carried out jointly—$200,000—paid by Transport Canada. (d) Nil. (e) Nil. (Some dredging was done downstream of Yamachiche Bend in 1976—$552,000—paid by Transport Canada).

O CANADA KIT

Question No. 2,368—**Mr. Diefenbaker:**

1. How many copies of the *Oh! "Canada"* kit and the accompanying cassettes and posters have been issued by or for the Commissioner of Official Languages for distribution in schools?

2. What is the total cost?

3. How many have been distributed (a) in Quebec schools (b) elsewhere in Canada, by province?

4. Are they no longer being distributed in Quebec and, if so, for what reason?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): The Commissioner of Official Languages reports directly to parliament and not through minister. Questions can be put directly to him.

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE COMMISSION—INQUIRY INTO THE USE MADE OF A FUND IN THE QUEBEC REGION

Question No. 2,389—**Mr. Fortin**

1. When Mr. Gabriel Béland was Director General of the Unemployment Insurance Commission for the Quebec Region, was a Commission set up to discover what use was made of a fund constituted by the sale of waste paper,

particularly for the year 1973 and, if so, what were the findings of the Commission?

2. What the Commission set up following a complaint made by the union that this fund was not being used to ensure the welfare of the workers as was intended?

3. In 1974, did one of Mr. Béland's colleagues sell bay windows, which were delivered by UIC employees to individuals, namely to one reporter from *La Presse* and another from *The Gazette*, among others, whose cheques were made out in his name and, if so (a) how many (b) how many windows were sold for $25.00 each (c) was there an enquiry and (i) if so, what were the findings (ii) if not, for what reason?

4. During the fiscal year 1974-75, the last year under Mr. Béland's direction, was $3 million missing and, if so (a) is that a common occurrence at the UIC (b) what became of (i) Mr. Béland and what is his current salary (ii) the comptroller, Mr. Al Belliveau, who was also responsible for drafting the finacial statement in question?

Hon. Bud Cullen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): 1. Yes, an administrative inquiry was held in 1973 upon the decision of the Director General, Gabriel Béland, who had been appointed to that position at the end of 1972. The findings of the inquiry were basically as follows: For some years it had been a practice at the UIC regional office to collect waste paper and sell it to a buyer or buyers for recyling purposes. The revenue from these sales constituted a fund known as the employees social fund, administered by volunteer officers. The fund was used for the benefit of all employees at the regional office, for activities of social, sporting, recreational or charitable nature. The practice, though applied in good faith for commendable ends, was open to misinterpretation. It was therefore advisable to put an end to it, and Director General Béland did so on December 21, 1973.

2. No.

3. Not in 1974. However, on October 1, 1973, Mr. Béland, Director General of the UIC, was informed by two people who identified themselves as journalists that the same day a UIC employee had sold them used windows left over after recent renovations to the UIC regional office building, for the sum of $25 each. They had picked up the windows at the building's service entrance. (a) About thirty-five. (b) Unknown. (c) Yes. Director General Béland immediately set up an administrative inquiry on October 1, 1973. (i) The inquiry's findings were basically as follows:—The Canada Department of Public Works, owner of the building occupied by the UIC regional office at 1441 St-Urbain, Montreal, had ordered renovation work on the building during the summer of 1973, consisting mainly in replacing windows.—The contract, which had been given to a contracting firm, stipulated that the removed or replaced windows became the property of that firm, which could dispose of them as it saw fit.—A UIC employee, without the Director General's permission and without informing him, had authorized the contractor to store about fifty of the old windows temporarily in the basement of the building.—This employee was authorized by the contractor to sell the windows to prospective buyers and to collect the money for the contractor.—This employee did in fact sell various people about thirty-five used windows for $20 to $25 each, including two which were sold on October 1, 1973 to unidentified persons for $25 each, paid directly to this employee, partly in legal Canadian tender, partly in the form of a Royal Bank of Canada money order in his name.—The buyers themselves picked up the windows at the building's service entrance, and no outside delivery was made by UIC employees.—To prevent any minsunderstanding as to the employee's actions, it was advisable to put an end to this situation and to have the fifteen or so remaining windows removed from the basement; an order to that effect was made on October 2, 1973 by Director General Béland and was carried out the same day. (ii) Not applicable.

4. No. (a) Not applicable. (b) Not applicable.

NATIONAL HARBOURS BOARD PORT AND GRAIN HANDLING FACILITIES AT CHURCHILL

Question No. 2,394—**Mr. Benjamin:**

1. (a) On April 20, 1977, what were the cumulative improvements made to the National Harbours Board port and grain handling elevator at Churchill, Manitoba (b) at what cost was each such improvement (c) what was the completion date in each case?

2. If such improvements are ongoing in nature, what will be the total cost and completion date in each case?

3. (a) On April 20, 1977, what was the cumulative extent of changeover at the National Harbours Board elevator at Churchill to upgrade the grain handling facilities to handle hopper cars (b) what was the total cost of any such changeover project to date?

4. If not initiated by April 20, 1977, on what date can it be expected that the project will be (a) commenced (b) completed and at what cost?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): The National Harbours Board advises as follows: 1.

(a)	(b)	(c)
Wharf rehabilitation	$213,000	1975
Dredge repairs	422,000	1974
New staff quarters	619,000	1975
Tug modifications and servicing	398,000	1976
Model studies	72,000	1975
Dredging	$1,771,000	Program ongoing
Miscellaneous small projects	191,000	Various times

2. It is estimated that the dredging will be completed in the fall of 1978 or 1979 at a further cost of $5,900,000.

3. (a) Nil. (b) Not applicable.

4. (a) Subject to obtaining necessary Treasury Board approval of the expenditure the project will commence in sufficient time to allow work to be completed when the rail track is upgraded by C.N. permitting access of hopper cars to Churchill. (b) Construction times vary according to the time of year but could be completed in no less than four months from start at an estimated cost of $825,000.

Order Paper Questions

MAKING PUBLIC MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING GRAIN HANDLING BETWEEN CANADIAN NATIONAL AND CANADIAN PACIFIC

Question No. 2,401—**Mr. Hnatyshyn:**

Will the government make public the memorandum of understanding concerning the sharing of grain handling between CPR and CNR, signed August 19, 1976 and, if not, for what reason?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): The agreement in question is one which has been made between two companies operating in the commercial area, Canadian National Railways and Canadian Pacific Limited. The contents of such private documents are not normally disclosed by Government.

WORKERS EXPOSED TO GRAIN DUST

Question No. 2,404—**Mr. Hnatyshyn:**

Is the government aware of reports that the Gage Research Institute study shows that respiratory problems may occur in up to 75 percent of workers exposed to grain dust and, if so, is the government giving consideration to assisting in the financing of the five year study which the Institute will begin in May 1977?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): In so far as Agriculture Canada is concerned: The Department is aware that the Gage Research Institute has released results of a study and that the Institute plans to conduct further studies relating to workers exposed to grain dust. This department is not considering the question of financial assistance.

In so far as Labour Canada is concerned: Labour Canada is participating in the Gage Institute research project by undertaking the environmental monitoring part of the study.

In so far as the Department of National Health and Welfare is concerned: The Department of National Health and Welfare is aware of a study of 68 grain elevator agents in Southern Manitoba, of whom 75 per cent were found to have respiratory symptoms. The Gage Institute has applied to the National Health Research and Development Program for financial support of a study of grain handlers and this application is being reviewed. In addition, the Department has cooperated with the Department of Labour in providing advice to the Gage Institute and has pledged technical assistance in furthering their study through the loan of technical equipment.

In so far as the Medical Research Council is concerned: Although the Medical Research Council provides significant support for a number of investigators working in the Gage Research Institute, the Council has received no applications from them for funds for research specifically related to respiratory problems of those exposed to grain dust.

PILOT BASES

Question No. 2,405—**Mr. Forrestall:**

1. Where are Air Canada's pilot bases located in Canada and how many pilots are assigned to each base?

2. Is the government aware of any studies which have been done, either in the United States or Canada, to determine the optimal and most economical number of pilots assigned to a base and, if so, what is the most economical number?

3. Has Air Canada considered making (a) Halifax-Dartmouth (b) Calgary (c) Edmonton as pilot bases and, if not, for what reason?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): The management of Air Canada advises as follows: 1. Total pilots and supervisory pilots: Montreal 566; Toronto 728; Winnipeg 126; Vancouver 148.

Transport Canada advises as follows: 2. The government is not aware of any studies which have been done, either in the United States or Canada, to determine the optimal and most economical number of pilots assigned to a base.

The management of Air Canada advises as follows: 3. (a) Yes. (b) Yes. (c) No. Because with relatively low flight frequencies it has not been economically feasible to domicile pilots at Edmonton.

PROJECTS ACCEPTED IN ROBERVAL CONSTITUENCY

Question No. 2,428—**Mr. Gauthier (Roberval):**

Since the inception of the Department of Regional Economic Expansion, what projects have been accepted for the Constituency of Roberbal and, in each case, what (a) is the name of the company and the type of industry involved (b) was the amount granted (c) is the name of the locality where the company was operating (d) was the year the project was accepted?

Mr. Ed. Lumley (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): The reply for the Department of Regional Economic Expansion is as follows:

a) Name of company	Type of industry/ Product	b) Estimated Ant. of Incentive	c) Locality	d) Year Accepted
Murdock Lumber Inc.	Sawmill	$122,400	Dolbeau	1970
Campeau Corporation Ltd.	Sawmill	396,491	Roberval	1970
Produits Forestiers M.P. Inc.	Sawmill	36,883	St-Thomas-Didyme	1970
Chibougamau Lumber Ltée	Timber & Lumber	927,923	Rivière Chicoubiche	1971
La Scierie Normandin Inc.	Dry kiln mill	112,435	Normandin	1972
Chaîne Coopérative du Saguenay	Lumber	121,400	Notre Dame de la Doré	1974
Association Coopérative Laitière du Saguenay-Lac-St-Jean	Cheese	16,080	Normandin	1974

Association Coopérative Laitière du Saguenay-Lac-St-Jean	Milk powder and butter	329,160	Chambord	1974
Hydromec Inc.	Machine parts, hydraulic and other	30,250	Dolbeau	1975
Julac Inc.	Blueberry wine	22,000	Dolbeau	1976
Abattoir St-Félicien Inc.	Slaughterhouse	55,000	St-Félicien	1976
Les Aliments Congelés Q.B.	Food processing and freezing	80,000	St-Félicien	1976
Ateliers de Meubles F.C.	Kitchen furniture (including cupboards)	16,250	Dolbeau	1976
Albert Perron Inc.	Cheese and butter	77,000	St-Prime	1976
Les Armoires Mido Inc.	Kitchen cupboards	23,550	Mistassini	1977
La Scierie Normandin Inc.	Wood seasoning and planing	112,435	Normandin	1972
La Scierie Normandin Inc.	Sawmill	278,944	Girardville	1972
Murdock Lumber Inc.	Undressed lumber	61,180	Girardville	1972
Chibougamau	Lumber	51,000	Rivière Chicoubiche	1972
Les Industries de St-André	Sawmill	12,400	St-André	1972
Le Laboratoire Chez-Nous	Sanitary Products	36,430	St-Félicien	1972
Albert Perron Inc.	Cheese	25,088	St-Prime	1972
Les Produits Forestiers M.P. Inc.	Timber	260,660	St-Thomas-Didyme	1972
Laiterie Dolbeau Ltée	Cheese and cheese powder	64,860	Dolbeau	1973
Audehou Inc.	Hardwood sawing	345,422	Lac Bouchette	1973
Les Industries Tanguay Ltée	Trees harvesters	591,400	St-Prime	1973
Dolbeau Oxygène Inc.	Pressure tanks	35,860	Dolbeau	1974
Julac Inc.	Wine and food products	56,500	Dolbeau	1974
Laiterie Dolbeau Inc.	Whey powder	143,088	Dolbeau	1974

O CANADA KIT

Question No. 2,431—**Mr. Stewart (Marquette):**

1. How many copies of the *Oh! "Canada"* kit were purchased by the Commissioner of Official Languages?

2. To how many schools and what other types of organizations were the kits distributed?

3. What was the total cost of preparation, publication and distribution of the kit and was the cost shared by any other levels of government?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): The Commissioner of Official Languages reports directly to parliamentary and not through a minister. Questions can be made directly to him.

UIC—MR. ROBERT KINGSLEY

Question No. 2,432—**Mr. Cossitt:**

1. (a) Is Mr. Robert Kingsley, Canada Manpower Regional Manager of Operations, working out of Ottawa and, if not, what is his exact title and duties (b) on what date was he appointed to this position?

2. What are all former positions held by Mr. Kingsley in government service and the dates and specifically did these include Manager of the Ottawa Office of the Unemployment Insurance Commission and Regional Manager of the Unemployment Insurance Commission Pay Centre in Montreal?

3. Is Mr. Dennis Kingsley, brother of Mr. Robert Kingsley, presently employed by the Unemployment Insurance Commission and is he stationed at the Head Office of UIC at 222 Nepean St., Ottawa and, if so, in what capacity?

4. Has an investigation been taking place of alleged defrauding of the Unemployment Insurance Commission by Mrs. Robert Kingsley and does this investigation include looking into completed UIC reporting cards sent in by Mrs. Kingsley making claims against the Unemployment Insurance Commission while Mrs. Kingsley was absent from the country on a vacation or trip and, if so (a) how many weeks of benefits were paid to Mrs. Kingsley that should not have been paid (b) what was the total sum of money involved?

5. Has an investigation been taking place of alleged defrauding of the UIC by a son of Mr. and Mrs. Robert Kingsley and does this investigation include looking into completed UIC reporting cards sent in by this individual making claims against UIC while he was a student, unavailable for work and, if so (a) how many weeks of benefits were paid to him that should not have been paid (b) what was the total sum of money involved?

6. Has this entire matter been referred to senior officials of UIC in Belleville or elsewhere with a recommendation that charges be laid and, if so (a) what are the names and job designations of all those recommending such charges (b) what are the names and job designations of all those considering such a recommendation (c) will charges be laid and, if so (i) on what date (ii) against whom (iii) what is the nature of the charges?

7. Has the investigation in any way whatsoever involved either Mr. Robert Kingsley or Mr. Dennis Kingsley and, if so, what part did either play in the matter?

Hon. Bud Cullen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): In so far as the Unemployment Insurance Commission and the Department of Manpower and Immigration are concerned: 1. (a) No. He is District Director, Manpower Division, Ottawa District Office. Under general direction of the Assistant Director General Manpower of the Ontario Region, Canada Man-

power Service, Department of Manpower and Immigration, directs the operations and programs of the Canada Manpower Centres in the district, including the employment service and other programs of the Canada Manpower Service. (b) July 19, 1976.

2. Claims Officer (level 1) Sudbury, July 27, 1959—April 1, 1960; Claims Officer (level 2) Sudbury, April 1, 1960—July 1, 1961; Claims Officer (level 3) Sudbury, July 1, 1961—August 27, 1962; Claims Officer (level 3) Sudbury, August 27, 1962—March 12, 1963; Claims Officer (level 4) Welland, March 12, 1963—February 1, 1965; Enforcement Officer (PM2) Cornwall, February 1, 1965—August 5, 1969; Benefit Control Monitor/Officer (PM 3) Belleville Region Office, August 5, 1969—July 1, 1970; Insurance Supervisor (PM 3) Kingston, July 1, 1970—October 1, 1970; Senior Benefit Control Officer (A/PM 4) Ottawa Head Office, October 1, 1970; Operations Officer (A/PM 5) Ottawa Head Office, October 1, 1970—July 14, 1971; Operations Officer (PM 5) Ottawa Head Office, July 14, 1971—September 13, 1971; District Manager (PM 5) Ottawa District Office, September 13, 1971—March 27, 1972; Operations Officer (PM 5) Ottawa Head Office, March 27, 1972—July 1, 1972; A/ Regional Manager Pay Centre (A/PM 6) Montreal, July 1, 1972—August 27, 1973; Regional Manager Pay Centre (PM 6) Montreal, August 27, 1973—April 1, 1975; A/Chief, Metro Area Operations (A/PM 7) Montreal, April 1, 1975—July 2, 1975; Chief, Metro Area Operations (PM 7) Montreal, July 2, 1975—July 19, 1976; District Director Manpower & Immigration (PM 7) Ottawa District, July 19, 1976—present.

3. Yes and he is stationed at 305 Rideau Street, Ottawa, as Official Languages Program Officer.

4. Yes; (a) Four weeks; (b) $440.

5. Yes; (a) Eight weeks; (b) $544.

6. Yes; (a) The investigator and District Manager, Ottawa. (b) Director General, Ontario, U.I.C. (c) Yes. (i) Date to be determined based on processing of charges and court availability. (ii) Mrs. Janel Kingsley and Ronald Kingsley. (iii) Both will be charged under Section 121.1(a) of the Unemployment Insurance Act. Mrs. Janel Kingsley for false statements concerning availability while outside the country; Mr. Ronald Kingsley for false statement concerning availability while attending a school or other educational institute.

7. The investigation is continuing and therefore the Commission is not in a position to provide information at this time.

USE OF GOVERNMENT AIRCRAFT

Question No. 2,433—**Mr. Cossitt:**

Is the Minister of Agriculture aware that Question No. 41, requesting the cost of the 32 trips by himself and family members on government aircraft is still unanswered and will the Minister take steps to expedite the answer and (a) if so, on what date can an answer be expected (b) if not, for what reason?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): See Beauchesne's Citation 171(a).

[Mr. Cullen.]

USE OF GOVERNMENT AIRCRAFT

Question No. 2,434—**Mr. Cossitt:**

Is the Minister of Transport aware that Question No. 1,208 requesting information on the use of a DOT Jet Star by five (5) female passengers at Saskatoon Airport remains unanswered and will the Minister take steps to expedite an answer and (a) if so, on what date can an answer be expected (b) if not, for what reason?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): See Beauchesne's Citation 171(a).

GOVERNMENT AIRCRAFT

Question No. 2,435—**Mr. Cossitt:**

1. Since the answer to Question Number 3,240 of the 1st Session of the 30th Parliament which lists thirty-two trips on government aircraft by the Minister of Agriculture with his wife and members of his family, how many similar trips have been made?

2. What was the place of origin and the destination of each trip?

3. What was the total cost of each trip and total cost of all such trips combined?

4. What are the names of all persons on board the aircraft on each flight?

5. What type of aircraft was used on each trip?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of Privy Council): See replies to Questions No. 29 and 30 answered this day.

PAYMENTS TO FRANCISCO KRIPACZ AND/OR FRANCISCO LTD. FOR SERVICES PERFORMED AT PRIME MINISTER'S RESIDENCES

Question No. 2,442—**Mr. Cossitt:**

1. What was the total amount of public funds paid to Mr. Francisco Kripacz and/or Francisco Limited of 550 Sherbrooke Street West, Montreal, between April 20, 1968 and the date the answer to this question is prepared, for services performed at the Prime Minister's official residence, 24 Sussex Drive or the summer residence at Harrington Lake and, in each case, what is a full description of the services performed, work done and the cost?

2. Since April 20, 1968, and the date the answer to this question is prepared were any services, work etc. performed for the Prime Minister at any government office occupied by him, his staff or the Privy Council by Mr. Kripacz and/or Francisco Limited and, if so, in each case, what is a full description of the services performed, work done and the cost?

3. What was the total cost of all such services, work etc?

Hon. Judd Buchanan (Minister of Public Works): (1) During the period April 1, 1971 through May 2, 1977 a total of $21,969 was paid by the Department of Public Works to Mr. Francisco Kripacz and/or Francisco Limited for services performed at the Prime Minister's official residence, 24 Sussex Drive, or the summer residence at Harrington Lake. Details follow. (a) 24 Sussex Drive; (i) Selection and purchase of furniture and furnishings $1,311; (ii) Design services for alterations and furnishings $20,658; (b) Harrington Lake: None Total: $21,969.

(2) During the period April 1, 1971 through May 2, 1977 a total of $310 was paid by the Department of Public Works to Mr. Francisco Kripacz and/or Francisco Limited for office furniture for the Prime Minister's office.

(3) Total costs of services performed by Mr. Francisco Kripacz and/or Francisco Limited amount to $22,279.

NOTE: Information for the period prior to April 1, 1971 is unavailable as the Government's Record Disposal Policy requires financial information to be retained for a period of six years only.

USE OF GOVERNMENT AIRCRAFT

Question No. 2,451—**Mr. Cossitt:**

Is the Prime Minister aware that Question No. 29, requesting information on Department of Transport aircraft used by Cabinet Ministers, remains unanswered and will the Prime Minister take steps to expedite the answer and (a) if so, on what date can an answer be expected (b) if not, for what reason?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): See Beauchesne's Citation 171 (a) & (b).

USE OF GOVERNMENT AIRCRAFT

Question No. 2,454—**Mr. Cossitt:**

Is the Prime Minister aware that Question No. 30, requesting information on Department of National Defence aircraft used by Cabinet Ministers, remains unanswered and will the Prime Minister take steps to expedite the answer and (a) if so, on what date can an answer be expected (b) if not, for what reason?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): See Beauchesne's Citation 171 (a) and (b).

CEREMONIALS—BATTLE OF ATLANTIC SUNDAY, HALIFAX

Question No. 2,456—**Mr. McCleave:**

1. Was a decision taken not to have a political representative on behalf of the government lay a wreath on May 1, 1977, at the ceremonies commemorating Battle of Atlantic Sunday, in Halifax and, if so, who made the decision?

2. Were federal politicians invited to pay such respects by laying a federal wreath and (a) if so, what are their names (b) if not, for what reason?

Hon. Barney Danson (Minister of National Defence): 1. No.

2. (a) and (b) The following federal politicians were invited to attend: The Hon. R. L. Stanfield, M.P.; Mr. J. M. Forrestall, M.P.; Mr. R. J. McCleave, M.P.

NOTE: Wreaths were layed by the Commander Maritime Command, and the Commanding Officer of HMCS Ottawa, on behalf of the Canadian government, the Department of National Defence, and the Canadian Forces individually and collectively. Representatives of organizations, and individuals, wishing to do so, may lay wreaths during the ceremony at Halifax, on request to the Base Commander.

Order Paper Questions

UIC—COMPUTER RENTAL

Question No. 2,460—**Mr. Fortin:**

1. During the time that Mr. Gabriel Béland was General Director of the Unemployment Insurance Commission for the Quebec Region, Mr. Robert Kingsley was Director of the Regional Payments Centre and Mr. Dorval Mainville was in charge of the computer, was the Unemployment Insurance Commission computer rented to a private company and, if so (a) for what amount (b) to whom (c) on what dates?

2. Did they obtain the employees' complicity and, if so, in what way?

3. What was the cost in employees' wages to the Unemployment Insurance Commission in (a) straight time (b) double time?

Hon. Bud Cullen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): The matter has been referred to the RCMP for investigation. Upon completion of the investigation the question will be answered.

AIR CANADA CARGO FLOWN TO FREDERICTON

Question No. 2,462—**Mr. Howie:**

1. On (a) April 20 (b) April 27, 1977, what was the total weight of cargo flown by Air Canada to Fredericton, New Brunswick directly from (i) Montreal (ii) Quebec City (iii) Toronto?

2. How many pieces of cargo were on each flight and what formula was used by Air Canada to determine the amount of cargo?

Mr. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): The management of Air Canada advises as follows: 1. (a)(i) 3,148 pounds; (b)(i) 1,242 pounds; (a)(ii) 8 pounds; (b)(ii) 10 pounds; (a)(iii) 965 pounds; (b)(iii) 499 pounds.

2. To Fredericton

	April 20, 1977	April 27, 1977
From Montreal:	AC 640—93 pieces AC 660—6 pieces AC 674—19 pieces	AC 660—55 pieces AC 674—10 pieces
From Quebec:	AC 674—1 piece	AC 674—1 piece
From Toronto:	AC 642—31 pieces	AC 642—22 pieces

Following is the formula used to establish an aircraft's uplift capability for cargo:

1. Establish the maximum take-off weight.

2. Subtract the minimum fuel, aircraft weight, passengers and baggage.

3. Having carried out the above transactions, the weight space available for cargo is established.

4. It is at this point and time that priority of load enters the picture, eg., Air Mail takes priority over express and express over air-freight.

PRACTICE OF GRANTING OF KNIGHTHOODS AND PEERAGES DURING THIS CENTURY

Question No. 2,475—**Mr. Jones:**

1. How many Canadians have received knighthoods and peerages during this century and, in each case, who received such honours and on what date?

2. Was the practice of granting knighthoods and peerages abolished and, if so, on what date?

3. Does the government intend to revert to this practice and, if not, for what reason?

Hon. John Roberts (Secretary of State): 1. Comprehensive records have not been kept concerning the number of Canadians which have received knighthoods and peerages during this century.

2. The practice of granting knighthoods and peerages to Canadians was abolished in 1919 when the House of Commons adopted the Nickel resolution requesting King George V to cease the practice of conferring upon Canadians honours to which titles were attached. This policy has been adhered to by successive government since 1919, with the exception of the Bennett administration, which recommended 17 Canadians for knighthoods during 1934 and 1935.

3. No. The government does not intend to revert to the practice of conferring knighthoods and peerages because to do so would not be in accord with long-standing custom and policy.

TRAVEL—TRANSPORTATION FOR MINISTER OF STATE FOR FITNESS AND AMATEUR SPORT

Question No. 2,538—**Mr. McKinnon:**

1. Was a government Falcon aircraft despatched to Europe for the main purpose of supplying transportation for the Minister of State for Fitness and Amateur Sport from April 20 to May 11, 1977?

2. What was the total cost to the public of Falcon flight 3013, which left Canada, Uplands Airport on April 20 until the time when the Minister finished using the plane and returned to Canada?

3. What were all the flights and the destinations of and passengers carried on Falcon number 503, between the period April 20 and May 11, 1977?

Hon. Barney Danson (Minister of National Defence): 1. Yes.

2. See reply to Question No. 2,881.

3. See Annex A.

Date and Place of Departure	Date and Place of Arrival	No. of Passengers
Apr 20, 1977 Ottawa	Apr 21, 1977 Lahr	Nil
Apr 24, 1977 Lahr	Apr 24, 1977 Zurich	Nil
Apr 25, 1977 Zurich	Apr 25, 1977 Vienna	4
Apr 27, 1977 Vienna	Apr 27, 1977 Rome	7
May 2, 1977 Rome	May 2, 1977 Frankfurt Main	6
May 2, 1977 Frankfurt Main	May 2, 1977 Schonefeld (East Berlin)	6
May 4, 1977 Schonefeld (East Berlin)	May 4, 1977 Warsaw	5
May 7, 1977 Warsaw	May 7, 1977 Vienna	5
May 9, 1977 Vienna	May 9, 1977 Budapest	5
May 11, 1977 Budapest	May 11, 1977 Zurich	5
May 11, 1977 Zurich	May 11, 1977 Lahr	Nil

UIC—MRS. ROBERT KINGSLEY

Question No. 2,539—**Mr. Cossitt:**

1. Was Mrs. Robert Kingsley called in for an interview by the Unemployment Insurance Commission and, if so (a) did the interview take place in Rockland, Ontario and, if not, in what location did it take place (b) on what date and at what time (c) which of the following benefit control officers from the Ottawa office of the UIC were present or conducting the interview (i) Mr. Jim Miles (ii) Mr. André Ethier (iii) Mr. Paul Labelle (iv) Mr. Jim MacDonald (v) Mr. Claude Charron (vi) Mr. Stan Wells (vii) Mr. Jim Harkness (viii) Mr. Brent Scarfe (ix) Mr. Archie Gauthier (x) Mr. Jim Bristol (xi) Mr. John Newfeld (d) was the purpose of the interview to interrogate Mrs. Kingsley on the question of her drawing UIC benefits while supposedly available for work whereas in actual fact she was in the United States on a vacation?

2. Was Mrs. Kingsley accompanied at any time during the interview by her husband, Mr. Robert Kingsley, presently Canada Manpower Regional Manager of Operations working out of Ottawa and, if so (a) did Mr. Kingsley state to the UIC personnel present: "Do you know who I am?" (b) is Mr. Kingsley the same person formerly employed by the UIC as Manager of its Ottawa office, Regional Manager of the UIC Pay Centre in Montreal, etc.?

3. Did Mr. Kingsley in any way attempt to use influence in regard to the manner in which UIC personnel dealt with his wife and, if so, what is being done about this matter?

Hon. Bud Cullen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): 1. Mrs. Kingsley was directed to attend a routine interview as a result of normal computer selection process and her claim was found in order. (a) Yes; (b) February 28, 1977 at 11:30 a.m.; (c) None; (d) No.

2. Yes; (a) Yes; (b) yes.

3. The investigation is continuing and therefore the commission is not in a position to provide information at this time.

WASTE CYCLING

Question No. 2,542—**Mr. Clarke:**

1. Has the government taken any measurements to implement the recommendation of the Gamma report that an externality tax be levied against industries as a means of controlling pollution?

2. Has the government taken any action to encourage communities to develop their own waste system and, if so, in what manner?

3. Has the government provided any incentives to reduce waste at the production level or has the government taken any measures to promote production of goods that create minimum environmental problems?

4. Has the government considered increasing the number of subsidies to recycle companies?

5. Is the government presently providing any research and development grants to recycling industries and, if so (a) to whom (b) in what amounts?

6. Do the same tax advantages exist for recycling industries as those which exist for industries classified as engaged in a manufacturing, mining or processing function and (a) if so, what are they (b) if not, what differences exist?

7. Are freight rates applied to virgin materials less than those applied to recycled materials and, if so, for what reason?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): I am informed by the Departments of Finance, Fisheries and the Environment, Industry, Trade and Commerce, National Revenue and Transport as follows: 1. An externality tax would impose a levy on the output of pollution. In order to be effective and equitable, such a tax would have to be graduated according to the harm done by various pollutants, which varies by type, quantity, geographical location, and presence or absence of other substances in the atmosphere or water. Of course, continuous monitoring of the output of pollution at the plant, apartment and household level would be necessary in order to determine the tax base. Any implementation of such a tax would have to await detailed knowledge of the harm done by various pollutants and

the setting up of a complex and undoubtedly costly apparatus for administration. It is not clear that this is the most cost-effective approach to pollution problems.

2. The operation of municipal solid waste management systems in Canada is a municipal or local government responsibility under provincial jurisdiction, and to date there has been no direct Federal Government involvement in such matters, other than at Federal establishments or where federal government wastes are involved. Fisheries and Environment Canada do provide indirect assistance in the form of technology transfers, seminars on waste management and on request acting as an exchange for information and advice on the subject.

3. The Department of Fisheries and the Environment in co-operation with other Departments is actively studying waste reduction at the production level but to date has not provided incentives in this regard.

4. The Department of Fisheries and the Environment has considered subsidies for recycling industries. At this time there is no assurance that subsidies would substantially increase the quantities of material recycled. Other aids to recycling are being considered.

5. As far as the Department of Fisheries and the Environment is concerned, no grants are being provided specifically to recycling industries at present; however, studies are being conducted to provide information which will greatly aid these industries. As far as the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce, recycling industries are eligible to receive contributions for research and development projects under the Enterprise Development Program. No applications have been received from recycling industries for assistance under the Program at the present time.

6. Certain recycling operations have been classified as manufacturing or producing under the Excise Tax Act. So far, they include recycling of scrap metals, glass, and scrap or reclaimed paper. Recyclers of these goods may acquire production equipment exempt from sales tax to the same extent as other manufacturers or producers.

7. There is no railway policy concerning rate levels on recycled material versus those on raw materials. Generally railways assess rates on the basis of cost, value of service, and market conditions. As an example, rates per ton of scrap iron are normally higher than rates for iron ore. Scrap iron is more valuable than iron ore in the market place and therefore can bear a larger transportation charge. Railways take advantage of cost savings from the large volume movements normally associated with iron ore, and these savings are reflected in rates. Unit or solid trains, reduced switching times, dedicated equipment and other such efficiencies created through economies of scale can reduce costs and can therefore allow a lower level of rates on these movements compared to commodities which cannot take advantage of these cost saving practices.

EXPENSES PAID TO HON. MEMBER FOR PORT ARTHUR

Question No. 2,547—**Mr. Cossitt:**

1. What is the total of all expenses paid by the Department of Supply and Services or any other branch of the government, directly or indirectly, for the honourable Member for Port Arthur while (a) Minister without Portfolio (b) Minister of State for Urban Affairs (c) Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs (d) Minister of Manpower and Immigration (e) President of the Treasury Board?

2. What is the total of all expenses paid for the Minister while serving in the five positions?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): See reply to Question No. 2,027 answered this day.

BAIL GRANTED ON DRUG OFFENCES

Question No. 2,550—**Mr. Johnston:**

How many times has bail been granted on a drug offence since the proclamation of the most recent law relating to bail and drug offences?

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Justice): Statistics of the scope sought by this question are not available. However, the Department of Justice did undertake a selective monitoring of the effects of amendments made to the Criminal Code in 1976 (see Chapter 93, Statutes of Canada, 23-24-25 Elizabeth II) with respect to bail procedures. In four Canadian cities, two matched samples of approximately 3,550 pre-change and 3,550 post-change cases were collected: Montreal (2,000), Ottawa (900), Toronto (2,200), and Vancouver (2,000). These were cases of persons charged with offences under the Criminal Code (excluding traffic offences) or under the Narcotic Control Act who were in custody when they made their first appearance on the charge before a court and who were not in custody for any other matter at the time. Persons who pleaded guilty at their first appearance or at a Show Cause hearing were also excluded as no decision on pre-trial release had to be made with respect to them. The following table indicates the results in relation to persons charged with drug offences covered by the amendments in the four cities in the time frame of the survey:

		Pre-trial Release of Persons Charged with Drug Offences		
		Number in Sample	Number Released	Percentage Released
Ottawa	1975	10	7	70
	1976	38	31	82
Montreal	1975	87	84	97
	1976	63	48	76
Toronto	1975	47	42	89
	1976	68	64	94
Vancouver	1975	75	69	92
	1976	29	23	79

PRIME MINISTER'S TRIP TO ANTICOSTI ISLAND

Question No. 2,555—**Mr. Cossitt:**

1. With reference to the answer to Question No. 69 of the 1st Session of the 30th Parliament which stated in part, that the Prime Minister made a private trip to Anticosti Island from August 14 to 17, 1974 and with further reference to

the answer to Question No. 5,342 of the same Session that the cost to the taxpayer was $4,927., did the Prime Minister spend any or all of his visit with Mr. Paul Desmarais, President of the Power Corporation and, if so (a) for what purpose (b) what were the reasons justifying such use of public funds (c) did the discussions include matters concerning government policy or the Liberal Party of Canada or donations to the Liberal Party of Canada?

2. What are the names of all those on board the aircraft flying to and from Anticosti Island and does the list include Mr. Simon Reisman, Deputy Minister of Finance at that time and, if not, did Mr. Reisman visit Mr. Paul Desmarais at the same time as the Prime Minister?

3. Did Mr. James Coutts, principal secretary to the Prime Minister, at any time visit Anticosti Island and meet with Mr. Desmarais, and, if so, on what date and for what purpose?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): 1 and 2. See reply to question 2,881 answered today.

3. No.

TRAVEL—TRIP TO SANDSPIT AIRPORT IN QUEEN CHARLOTTE ISLANDS

Question No. 2,556—**Mr. Firth:**

Did a Falcon Fan Jet No. 502 from Squadron 412 in Ottawa make a trip to Sandspit Airport in the Queen Charlotte Islands, British Columbia on the weekend of April 29 to May 1, 1977 and, if so (a) who were the passengers on the flight (b) what was the purpose of the visit?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): I am informed by the Departments of National Defence and the Secretary of State as follows: Yes. The aircraft was assigned to the Secretary of State for Canada who was using it on official government business. See answer to Question No. 2,881.

THE BOOKCELLAR, HAMILTON, ONTARIO

Question No. 2,557—**Mr. O'Sullivan:**

Were payments made to The Bookcellar, 144 James St. S., Hamilton, Ontario by any departments and, if so (a) which departments and in what amounts (b) for what purpose in the fiscal year (i) 1972-73 (ii) 1973-74 (iii) 1974-75 (iv) 1975-76 (v) 1976-77?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): (a) Department of Employment and Immigration—$533.25; (b) (i) 1972-73—Nil; (ii) 1973-74—Manpower Training Program ($516.00); (iii) 1974-75—Purchase of Books ($17.25); (iv) 1975-76—Nil; (v) 1976-77—Nil; Other departments have no information on this subject.

WAREHOUSE SPACE OWNED OR LEASED BY DSS

Question No. 2,646—**Mr. Bawden:**

1. Does the Department of Supply and Services own or lease warehouse space and, if so, in each case, what is the location?

2. For each location, what was the number of square feet of warehousing space available for the years 1971 to 1977?

3. What projected number of square feet of warehousing space will be required by the Department for the years 1977 to 1979?

4. Does the Department anticipate a consolidation of warehouse space and, if so (a) what are the details (b) is any study presently being done on the feasibility of consolidation or reduction of such space?

[Mr. Cossitt.]

5. Is there a mark-up for items sold from the DSS warehouses to other government departments and, if so, what is it?

6. Is there a mark-up for goods that are not stored in DSS warehouses but which are purchased directly from manufacturers for customers by DSS and, if so, what is it?

7. Do other government departments maintain warehouses for their own use as opposed to keeping their goods or equipment in the DSS warehouses and, if so, which departments?

8. Does the Department maintain warehouses outside of Canada and, if so (a) in what locations (b) is the Department giving consideration to closing them down?

9. Is there a mark-up and charge for providing the service of warehousing to other government departments and, if so, what is it?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): I am informed by the Departments of Supply and Services and Public Works as follows: 1. The Department of Supply and Services leases warehouse space from the Department of Public Works in the following locations: Atlantic Region Supply Centre. (a) Burnside Industrial Park, Dartmouth, N.S.; (b) Goose Bay, Labrador. Québec Region Supply Centre. (a) 800 Golf Rd., Nuns' Island, Montréal, Québec; (b) 1006 Golf Rd., Nuns' Island, Montréal, Québec. Capital Region Supply Centre. (a) 1010 Somerset St., W., Ottawa, Ontario; (b) 45 Sacré-Cœur Blvd., Hull, Québec; (c) O'Keefe Bldg., 819 Wellington St., Ottawa. Ontario Region Supply Centre, 1191 Cawthra Road, Mississauga, Ontario. Western Region Supply Centre, 10210–107th Street, Edmonton, Alberta. Pacific Region Supply Centre, 3551 Viking Way, Richmond, B.C.

2.

Regions	1977	1976	1975	1974	1973	1972	1971
Atlantic (See note 1)	170,237	250,237	50,237	50,237	0	0	0
Quebec (See note 2)	81,806	81,806	81,806	81,806	51,986	70,000	70,000
Capital (See note 3)	504,900	524,600	555,400	484,800	467,000	443,200	443,200
Ontario (See note 4)	96,063	96,063	96,063	96,063	96,063	96,063	0
Western (See note 5)	106,315	106,315	30,000	30,000	30,000	0	0
Pacific (See note 6)	37,726	37,726	37,726	37,726	0	0	0

NOTE 1: Atlantic Region Supply Centre opened in April 1974. The facility is privately owned, and leased through the Department of Public Works (DPW). The Department of Supply and Services (DSS) took on the Department of Transport (MOT) warehousing facility (Government owned) of 200,000 sq. ft. at Goose Bay in July 1976 and reduced the requirement to 120,000 sq. ft. in April 1977.

NOTE 2: Québec Region Supply Centre moved in October 1973 from a Government owned facility of 70,000 sq. ft. at 1659 de Lorimier St., Montréal, which was scheduled for demolition, to a privately owned facility of approximately 52,000 sq. ft. at Nuns' Island leased through DPW. An additional 30,000 sq. ft. of privately owned warehousing space

was leased through DPW in November 1974 to provide a warehouse service for the Canadian Dairy Commission.

NOTE 3: The Capital Region Supply Centre's prime storage facility is a permanent warehouse of 274,500 sq. ft. in the Plouffe Park warehouse, Ottawa, which is Government owned and leased from DPW. It also occupies semi-permanent warehouse space at 45 Sacré-Cœur Blvd., Hull. Year to year space requirements within this building vary from a high of 188,000 sq. ft. in 1975 to its present low of approximately 150,000 sq. ft. Additionally, varying amounts of warehousing space have been and continue to be leased through DPW from the private sector primarily as a warehouse service to meet storage needs of other government departments. Currently 81,000 sq. ft. of such space is being leased in the O'Keefe building in Ottawa.

NOTE 4: Ontario Region Supply Centre opened in April 1972. The facility is Government owned.

NOTE 5: Western Region Supply Centre opened in April 1973 in accommodations shared with MOT in a Government owned facility of 30,000 sq. ft. In January 1976 a privately owned facility of 76,000 sq. ft. was leased through DPW. DSS continued to operate a warehouse service for MOT in the 30,000 ft. facility.

NOTE 6: Pacific Region Supply Centre opened in November 1974. The facility is privately owned and leased through DPW.

3 and 4. There are ongoing studies relating to warehouse space utilized by DSS and other departments with a view to reduction through consolidation.

5. Yes. Varying mark-ups are applied to different commodities, designed to produce an overall gross margin of 32 per cent.

6. No, but a service charge is levied at Treasury Board approved rates.

7. The Department of Public Works does not maintain a listing of other government departments who maintain warehouses for their own use; however, it is known that many do for their own operational requirements such as Public Works, Transport, National Revenue, Post Office.

8. No. (a) Not applicable (b) Not applicable.

9. Yes. 1. 40 cents/sq. ft. for storage space; 2. Small van with driver, $15/hr; 3. Large vehicle with driver and helper, $23.50/hr; 4. Export packaging, $3.50/cubic ft.

EMPLOYEES BY DEPARTMENTS AND CATEGORIES

Question No. 2,675—**Mr. Orlikow:** (Revised)

On April 30 (a) 1976 (b) 1974, how many persons were employed by each department at the CO-4 level?

Hon. Robert K. Andras (President of the Treasury Board): The number of persons employed at the CO-4 level on April 30 (a) 1976 (b) 1974 by each department is shown on the following list.

CO-4*

Department or Agency	(a) 1976	(b) 1974
CCA	9	13
CDC	1	
COM	2	3
CSM	3	
DND	1	1
DOE	2	1
DPW	1	
DSS	1	
FIN	1	
FIR	5	
IAN	6	3
INS	3	3
ITC	119	107
MID	1	
REA	5	2
REE	45	33
RTC	2	2

*Because of a transcription error, the answer previoulsy provided was applicable to the number of incumbents at the CS-5 level.

NEW LOGO FOR TELEGLOBE CANADA

Question No. 2,724—**Mr. Crouse:**

1. Who designed the new logo for Teleglobe Canada?

2. Was the design contract put out to tender and, if not, in what manner was it obtained?

3. (a) What was the cost of the new logo (b) what was the estimated cost of converting from the old to the new design?

Hon. Jeanne Sauvé (Minister of Communications): 1. Foster Advertising Company Ltd., 3 Place Ville Marie, Montréal.

2. The design work was requested of Foster Advertising within the framework of an existing global contract between Teleglobe Canada and Foster Advertising for the provision of advertising and publicity services. Foster Advertising was awarded this contract by Teleglobe following submissions by a number of advertising agencies.

3. (a) Total payments to Foster Advertising for the Corporate identification program amounted to $20,791.55 (authorizations of expenditures Nos. 13376, 13377 and 14268). Of this amount, $8,310.19 was charged for development of the logo itself and the balance of typewetting, mechanical revision, applications on letterheads, buildings, trucks, etc. (b) The cost of conversion resulted, not from the design of a new logo, but from the change of the Corporation's name from Canadian Overseas Telecommunication Corporation to Teleglobe Canada. The new logo was designed to integrate the existing symbol with the new name which was approved by Parliament in an amendment to the Teleglobe Canada Act. There were no additional costs involved in conversion to the new logo as far as forms and stationery are concerned. Identification of buildings and vehicles under the new logo is just underway and estimated costs are not yet available. The approximate cost of producing the graphics manual is $10,000.

Order Paper Questions

NATIONAL FILM BOARD

Question No. 2,725—**Mr. Friesen:**

1. In 1976, how many original motion pictures were produced by the National Film Board and, in each case (a) how many minutes long was it (b) what was the average cost?

2. In 1976, how many original motion pictures were contracted out by the National Film Board to the private sector and, in each case (a) for how long (b) what was the average cost?

Hon. John Roberts (Secretary of State): I am informed by the National Film Board as follows: 1. (a) In 1976-77 there were 104 original motion pictures produced by the National Film Board; the running time of each film is listed below:

Title	Running Time (minutes)
*A Very Important Place	7
*The Canadian Air Connection	8
*Nouvelles conceptions	17
*1 Cag Story	16
*To Make a Map	21
*Du cœur à l'ouvrage	19
*A Working Chance	22
*Citizen Sailor	23
*D'une mer à l'autre	23
*Engineering With a Difference	20
*The Land, a New Priority	28
*People Like You	26
*The First Year	37
*Operation Gamescan	58
*What Do You Do	7
*Summary Trial	23
*Drinking	21
*New Reserves Role 2	13
The Wings of Time	28
River (Planet Earth)	28
Schefferville, 4th Arctic Winter Games	27
I'll Go Again	41
The World Is Round	53
Henry Ford's America	57
The Great Clean-Up	52
A Sense of Place	57
Passage West—A Dream of Freedom	52
Passage West—The Awakening	54
The Great White Bird	52
The Mad Canadian	10
Runing Time	80
Sail Away	18
For Gentlemen Only	28
Striker	25
Bargain Basement	27
Porter's Magic Dream	14
Earthware	10
Metal Workers	10
Threads	10
Wax and Wool	10
Maud Lewis	10
First Born	10
The Art of Eating	11
Mac's Mill	12
Christ Is Risen	13
Augusta	17
Tara's Mulch Garden	21
No Big Money	15
A Simpler Life	17
Salmon People	25
The Other World	19
Blackwood	28
Log House	25
Potatoes	27
A Sense of Humus	28
Waterloo Farmers	28
The Whales Are Waiting	28
Child, Part IV—Kathy and Ian	29
No Way They Want to Slow Down	29
Path of The Paddle—Solo Flatwater	28
Path of The Paddle—Solo Whitewater	28
Path of The Paddle—Doubles Flatwater	28
Path of the Paddle—Doubles Whitewater	28
Bekavar Jubilee	27
Some People Have to Suffer	43
Have I Ever Lied to You Before	57
His Worship Mr. Montreal	58
High Grass Circus	57
Moses Coady	58
Volcano	99
Temiscaming	64
Listen, Listen, Listen	83
The Lion and The Mouse	4
Lady Fishbourne's Complete Guide to Better Manners	6
No Apple for Johnny	9
*3 Genies associés	24
Surtout l'hiver	68
Wamba "Entre l'eau et le feu"	91
Etmocidio Ethnocide	131
Blanche et Claire	20
La différence	15
Le goût de la farine	108
L'heure bleue	39
L'interdit	88
L'invasion (1775-1975)	11
Les jardins d'hiver	86
J. A. Martin photographe	101
Monsieur journault	65
La nuit du 8	28
On s'pratique... C'est pour les Olympiques	59
Les petits inventeurs	59
Puzzle	7
Le retour à la terre	57
Rien qu'en passant	38
Rose et Monsieur Charbonneau	71
Shakti	56
Une simple journée	12
Ti-Dre	56
Ti-Mine, Bernie pis la gang	124
La veillée des veillées	95
Les vieux amis	52
24 heures ou plus	113
Le paysagiste/mindscape	7
Trouvailles ou bizarreries thingumajigs	6

1(b) The average cost per film was $99,640.

2(a) In 1976-77 there were 41 original motion pictures contracted out by the National Film Board to the private sector; the running time of each film is listed below:

Title	Running Time (minutes)
The Good Land	15
Safety Procedures Aboard Commercial Aircraft	5
Garden of The Great Spirit	12
Systems Approach to Training	20

[Mrs. Sauvé.]

Guatemala	30
Fitness Trails	5
Customs and Excise	25
What's In It For Me	10
Identity Film	15
About Canadian Citizenship	15
The Beauty of My People	27
Winter in Canada	27
David Steinberg and Metric	30
The Snowbirds	14
Militia: Twice The Citizen	20
Wings Across	20
The Eagle	15
Doiem	15
Defense-Energy Conservation	10
Oniniki	12
Metric T.V. Special	60
National Highway Metric Commission	10
You're Hired	30
Saddle Your Own Bronc	22
"Community Education"—7 films	85
Construction Engineering	15
Grain Sector Metric Conversion	8
Lowering and Hoisting and Seaberer	22
Towing at Sea	12
Coming To and Slipping From A Buoy	16
Canadian Forces Officer School	20
The Campus and The Sea	20
Signs of Suicide	30
Security on Post Office	7
Parc de l'artillerie	10

2(b) The average cost per film was $28,124.

Additional information

Of the 104 original productions by NFB, 19 films (*) were produced for sponsoring federal government departments.

The average length of each film was 21 minutes and the average cost per film was $59,954.

RELIGIOUS SECTS

Question No. 2,727—**Mr. Friesen:**

1. In (a) 1974 (b) 1975 (c) 1976 was the government approached by diplomatic representatives of foreign countries in Canada on behalf of their nationals requesting assistance in their removal and/or their dependants from orders such as (i) the Apostles of Infinite Love (ii) the Church of Scientology (iii) Hari Krishna (iv) similar groups and, if so, how many times and what were the names of the Embassies and High Commissions?

2. In each case (a) how many individuals and what sects were involved (b) what action was taken by the Departments of External Affairs and Manpower and Immigration?

3. How many of the individuals concerned are in the country on a (a) visa (b) student visa and, in each case, how many times has the visa been renewed and for what reason?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): I am informed by the Departments of External Affairs and Employment and Immigration as follows: 1. Only the Embassy of Belgium approached the Department of External Affairs in September 1976 to request assistance for the return of one of its nationals. The Embassy had been asked for help by the parents of the individual.

Order Paper Questions

2. (a) One, the Order of the Apostles of Infinite Love; (b) On being informed by the Department of Manpower and Immigration that the status in Canada of the Belgian person concerned was in accordance with the Immigration requirements and since the individual was of legal age, the Department of External Affairs notified the Belgian Embassy that no intervention was possible to return the person to Belgium.

3. (a) and (b) Citizens of Belgium do not require visas to visit Canada.

PRIME MINISTER'S TRIPS

Question No. 2,728—**Mr. Cossitt:**

1. What is a list of all flights taken by the Prime Minister on government aircraft in the recent by-election campaigns, including points of departure and arrival, dates and times, the exact cost of each flight including flying time, waiting time, fuel and wages of the crew?

2. What was the total of all expenses incurred for such flights?

3. Was the Liberal Party billed for such flights and, if so (a) on what date (b) in what amount and to whom was the bill sent (c) on what date was it paid and who was the cheque made payable to and who signed the cheque?

4. Did the Prime Minister decide to have the Liberal Party pay for such flights and, if so, was the decision made before or immediately after the Honourable Member for Leeds raised the matter in the House on May 31, 1977?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): 1. See replies to questions 29 and 30 answered today.

2 to 4. See reply to question 2,881 answered today.

MR. ROBERT KINGSLEY

Question No. 2,729—**Mr. Cossitt:**

Has Mr. Robert Kingsley, Canada Manpower Regional Manager of Operations, stationed in Ottawa, in any way whatsoever been relieved of his title, duties etc. and, if so (a) was he suspended or transferred to another position or dismissed on or about the end of May, 1977 (b) what are the reasons for any changes made in connection with his employment and dit they have anything to do with claims made by his wife and son for unemployment insurance to which they were not entitled (c) was any change made in his status as a result of UIC or RCMP investigations into any misuse of the UIC computer in Montreal at the time Mr. Kingsley was Regional Manager of the UIC Pay Centre in that city?

Hon. Bud Cullen (Minister of Employment and Immigration): Mr. Kingsley has assumed a temporary assignment as a member of a project group responsible for developing a plan for the relocation of the national headquarters offices of the Unemployment Insurance Commission and the Department of Manpower and Immigration. (a) No. (b) Mr. Kingsley was selected as a member of the project group on the basis of his experience and knowledge of the operations and programs of both the Unemployment Insurance Commission and the Department of Manpower and Immigration, and of the logistical factors affecting a major relocation of staff. (c) No.

Order Paper Questions

COST OF TROPICAL PLANTS

Question No. 2,731—**Mr. Jones:**

1. What is the cost per year for the upkeep of tropical plants in the various government offices in the City of Moncton?

2. (a) How many government offices across the country are provided with tropical plants (b) what is the total cost of maintaining them (c) what was the cost in 1976 (d) what is the estimated cost for 1977?

3. What (a) was the cost for 1976 (b) is the estimated cost for 1977 of maintaining the plants in the Province of New Brunswick?

Hon. Judd Buchanan (Minister of Public Works): 1. $3,607.20 for 1977—by contract.

2. (a) In the National Capital Region, there were 120 buildings which had tropical plants in July 1977. This total figure is presently fluid as moves to buildings in Hull and elsewhere are being made. However, in the rest of Canada, where accommodation changes are smaller in number and where the concentration is lower, there were 401 offices with tropical plants. (b) See (c) and (d); (c) $357,554.60 for 1976; (d) $413,612.06 (estimated) for 1977.

3. (a) Nil; (b) $5,000.00 (estimated).

STUDIES MADE BY GOVERNMENT ON THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT OF OIL SPILLS

Question No. 2,735—**Mr. Friesen:**

1. Were studies made by the government on the environmental impact of an oil spill in the Semiahmoo Bay and Mud Bay areas and, if so, how many have been completed?

2. (a) What was the length of time taken to complete each (b) on what date were they completed (c) what was the cost of each?

3. Does the government intend to use the White Rock Federal Building as a Pollution Alert Centre?

4. In the event of an oil spill in the Surrey-White Rock area as a result of oil tankers using the Cherry Point facility is there oil pollution clean-up equipment available and, if so (a) what is the nearest location (c) what is the nature of the equipment (c) what is the estimated time it would take for the equipment to reach the White Rock area (d) how many personnel are permanently assigned to operate the equipment?

5. Does the government have any plans to locate oil clean-up equipment in the City of White Rock?

6. (a) What is the estimated value of any government installation, i.e. piers, wharfs, DOT facilities etc., on the Semiahmoo Bay, Mud Bay, Boundary Bay shoreline (b) what is a description of each of these facilities?

7. How much money has the government contributed through LIP, Canada Works and Young Canada Works to environmental projects in the Boundary Bay, Mud Bay, Semiahmoo Bay, Serpentine Fen area of the lower mainland of B.C. in (a) 1974 (b) 1975 (c) 1976 (d) 1977?

8. Does the government have any training programme in place in B.C. for the purpose of instructing its employees and/or interested citizens in oil spill clean-up procedures and, if not, is it the intention to establish such a programme?

9. Has the government held any discussions with the local city and municipal governments of Surrey, White Rock, Richmond and Delta with respect to clean-up procedures, their financing and implementation and, if so, on what date and what was their conclusion?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): I am informed by the Departments of Fisheries and the Environment, Employment and Immigration and Transport Canada as follows: 1. Yes, two by the Department of Fisheries and the Environment.

[Mr. Cullen.]

2. The first study was a joint Headquarters/Regional effort. It resulted in the report entitled "The Environmental Consequences of the Proposed Oil Transport between Valdez and Cherry Point Refinery" and was dated August 5, 1971. Costing is indeterminate as internal staff time was involved. The second study was carried out by the firm of consultants Howard Paish and Associates Ltd. It resulted in the report entitled "West Coast Oil Threat in Perspective". The three volume report was six months under preparation and is dated April 1, 1972. Cost of the report was $50,000.

3. No. The Canadian Coast Guard Pollution Emergency Centre is established at its VTM Centre, Kapilano 100, West, Vancouver.

4. (a) Equipment is based at Richmond, Vancouver and Victoria, B.C. and also, Bellingham, Wash. (b) Equipment is used for the containment and removal of spilled oil both on the water and the shore, as well as pumping out damaged vessels. (c) Minimum two hours deployment time. (d) None dedicated, but Canadian Coast Guard ship and base personnel are trained and available for this task.

5. Not at this time.

6. Government Wharf, Float and Breakwater, White Rock, B.C. Administered by Fisheries and Environment Canada. Estimated replacement value 1970: Float, $9,000; Breakwater, $280,000; Wharf, $186,000; Total, $475,000. Government Wharf and Float, Crescent Beach, B.C. Administered by Fisheries and Environment Canada. Float, $5,000; Wharf, $26,000; Total, $31,000. 1977 replacement value considered to be approximately three times those of 1970. 7. (a) 1974-75 LIP, $56,569; (b) 1975-76 LIP, $60,060; (c) 1976-77 LIP, $433,160; (d) 1977-78 Canada Works Program $279,384.

8. Both the Canadian Coast Guard of the Ministry of Transport, and the Environmental Protection Service of the Department of Fisheries and the Environment ensure the training of its employees in oil spill cleanup procedures through attendance at in-house, and out of house training programmes, seminars and conferences. In-house exercises are carried out at intervals with attendance by Port Authority, industry personnel and employees of other government departments. The private sector and other levels of government are encouraged to develop and sponsor similar training programmes for the benefit of their respective staff to enable them to better deal with and direct on-scene oil spill containment and cleanup countermeasures. Already several major industries, groups and agencies within the province of B.C. have done so. This includes the B.C. Petroleum Association, Provincial Emergency Program, MacMillan Bloedel Limited and the Burrard Inlet Working Group to name four. In all instances both the Ministry of Transport and the Department of Fisheries and the Environment have actively supported the programmes through an advisory and/or participatory capacity.

9. A seminar covering these subjects was held on May 29 and 30, 1975 at U.B.C. Surrey, Richmond, Delta and White Rock representatives were among the participants. The expla-

nation of government resources plans and techniques was well received.

UIC—MR. ROBERT VANTANGERLOO

Question No. 2,737—**Mr. Cossitt:**

1. Was Mr. Robert Vantangerloo appointed District Manager of the Unemployment Insurance Commission office in Ottawa to succeed Mr. F. Leblanc and, if so (a) on what date (b) at what salary (c) what were the reasons for his appointment?

2. Since the date of his appointment, how many working days has he actually been present in his office and what are the reasons for all absences?

3. Was Mr. Vantangerloo formerly stationed with the Commission in Belleville and has he moved to Ottawa since his appointment and (a) if so, on what date did he move (b) if not, what is the total amount of money involved to the taxpayer for all trips he has made to or from the Ottawa office and in each case, where has he been and for what purpose?

4. Is he on full expenses and, if so, what is the amount of all expenses paid on his behalf from the date of his appointment in Ottawa to date the answer to this questions is prepared?

Hon. Bud Cullen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): 1. No. Mr. Vantangerloo is currently on assignment as acting District Manager, Ottawa. (a) April 18, 1977. (b) His salary scale is $24,200 to $34,800. (c) Mr. Vantangerloo's assignment is for career development purposes.

2. From April 18 to June 10 he was present for 27 days and absent for 12 days: Five days to serve as a member of a competition board; two days to attend Regional Management Conference; five days of annual leave.

3. Yes, he was stationed in Belleville from September 10, 1974 until April 19, 1976, and he was then in London, Ontario, until assignment to Ottawa. He has not moved to Ottawa as his assignment is only on a temporary basis. (a) Not applicable. (b) Nil. April 18, London to Ottawa to report for assignment. April 22, Ottawa to London to return home. April 24, London to Ottawa to return to work. April 29, Ottawa to London to return home. May 1, London to Ottawa to return to work. May 7, Ottawa to London to return home. May 8, London to Ottawa to return to work. May 14, Ottawa to London to attend competition board as a member May 16-20. May 22, London to Ottawa to return to work. May 24, Ottawa to Toronto to attend Management Conference May 25-26. May 26, Toronto to London to return home. May 29, London to Ottawa to return to work. June 3, Ottawa to London to return home. June 5, London to Ottawa to return to work. June 10, Ottawa to London to return home.

4. Yes. $2,803.56.

UIC—MR. RICHARD SULLIVAN

Question No. 2,738—**Mr. Cossitt:**

1. What is the history of the employment with the Unemployment Insurance Commission of Mr. Richard Sullivan and specifically what appointment does he hold at the present time in the Ottawa office of the Commission or elsewhere?

2. Has any official of the Commission been advised by any member of the Commission's staff or any member of the public that Mr. Sullivan is conducting a "Reign of Terror" in connection with whatever duties he is performing at the Ottawa District office and if so, what are all the details?

Hon. Bud Cullen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): 1. Head Office Ottawa—Staffing Officer; November 1971-October 1972. Regional Office Belleville—Staffing Officer; October 1972—April 1974—Supervisor, Personnel Operations, April 1974—March 1975—Area Personnel Advisor, March 1975—August 1976—Senior Operations Officer, August 1976—Present. At the present time Mr. Sullivan is a Senior Operations Officer reporting to the Director of Operations, East.

2. No.

FRANCE-CANADA RELATIONS

Question No. 2,740—**Mr. Jones:**

1. Is the government aware that (a) French Nationals have been on the staff and faculty of the University of Moncton and other Canadian universities or colleges in Canada, in lieu of serving an extra year in the military in France (b) French Nationals have been on the staff of *L'Evangeline* newspaper, Moncton, in lieu of serving in the military in France (c) France has established a full consulate office in Moncton, New Brunswick (d) France has paid for substantial portions of the equipment used in *L'Evangeline* newspaper, Moncton (e) France has taken steps to substantially increase the size of the (i) airport (ii) harbour for the islands of St. Pierre and Miquelon (f) France has plans to and is negotiating for establishment of a high powered television and/or radio station which will be beamed into parts of Eastern Canada and, if so, in each case, to what extent has the government studied or given consideration to such matters?

2. Have negotiations taken place between France and Canada over the past five years and, if so, what are they?

3. (a) How many French Nationals were employed in Canada in the years 1963 to 1977 (b) in what locations and in what manner were they employed (c) was special immigration clearance necessary to facilitate their employment terms and, if so, what are the details?

4. (a) How many French Nationals have received Canadian citizenship over the past ten years (b) where are such persons presently employed?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): I am informed by the Departments of External Affairs, Employment and Immigration and the Secretary of State as follows: 1. (a) The government is aware that French nationals have worked and are working on the staff of Canadian educational institutions in lieu of military service in France; this is done with the full knowledge of the government. (b) Yes. The government is fully aware of this and has satisfied itself that it conforms to Canadian law and regulations. (c) Yes. The government is fully aware of this and has satisfied itself that it conforms to Canadian law and regulations. (d) Yes. The government is fully aware of this and has judged that there is nothing objectionable in the arrangement. (e) The government is aware of projects to increase the size of airport and harbour facilities at St-Pierre; these are not a source of concern to the government. (f) The government is aware that there are plans to improve radio and television broadcasting facilities in St-Pierre et Miquelon and is in touch with the French authorities with a view to being kept informed of the development of such plans as they may affect Canada. No negotiations are under way at the present time.

2. Negotiations have taken place between Canada and France in a wide range of areas, notably fisheries, air transport, telecommunications, territorial elimitation, economic relations, and scientific relations.

Order Paper Questions

3. (a) and (b); Statistics are not kept regarding the employment of immigrants after they are admitted to Canada. From 1973 to May 1977, 5,956 French nationals were issued employment visas destined to the provinces indicated in the following occupations. Statistics for the period 1963 to 1972 are not available as employment visas were not introduced until 1973.

	Nfld.	P.E.I.	N.S.	N.B.	Que.	Ont.	Man.	Sask.	Alta.	B.C.	Y. NWT.
Manager—Adminstr.	2	—	10	6	246	33	7	5	21	5	—
Nat. Scien.—Eng.—Math.	50	—	102	3	281	63	3	26	110	9	2
Social Sciences	—	—	2	—	62	20	—	1	—	—	—
Religion	—	—	—	1	21	—	—	1	—	—	1
Teaching	12	—	20	15	1067	253	31	18	23	26	—
Medicine—Health	—	—	—	5	289	6	1	—	—	1	—
Artist.—Lit.—Per. Art.	3	—	8	6	239	65	6	5	6	20	2
Sports—Recreation	—	—	—	—	27	9	—	—	8	3	—
Clerical	—	—	1	—	105	24	1	3	7	4	—
Sales	—	—	2	—	68	12	1	—	1	2	—
Service	5	2	24	1	289	166	5	6	75	15	—
Farm—Hort.—Ani. Husb.	—	—	1	—	49	1209	70	8	35	15	—
Fish—Hunt—Trap	2	—	1	—	4	—	—	—	—	—	—
Forest—Logging	—	—	—	—	8	2	—	—	—	—	—
Mine—Quarry—Oil Gas	—	—	—	—	6	—	—	—	27	—	1
Processing	—	—	3	1	36	7	—	—	2	1	3
Machining	—	—	3	—	23	6	—	—	3	—	—
Pro. Fab.—Ass.—Repair	2	—	31	1	99	19	2	3	10	1	—
Construction	—	—	6	1	41	7	—	2	5	1	—
Transport	7	—	2	—	15	3	—	—	8	—	—
Material Handling	—	—	—	—	8	4	2	—	1	1	—
Other Crafts—Equip.	—	—	—	—	8	3	—	—	6	—	—
Not Classified	—	—	2	—	30	9	—	—	3	1	—

3. (c) No. They met normal immigration requirements.

4. (a) 18,749 (b) No statistical data available.

GRANTS, LOANS AND COMMITMENTS—QUEBEC AND PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND CENTRES

Question No. 2,741—**Mr. MacKay:**

1. Between January 1 and May 31, 1977, how many grants, loans and other commitments were made by CMHC in the Constituency of (a) Verdun (b) Terrebonne (c) Langelier (d) Témiscamingue (e) Louis-Hébert (f) Malpeque?

2. For each such Constituency, during the months of March, April and May 1977, what was the amount, purpose and name of the recipient or recipients of such grants, loans or other commitments?

Hon. André Ouellet (Minister of State for Urban Affairs): I am advised as follows by Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation: 1 and 2. See Table 1 following.

NOTE: Data compiled by CMHC on activities under the National Housing Act are based on municipalities and municipal counties and not on federal electoral constituencies.

POST OFFICE ADVERTISING

Question No. 2,744—**Mr. McKenzie:**

1. Did the Post Office Department commission an advertising agency to produce the brochure and postal code stickers "2 ways you can help yourself to better mail service" and, if so, what was the (a) cost (b) name and address of the firm?

2. (a) What was the printing cost (b) how many were produced (c) what was the total cost (including printing, production, distribution, etc.)?

3. What was the name and address of the firm that was contracted to produce the brochure and stickers?

Hon. J.-J. Blais (Postmaster General): 1. (a) and (b) The creative aspects of the national postal householder package (brochure and postal code sticker sheets) were developed under contract with B & B Advertising Ltd., 1010 St. Catherine Street W., Montréal, Quebec. Cost: $11,400*.

2. (a) and (b) Overall production of the householder was handled through the Department of Supply and Services contracts, after the normal procedure of bidding and tendering. Seven and one-half million householders were produced. Itemized contract costs are as follows: envelope—$63,630.00; brochure—$69,503.98; stickers—$70,371.75; mailing preparation—$33,750.00; and primary distribution—$11,400.00*. (c) Total cost—$248,655.73.

3. Printing production of the brochure was awarded under DSS contract to: Gazette Canadian Printing Ltd., 1000 St. Antoine St., Montreal, Quebec H3C 3R7. Similarly, contract for production of the stickers was awarded to: Southam Printing Ltd., Specialty Division, P.O. Box 1079, Montreal, Quebec H3C 2X6.

CUPW—NEW COLLECTIVE AGREEMENT

Question No. 2,746—**Mr. Dinsdale:**

1. Did the Canadian Union of Postal Workers (CUPW) submit a list of demands on April 20, 1977 to be included in a new collective agreement being negotiated and did the Public Affairs Branch of the Post Office Department in Ottawa send a TELEX on April 19 to subordinate headquarters and/or postal facilities across Canada setting out the demands in detail and, if so, by what method did the Public Affairs Branch obtain particulars of the demands before April 20?

NHA ACTIVITY (1), SELECTED MUNICIPALITIES AND MUNICIPAL COUNTIES, PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND AND QUEBEC, JANUARY-MAY 1977

Program	Queens County, P.E.I.			L'Assomption Co.			Témiscamingue Co.			Terrebonne Co.			St-Felix-du-Cap-Rouge			Ste-Foy			Sillery			Québec City			Verdun		
	Loans	Units	$000	Loans	Units	$000	Loans	Units	$000	Loans	Units	$000	Loans	Units	$000	Loans	Units	$000	Loans	Units	$000	Loans	Units	$000	Loans	Units	$000
Private Mortgage Market																											
Approved Lenders Sec. 6	4	4	101	343	398	11,149	39	41	1,100	594	724	20,197	1	1	32	89	89	2,775	2	2	82	248	849	20,573	31	53	814
CMHC-Home Owner Sec. 58/59	—	—	—	—	—	—	2	2	25	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
CMHC-Assisted Home Owner S.C.H.L. Sec. 34.15	7	7	209	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Social Housing																											
Co-operatives Sec. 34.18	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	78	1,872	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	6	43	—	—	—
Community Revitalization Loans																											
Residential Rehabilitation Sec. 34.1	75	75	346	—	—	—	—	89	356	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	29	63	245	—	—	—
Neighbourhood Improvement Sec. 27.5	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	640	—	—	1,184	—	—	—
Grants																											
Neighbourhood Improvement Sec. 27.2	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	26	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Infrastructure																											
Loans																											
Water and Sewerage Projects Sec. 51	—	—	—	2	—	174	—	—	24	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	62	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Grants																											
Water and Sewerage (non-NHA) Sec. 56.2	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	336	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Municipal Incentive Sec. 56.2	—	—	—	5	—	36	—	—	—	—	289	289	—	—	—	—	580	580	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—

(1) Data are gross.
(2) Excluding Charlottetown.

2. Should such a communication have been sent out by Treasury Board, designated as the employer in the current collective agreement with CUPW?

Hon. J.-J. Blais (Postmaster General): 1. CUPW, on April 20, 1977, submitted a list of demands in the form of a 12 page CUPW newspaper, previously published, quoted in the Toronto *Globe and Mail* of April 13, 1977, and dated March, 1977. Post Office ComTeam communicated a 170 word summary, via telex, on April 21, 1977 at 17:05 eastern standard time.

2. No.

MINISTER OF STATE FOR FITNESS AND AMATEUR SPORT—COST OF EUROPEAN TOUR

Question No. 2,750—**Mr. Yewchuk:**

Was a tour conducted through Europe by the Minister of State for Fitness and Amateur Sport, Dr. Roger Jackson, Director of Sport Canada and Mr. Geoff Gowan, Technical Director of the Coaching Association of Canada, from April 24 to May 12, 1977 and, if so, at what cost?

Hon. Iona Campagnolo (Minister of State (Fitness and Amateur Sport)): Yes. Refer to the answer to question 2,881 tabled this date.

SALARIES OF SOME MEMBERS OF CANADIAN WHEAT BOARD

Question No. 2,757—**Mr. Robinson:**

What is the salary of the (a) Executive (b) Director (c) Chairman (d) Vice-Chairman (e) board members of the Canadian Wheat Board?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): In so far as the Canadian Wheat Board is concerned: With respect to (a), (c) and (d), there are no positions in the Canadian Wheat Board with such titles. With respect to (b), there are a number of Board employees with the title "Director". However, Board employees are not public servants under the Public Service Employment Act nor do their salaries constitute an expense to the Government. Accordingly, information on their salaries is regarded as confidential. With respect to (e), the salary ranges for Board members are established by Governor in Council and are currently at the following levels: Chief Commissioner, $49,500—$65,300 per annum; Assistant Chief Commissioner, $43,000—$58,800 per annum; Commissioner, $43,000—$58,800 per annum.

ADVISOR TO MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS FOR FRANCOPHONE COUNTRIES

Question No. 2,762—**Mr. Cossitt:**

1. Was the Minister of Supply and Services appointed Advisor to the Minister of External Affairs for Francophone countries and, if so (a) on what date (b) did the Prime Minister make this appointment after consultation with (i) Ivan Head (ii) the Minister of External Affairs (iii) others and, if so, what are their names?

2. Since his appointment, on what specific matters and on what dates has the Minister offered advice to the Minister of External Affairs?

3. What are the qualifications of the Minister of Supply and Services that justify his appointment to the position of advisor?

[Mr. Dinsdale.]

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): 1, 2 and 3. See Department of External Affairs Press Release of May 4, 1977.

AIRCRAFT OPERATIONS GROUP CONTRACT

Question No. 2,767—**Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton):**

1. Has the Aircraft Operations Group of the Public Service, which has been without a contract for nearly two years, historical relationship with other aviation professionals, such as the Air Traffic Controllers, not been accorded any weight, thus allowing the Aircraft Operations Group to fall as much as $6,000 behind the Controllers where there has traditionally been a variation of only 1% and, if so, for what reason?

2. Is it anticipated that at some time in the future the Aircraft Operations Group will be given an opportunity to catch up to the other professional categories to which it has had an historical pay-scale relationship and, if so, approximately on what date?

3. Is consideration being given to amending Sections 38 and/or 44.(1)(a) of the Anti-Inflation Act regulations to clarify the meaning of the words "entered into" and "established" as suggested by Mr. E. D. Jensen, Chairman of the Aircraft Operations Group in his letter to the Minister of Finance of January 12, 1977?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): I am informed by the Treasury Board Secretariat and the Department of Finance as follows: 1. The Aircraft Operations Group which still remains without a contract has filed an application with the Federal Court to set aside a decision made by the Anti-Inflation Appeal Tribunal on March 17, 1977. The decision upheld decisions already made by Cabinet and by the Administrator's office rejecting the request by the Aircraft Operations Group to disregard a ruling by the Anti-Inflation Board that had the effect of denying any historical relationship between the Aircraft Operations Group and others in the Technical Category including Air Traffic Controllers. The Anti-Inflation Board ruled that an Arbitration Award by Justice Emmett Hall granting increases of $3,700 and 10 per cent for a two-year agreement exceeded guidelines and ordered a roll back to a maximum of $2,400 in each year of a two-year agreement.

2. This group remains subject to the Anti-Inflation Legislation and any catch up, if justified, will be in accordance with the appropriate guidelines.

3. The Anti-Inflation Board is not contemplating amending Section 38 and/or 44(1)(a) of the regulations. It is their view that the current interpretation given to these sections correctly reflects the intention of the Anti-Inflation Act.

LAND ASSEMBLY—CORNER BROOK, NEWFOUNDLAND

Question No. 2,771—**Mr. Marshall:**

1. Did the government provide funds through CMHC for the provision of water and sewage in the Elizabeth Street area in Corner Brook, Newfoundland and, if so, in what amount?

2. What portion of the total funds expended for work in the land assembly area in the Elizabeth Street area was provided by the government?

3. Did the government sign an agreement with the provincial government with regard to the work done in the land assembly area in the Elizabeth Street area and, if so, what was the extent of the government's responsibility as to completion in line with specifications?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): I am informed by Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation and the Department of Regional Economic Expansion as follows: 1 and 2. Under the terms of a land acquisition and holding Agreement with the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation under Section 40 of the National Housing Act, CMHC approved the expenditure of $111,750 (75 per cent of the estimated cost of acquisition), for the acquisition of 300 acres in the Elizabeth Street area of Corner Brook, Newfoundland. CMHC incurred costs of only $37,575 under this Agreement for investigation of such items as need, location, anticipated costs and selling prices. The acquisition of the land was financed under Section 42, as follows: (a) A loan of $671,730 was authorized on November 2, 1969 under Section 42 of the NHA to finance 90% of the cost of acquisition and servicing of 31.28 acres. (b) A loan of $1,616,058 was authorized on October 22, 1974 under Section 42 of the NHA to finance 90% of the cost of acquisition and servicing of 54 acres. (c) A loan of $2,149,851 was authorized on May 31, 1976 under Section 42 of the NHA to finance 90% of the cost of acquisition of 147 acres and of the servicing of 47 of these acres. Under the Canada/Newfoundland Second Special Areas Agreement, DREE provided funding for the "Upper Elizabeth Street Reconstruction and Water Reservoir" projects in the amount of $602,663, on the basis of a 50 per cent contribution/loan ratio.

3. The above noted CMHC commitments state that "the borrower shall undertake and complete the project in accordance with its accepted application for loan." Where CMHC provides funding through loans under Section 42 of the NHA, the borrower has the responsibility for completion in accordance with specifications. DREE—Canada/Newfoundland Second Special Areas Agreement, signed August 9, 1971. DREE—Under the terms of the Agreement, a Federal/Provincial Management Committee was established to direct the implementation of the Agreement. The "Upper Elizabeth Street Reconstruction and Water Reservoir" projects were completed prior to December 1974, and deemed by the Management Committee to have been constructed in accordance with the prescribed specifications.

LETTER FROM CAPTAIN G. B. LANDIS

Question No. 2,782—**Mr. Brisco:**

1. Did the Office of the Prime Minister receive a letter from Captain G. B. Landis, 467 Earl Street, Kingston, Ontario, dated June 26, 1976 and, if so, was the Prime Minister advised of the substance of Captain Landis' recommendation?

2. Did the letter receive a substantive response to date and, if not, for what reason?

3. Did the Prime Minister or Secretary of State for Canada cause studies to be made of the language teaching method outlined therein known as alternating lingual communication and (a) if so, what have been the recommendations with respect to its use as an alternative to existing teaching methods (b) if not, for what reason?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): I am informed by the Prime Minister's and the Privy Council Offices and the Department of the Secretary of State as follows: 1. (a) Yes; (b) No.

2. Mr. Landis' comments on languae policy in this letter and a follow-up letter of July 13 were acknowledged by the Prime Minister's Office on September 20, 1976.

3. A study of the language teaching method proposed by Captain Landis was conducted by the Language Bureau of the Public Service Commission. It was concluded that the method did not fit the mandate for the teaching of a second language that the Language Bureau has received from Parliament.

MINISTER'S VISAS

Question No. 2,783—**Mr. Jelinek:**

How many ministerial visas were granted at (a) Vancouver International Airport (b) Toronto International Airport (c) Montreal Mirabel and Dorval Airports (d) other locations and ports of Canada in (i) 1972 (ii) 1973 (iii) 1974 (iv) 1975 (v) 1976?

Hon. Bud Cullen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Permits are issued by Ottawa and in the Regions by Minister's delegated authority and statistics are not maintained on a Port of Entry basis.

APPOINTMENT OF DR. BERNARD SUTET

Question No. 2,785—**Mr. Jones:**

1. Is there any regulation in the rules of the Public Service Commission requiring high ranking officials to be or to have the intention of becoming a Canadian citizen?

2. (a) Is Dr. Bernard Sutet a citizen of France (b) is he presently the Director of Economic Policy in the Policy Planning Office of the Unemloyment Insurance Commission (c) what are his qualifications (d) was there an open competition for the position he presently occupies and, if not, was he appointed directly?

3. (a) For what position was he hired by the Department of Manpower and Immigration in 1968 (b) was the position advertised as an open competition or was he appointed to the position?

4. What special expertise does he have for high-ranking Public Service positions?

5. Is he required to become a Canadian citizen and (a) if not, for what reason (b) if so, has he refused?

6. (a) What is his salary (b) what is the amount of his expense allowance (c) what are his special privileges?

7. Is he allowed to sit in on Cabinet meetings and, if so, has he ever done so?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): I am informed by the Department of Employment and Immigration and the Public Service Commission as follows: 1. There is no requirement for any person appointed under the Public Service Employment Act to be or to have the intention of becoming a Canadian citizen. In appointments from outside the Public Service, however, a preference is given to Canadian citizens. Therefore, if both a citizen and a non-citizen are found qualified, the citizen is appointed before the non-citizen. In addition, all employees are required, upon appointment from outside the Public Service, to take and subscribe the oath or affirmation of allegiance and the oath or affirmation set out in Schedule III of the Public Service Employment Act (oath or affirmation of office and secrecy).

Order Paper Questions

2. (a) Yes. (b) Yes. (c) BA Economics 1959, MA Economics 1961, Ph.D. Economics 1966, 1966-68 Market Research, Texas Instruments, France, 1968-date Economist in MID, NH&W, UIC. (d) Dr. Sutet was selected from a number of candidates from various departments on the basis of interviews held following an interdepartmental search conducted by the Public Service Commission.

3. (a) Dr. Sutet was hired on April 1, 1968 as an Economist 3 in position M&I-PD-60, Research Branch, Immigration and Foreign Manpower Section. (b) The position was advertised as an open competition (67-430-39).

4. Dr. Sutet demonstrated he possessed an excellent knowledge in the statistic and econometric fields. Furthermore, he had experience in policy studies and in studies on the economical situation of France and the Common Market. He made financial studies of companies located in Europe. See 2 (c) above.

5. No. (a) See answer to Part 1. (b) Dr. Sutet obtained Landed Immigrant Status March 27, 1968 and has recently applied for Canadian citizenship.

6. (a) $32,080-$39,080 ES-8 salary range. (b) As required according to Canadian Government Travel Regulations. (c) None.

7. No. Cabinet Committee Meetings only.

NEW HORIZONS CONTRIBUTIONS IN NEW BRUNSWICK

Question No. 2,787—**Mr. Jones:**

In the latest series of contributions through the New Horizons Programme of the Department of National Health and Welfare, were grants awarded to Francophones in the Province of New Brunswick totalling $37,612 and to Anglophones totalling $16,850 and, if so, for what reason?

Hon. Marc Lalonde (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Contributions through the New Horizons Program are announced 10 times throughout the year and are made in response to applications received from groups of senior citizens. In any particular series the funding pattern for a province is likely to vary significantly from the long range pattern. In addition, it is difficult to divide New Horizons allocations between Anglophone and Francophone organizations, especially in a province such as New Brunswick where members of both linguistic groups may participate in any one group; determination from the language of application or the name of an organization will not necessarily reflect the proportion of the members of Anglophone and Francophone origin. Given these restrictions on the validity of dividing New Horizons statistics between official language groups, grants awarded to applications filed in English and in French were as follows: (1) for series number 47 released in June 1977, the figures stated in the question are correct; (2) for the six series released in 1977, a total of $154,300.00 was awarded to organizations who applied in French and a total of $166,557.00 to those in English.

[Mr. Goodale.]

GRANTS GIVEN TO TEACHERS TO IMPROVE THEIR LANGUAGE SKILLS

Question No. 2,788—**Mr. Jones:**

Under the terms of the Federal-Provincial Agreement on Bilingualism in Education, are contributions being made to enable (a) French (b) English teachers in each province whose mother tongue is (i) French (ii) English to improve their language teaching skills and, if so, in each case, how many and in what amounts?

Hon. John Roberts (Secretary of State): Department of the Secretary of State: Under the Teachers' Bursary Programme of the Federal-Provincial Agreement on Bilingualism in Education contributions are made to the provinces to enable teachers of French and English as second languages and teachers in the official minority language to take short refresher courses to improve their skills. Bursaries are awarded to the teachers by the provincial governments, according to their priorities in the area of bilingualism in education. The attached tables show the amounts contributed by the federal government to each province under this programme since its inception in fiscal year 1972-73. As the mother tongue of the teachers concerned is not a factor in the awarding of the bursaries, no statistics on this point are available.

Teachers' Bursaries

To enable second-language or minority language teachers to take short refresher courses
To improve their skills

Amount paid to each province in each year

Province	Fiscal Year 1972-73	1973-74	1974-75	1975-76	1976-77
Newfoundland	18,200	22,200	31,343	35,934	45,708
Prince Edward Island	4,470	5,682	7,255	9,920	15,192
Nova Scotia	34,261	39,576	65,298	52,155	78,417
New Brunswick	14,300	48,200	47,354	57,370	85,298
Quebec	5,200	88,538	385,505	406,902	412,044
Ontario	79,990	402,200	592,662	510,929	702,605
Manitoba	7,560	12,075	18,586	24,780	91,080
Saskatchewan	13,350	18,900	27,750	35,850	37,450
Alberta	22,255	36,670	68,971	72,041	137,875
British Columbia	—	26,000	124,417	126,755	217,327
National Total	199,586	700,041	1,369,141	1,332,636	1,822,996
Cumulative National Total	199,586	899,627	2,268,768	3,601,404	5,424,400

CONSUMER ASSISTANCE GRANTS PROGRAMME

Question No. 2,789—**Mr. Jones:**

1. How many local voluntary groups which offer a range of consumer information, education and mediation services applied for grants under the Consumer Assistance Grants Programme of the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs?

2. Were any of the thirteen grants awarded given to the Provinces of Newfoundland, Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Manitoba or Saskatchewan and, if not, for what reason?

3. Is the availabilty of grants under the Programme advertised publicly and, if so (a) in what manner (b) were they advertised in the Moncton area?

4. Did any local voluntary groups from the Constituency of Moncton apply?

Hon. A. C. Abbott (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): 1. The Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs Canada is in regular contact with voluntary consumer groups through its regional and district offices. This contact includes many informal requests regarding the availability of financial support from the department in addition to formal application for money under the Consumer Assistance Grants Programme. The numbers of the former type of contact have not been tabulated: formal application for grants were received from seventy local groups during the 1976-77 fiscal year.

2. The Department assumes that this question refers to voluntary organizations located in the provinces of Newfoundland, Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Manitoba, Saskatchewan and not to the provinces themselves, as no grants are awarded to the provincial government by the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. Further, the Department assumes that this question refers to a news release dated May 19, 1977 regarding the awarding of 13 grants. None of the recipient groups had offices located in any of Newfoundland, Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Manitoba or Saskatchewan. However, several of the groups offer services to consumers living in those provinces i.e. Allergy Information Association, Consumers' Association of Canada, and Transport 2000. At the time the news release was issued, applications from agencies located in the above listed provinces did not meet the criteria of the grants program.

3. National press releases regarding the Consumer Assistance Grants Programme are made on a regular basis.

4. No formal grant applications have been received from voluntary consumer groups from the Moncton constituency.

EMPLOYMENT OF EXECUTIVE AND SPECIAL ASSISTANTS

Question No. 2,790—**Mr. McKinnon:**

By ministry, from December 31, 1972, what are the names of all those who were employed as executive assistants and special assistants to Ministers and of these (a) which ones were also employed by the government in any capacity as of December 31, 1976 (b) what were their (i) positions at that time (ii) remuneration?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): With regard to the names of those employed as executive assistants and special assistants to Ministers since December 31, 1972, see the replies to the following Questions: Nos: 1,028, ordered May 14, 1973; 42, ordered March 26, 1975; 518, ordered April 9, 1975; 1,204, ordered July 30, 1975. It is not possible to provide the remainder of the information in the form requested.

CANADIAN SHIPYARDS SUBSIDIZED BY I.T.C.

Question No. 2,794—**Mr. Lambert (Bellechasse):**

1. During the past three years, have the Canadian shipyards subsidized by the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce been used and, if so (a) by which countries (b) how many ships were (i) built (ii) renovated?

2. Have ships been renovated in these shipyards following an accident and, if so, how many?

Mr. Hugh Poulin (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): In so far as the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce is concerned: 1. Listed are the names of the companies that have received subsidies for the construction of vessels for export completed during the fiscal years 1974/75-1976/77, the number of vessels subsidized and the country where the vessels were registered:

Shipbuilder	No. of Vessels	Country of Registration
Allied Shipbuilders Ltd.	2	Bermuda
Bel-Aire Shipyard Ltd.	5	Bermuda
Burrard Dry Dock Company Ltd.	1	Cayman Island (UK)
Canadian Shipbuilding & Engineering	2	United Kingdon
Davie Shipbuilding Limited	3	United Kingdom
Davie Shipbuilding Limited	2	Liberia
Hawker Industries Limited	2	Liberia
Hawker Industries Limited	1	United Kingdom
Marine Industries Limited	2	Algeria
Marine Industries Limited	1	Cuba
Marine Industries Limited	6	France
Matsumoto Shipyard Limited	2	New Zealand
Saint John Shipbuilding & Dry Dock Co.	5	Liberia
Vancouver Shipyards Co. Ltd.	1	Bermuda

2. During these fiscal years, no subsidy was paid toward the renovation or repair of ships.

AMOUNT SPENT BY SOS IN SAULT STE. MARIE SINCE 1972

Question No. 2,798—**Mr. Symes:**

What was the total amount spent in Sault Ste. Marie from October 1972 to date by the Secretary of State Department?

Hon. John Roberts (Secretary of State): From October 1972 to July 1977, the Department of the Secretary of State spent an amount of $473,900 in Sault Ste. Marie. The sums were allocated as follows:

	Amount
Travel and Exchange 1972-1975	$ 23,000
Opportunities for youth 1972-1973	118,500
Native Citizens 1972-1977	212,185
Hostels 1972-1975	60,000
Womens Program 1972-1977	2,100
Student Community Services Program 1972-1975	58,115

EXPENDITURES—SAULT STE. MARIE

Question No. 2,804—**Mr. Symes:**

What was the total amount spent in Sault Ste. Marie from October 1972 to date by the Department of Regional Economic Expansion?

Mr. Ed. Lumley (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): The reply for the Department of Regional Economic Expansion is as follows:

October 1, 1972—March 31, 1973	$ 30,056
April 1, 1973—March 31, 1974	62,553
April 1, 1974—March 31, 1975	67,383
April 1, 1975—March 31, 1976	4,956,440
April 1, 1976—March 31, 1977	539,331
April 1, 1977—Present	0
Total	$5,655,763

Order Paper Questions

TRANSPORT—EXPENDITURES IN SAULT STE. MARIE

Question No. 2,806—**Mr. Symes:**

What was the total amount spent in Sault Ste. Marie from October 1972 to date by the Department of Transport?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): The total amount spent in Sault Ste. Marie from October 1972 to date is: $10,669,594.

EXPENDITURES—SAULT STE. MARIE

Question No. 2,807—**Mr. Symes:**

What was the total amount spent in Sault Ste. Marie from October 1972 to date by the Department of National Health and Welfare?

Hon. Marc Lalonde (Minister of National Health and Welfare): $660,754. from October 1, 1972 to May 31, 1977, the latest date for which figures are available. (Payment for benefits under the Old Age Security, Guaranteed Income Security, Spouses' Allowances, Family Allowances and Canada Pension Plan programs are recorded by province, not by municipality).

MINISTRY OF SECRETARY OF STATE (MULTICULTURALISM) EXPENDITURES

Question No. 2,809—**Mr. Symes:**

What was the total amount spent in Sault Ste. Marie from October 1972 to date by the Ministry of State (Multiculturalism)?

Hon. Joseph-Philippe Guay (Minister of State (Multiculturalism)): The amount spent in Sault Ste. Marie from October, 1972 to August, 1977 under the Multiculturalism Program totals $30,700.

EXPENDITURES—SAULT STE. MARIE

Question No. 2,812—**Mr. Symes:**

What was the total amount spent in Sault Ste. Marie from October 1972 to date by the Department of the Solicitor General?

Hon. Francis Fox (Solicitor General): Canadian Penitentiary Service and National Parole Service: Records are not kept in a manner that would enable the provision of expenditure figures by cities. Royal Canadian Mounted Police: $841,754.00 (includes both capital and law enforcement expenditures). Ministry Secretariat National Parole Board: Nil.

EXPENDITURES—SAULT STE. MARIE

Question No. 2,814—**Mr. Symes:**

What was the total amount spent in Sault Ste. Marie from October 1972 to date by the Department of Manpower and Immigration?

Hon. Bud Cullen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): The total amount spent by the department in Sault Ste. Marie from October, 1972 to date is $15,784,159.

[Mr. Lumley.]

EXPENDITURES—SAULT STE. MARIE

Question No. 2,819—**Mr. Symes:**

What was the total amount spent in Sault Ste. Marie from October 1972 to date by the Post Office Department?

Hon. J.-J. Blais (Postmaster General):

	Operating Expenditures	Capital Expenditures	Expenditures From Revenue	Total
Oct 1/72 -Mar 31/73	556,563	3,057	12,998	572,618
1973/74	1,149,243	403	29,916	1,179,562
1974/75	1,301,347	709	31,844	1,333,900
1975/76	1,611,433	2,001	35,506	1,648,940
1976/77	2,004,861	104	36,290	2,041,255
Apr 1/77 -May 31/77	371,317		7,248	378,565
Total	6,994,764	6,274	153,802	7,154,840

EXPENDITURES—SAULT STE. MARIE

Question No. 2,820—**Mr. Symes:**

What was the total amount spent in Sault Ste. Marie from October 1972 to date by the Department of National Revenue?

Hon. Monique Bégin (Minister of National Revenue): $2,603,447.

NOTE: Monthly expenditure statements are not available for the fiscal year 1972-73, therefore, included in this figure is the amount spent for the entire F/Y 1972-73 to date.

CBC—GUIDELINES FOR ALLOTMENT OF TIME FOR MPS

Question No. 2,825—**Mr. Jones:**

1. Are there guidelines laid down by the CBC for allotment of time for Members of Parliament to appear on such programmes as the *Nation's Business* and, if so, what are they?

2. Does the CBC, on such programmes as the *Nation's Business*, permit those not affiliated with any recognized political party to appear and, if not, for what reason?

3. What amount of money is allocated to the programme the *Nation's Business* for production crews, interviewers, researchers and other persons connected with it?

Hon. John Roberts (Secretary of State): I am informed by the CBC as follows: 1. CBC does not allot television time to individual members of parliament. The relevant policy reads as follows: (a) It is the policy of the corporation during the periods between election campaigns to make free time available to federal parties for political broadcasts on a national CBC network. (b) The corporation provides free network time to bona fide parties which are national in extent and which reflect a significant body of opinion throughout the country.

2. No. It is felt that only national parties should be represented on a national program. It is suggested that each party requesting time on such a program meet the following requirements: (i) Have a recognized national leader. (ii) Have a nation-wide organization established as the result of a national conference or convention. (iii) Form a group in the House of Commons under a recognized leader to whom the house has accorded privileges in the conduct of parliamentary business.

(iv) Have sought the election of candidates in at least three of the provinces and have put into the field at least one candidate for every four constituencies in the immediately preceding general election.

3. It has not been customary to require the CBC to provide such information as the costs of programs. However, the budget of "The Nation's Business" is minimal.

GRANT OF $300,000 to A.C.F.O.

Question No. 2,827—**Mr. Jones**

1. Did the French speaking Association of Ontario or the counterparts in each of the nine other provinces in Canada receive a grant of $300,000 and, if so, under what government programme?

2. Was the $300,000 for use by the Ontario Association only or was it to be divided among all ten provincial groups?

Hon. John Roberts (Secretary of State): 1. Only the French speaking Association of Ontario received such a grant of $300,000 in 1976-77. This grant was provided by the Official Language Minority Groups Directorate of the Secretary of State Department. The counterparts received grants apart from this but of a less amount.

2. The grant of $300,000 was given to the French speaking Association of Ontario for the implementation of its animation program and was not to be divided among all ten provincial groups.

PERSONNEL OF PRAIRIE REGIONAL OFFICE OF UIC

Question No. 2,833—**Mr. Ritchie:**

1. How many individuals are employed at the present time on a (a) part-time (b) full-time basis, at the Prairie Regional Office of the Unemployment Insurance Commission and the Department of Manpower and Immigration?

2. How many individuals are employed as field representatives?

3. In what locations is it proposed to establish new provincial offices for the Department of Manpower and Immigration and the Unemployment Insurance Commission in (a) Alberta (b) Saskatchewan (c) Manitoba after passage of Bill C-27 and, in each case, how many individuals will be employed as (i) full-time (ii) part-time (iii) field representative for these services?

Hon. Bud Cullen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration):

		Prairie Regional Office	
		Unemployment Insurance Commission	Department of Manpower and Immigration
1. (a) Part-time Employees		Nil	Nil
(b) Full-time Employees		210	129
2. Field Staff		(Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta Northwest Territories) 783	1628

3. Location of Canada Employment and Immigration Commission Regional Offices		Alberta NWT Region Edmonton	Saskatchewan Region Regina	Manitoba Region Winnipeg
Full-time Employees				
(i) Regional Office	(a)	159	88	142
Part-time Employees				
(ii) Regional Office	(a)	2	3	Nil
(iii) Field Staff	(a)	1,033	479	679
(a) Planned for fiscal 1977-78				

SUMMER JOB CORPS PROGRAM

Question No. 2,837—**Mr. Marshall:**

What is the breakdown of the jobs and allocation of funds, by province, under the Summer Job Corps Program implemented in 1977 and sponsored by the Department of Manpower and Immigration for (a) service (b) fisheries and marine (c) environmental protection (d) environmental management?

Hon. Bud Cullen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Summer Job Corps Program 1977 breakdown of the number of jobs and allocation of funds by province, for (a) service; (b) fisheries and marine; (c and d) environmental protection and management. See table below.

Subject: Breakdown of the jobs and allocation of funds* by the following activities

Provinces	Services # of Jobs	Services Funds	Environment Fisheries & Marine # of Jobs	Environment Fisheries & Marine Funds	Environment Protection & Management # of Jobs	Environment Protection & Management Funds
Newfoundland	140	259,585	0	0	0	0
Nova Scotia	235	477,035	53	118,004	0	0
Prince Edward Island	52	95,525	0	0	0	0
New Brunswick	211	426,412	0	0	10	23,783
Quebec*	1,112	2,181,955	7	13,601	13	31,696
Ontario	1,152	2,126,237	0	0	114	245,902
Manitoba*	327	589,191	0	0	21	54,297
Saskatchewan	292	538,628	0	0	0	0
Alberta*	286	548,775	0	0	0	0
British Columbia	717	1,389,015	0	0	0	0
North West Territories	29	64,783	0	0	7	18,244
Yukon*	61	87,422	0	0	18	44,428
Totals	4,614	8,784,563	60	131,605	183	418,350

*Figures were taken from data compiled as of the second of June, 1977.

Order Paper Questions

ORDER IN COUNCIL

Question No. 2,840—**Mr. Jones:**

1. What exactly is the purpose of the Order in Council?

2. Of the 3,327 Orders in Council in 1976, how many were brought before the House of Commons for discussion?

3. What is the general nature of the majority of Orders in Council?

4. Are Orders in Council brought before the House of Commons for discussion as general practice and, if not, for what reason?

5. Is there any government procedure which could replace the Order in Council and provide for a more democratic government?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): 1. An Order in Council is a legal instrument evidencing action by the Governor General acting by and with the advice of, or by and with the advice and consent of, or in conjunction with the Queen's Privy Council for Canada. Most Orders in Council are passed pursuant to specific authority set out in particular Acts of Parliament. A few are also made under the royal prerogative. In 1976, 3265 Orders in Council were passed pursuant to statute and 61 were passed pursuant to the royal prerogative.

2. Of the 3326 Orders in Council passed in 1976, 653 were statutory instruments within the meaning of the Statutory Instruments Act and as such stood referred to the Standing Joint Committee on Regulations and Other Statutory Instruments pursuant to section 26 of the Statutory Instruments Act.

3. Description of Orders in Council for the year 1976

	Number	Percentage
Appointments (includes re-appointments, resignations and fixing salaries)	750	22.55
Regulations and other Statutory Instruments	653	19.63
Lands and other property (includes exchanges, acquisitions, transfers to or from a Province, sales of lands under the Surplus Crown Assets Act and under the Veterans' Land Act)	481	14.46
Contracts and other agreements	289	8.70
Pardons and Revocations (under Criminal Records Act)	234	7.03
Foreign Investment Review Act	232	6.97
Payments, loans, contributions, grants and gifts	161	4.84
Remission Orders	82	2.46
Satisfied Securities	75	2.25
Judges Act, other than appointments (annuities to widows, approving residence, retirements, etc.)	55	1.65
Railways	41	1.23
Ex gratia payments	35	1.05
Other	238	7.18
Total	3,326	100.00

[Mr. Cullen.]

4. A list of Orders in Council is tabled monthly in the House of Commons. As stated in answer to part 2, those Orders in Council that constitute statutory instruments within the meaning of the Statutory Instruments Act stand referred to the Standing Joint Committee on Regulations and Other Statutory Instruments pursuant to that Act.

5. See Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms, Fourth Edition, Citation 171 (a), (b), (f), (g), (h) and (i).

MR. A. T. DAVISON OF PARKS CANADA

Question No. 2,841—**Mr. Cossitt:**

1. Did Mr. A. T. Davison of Parks Canada outline in a telex dated March 9, 1977 and sent to Mr. Mike McInnis, Chairman of the Advisory Board to the government on St. Lawrence Islands National Parks, information on grants-in-lieu of taxes to municipalities as a result of Parks Canada being involved with land contained therein and, if so (a) how are such grants-in-lieu of taxes determined (b) does the Treasury Board accept provincial assessment procedures (c) as an example, what would the grant be for 200 acres assessed at $3,000 with the local tax rate at 100 mills and the municipal tax payable being $300 per annum (d) is land considered "developed" at the start or at the completion of development (e) how is the necessary degree of development determined, who makes the decision and can it be reviewed?

2. Did Mr. Davison's telex state "it is possible in addition that the Act will be revised in the next couple of years to provide for more liberal tax grant arrangements for National Park lands. We are continuing to work with the Department of Finance on that possibility" and (a) if so, have any steps been taken as yet in this direction (b) if not, when will such steps be taken?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): I am informed by the Departments of Indian Affairs and Northern Development and Finance as follows: 1. Yes. (a) In accordance with the Municipal Grants Act as administered by the Department of Finance. (b) Property owned by the Crown in right of Canada is not taxable property, but the municipal or provincial assessor may place an assessed value for such property on the assessment roll. This valuation will be accepted by the Minister of Finance for purposes of determining the amount of a grant in lieu of real property taxes on property which is eligible for a grant provided that its amount is deemed to be fair and equitable in relation to the valuation of similar taxable property within the same assessment jurisdiction. In practice, values of federal property are most likely to be in line with those for taxable property where the municipal or provincial assessment authority has used the same "procedures", i.e., the same steps and the same methods, in placing values on federal property that it has used for taxable property. (c) If $3,000 is deemed to be a fair and equitable value for 200 acres of federal land which is subject to grant in lieu of real property taxes, the grant would be $300 per annum when computed at a local tax rate of 100 mills. Grants are based upon the full mill rate in nearly all instances. However, a lower rate would be used if the government is making separate payments for a particular local service. Thus, in a few instances, the federal government makes special arrangements to pay for the cost of schooling of children of federal employees living on federal property. In such instances, the amount of the grant would be determined

without reference to the school portion of the tax rate in order to avoid paying twice for the same service. (d) At the completion. (e) (i) Developed lands are considered as being lands acquired by Parks Canada which are being used for the purposes for which they were intended to be used, i.e., public use of the land is available in a manner compatible to the development of a national park or historic site or park. (ii) Parks Canada in consultation with the Department of Finance. (iii) Decisions on the designation of developed/undeveloped category would be open to review to ensure that decisions have been made in accordance with established guidelines upon reasonable request.

2. Yes.

TAR SANDS RESERVES

Question No. 2,842—**Mr. Brisco:**

1. What are the total known tar sands reserves in Canada?

2. How long will they last at present and predicted future rates of consumption?

Hon. Alastair Gillespie (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): The Department of Energy, Mines and Resources reports as follows:

1. It is estimated that 26.5 billion barrels of synthetic crude may be recovered from the mineable portion of the tar sands, using existing mining, upgrading technology, and under appropriate economic conditions. The extent of additional recoveries from a total resource in place of 789 billion barrels will depend on technological progress in mining and in-situ recovery methods and the extraction costs.

2. The only volumes of reserves from the tar sands, expressed in terms of recoverable upgraded synthetic oil, are those today within economic reach and the two plants now operating or under construction. This volume is 2 billion barrels; at current and projected production rates, the reserves available to these plants would last approximately 25 years.

NATURAL GAS RESERVES

Question No. 2,843—**Mr. Brisco:**

1. What are the total known natural gas reserves in Canada exclusive of the Arctic?

2. How long will they last at present and predicted future rates of consumption?

Hon. Alastair Gillespie (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): The Department of Energy, Mines and Resources reports as follows: 1. Canada's proven reserves of natural gas (exclusive of Arctic) total 61.4 trillion cubic feet.

2. The reserves noted in 1 above will provide gas supplies for many years into the future. However, the limiting factor with regard to meeting all of our required needs at any point in time is the potential rate of production rather than the size of the remaining reserves. Present estimates suggest that production rates possible from presently known reserves may fall short of meeting all Canadian needs before the mid-1980's. If production was not a limiting factor the reserves noted would meet present and projected needs for about 19 years. In making this estimate no allowance has been made for new reserves that will be found and it was assumed that: 1. There will be no change in exports, currently about 1 trillion cubic feet a year; 2. that domestic demand will increase by approximately 3 per cent a year.

OIL RESERVES

Question No. 2,844—**Mr. Brisco:**

1. What are the total known oil reserves in Canada exclusive of the Arctic?

2. How long will they last at present and predicted future rates of consumption?

Hon. Alastair Gillespie (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): The Department of Energy, Mines and Resources reports as follows: 1. Canadian proved oil reserves as of January 1, 1976 amounted to 6,474.3 million barrels, exclusive of the tar sands and related resources.

2. The reserves noted in 1 above will provide oil supplies for many years into the future. However, the limiting factor with regard to meeting all of our required needs at any point in time is the potential rate of production rather than the size of the remaining reserves. The production capacity currently available is already less than that required to meet total Canadian demand. Therefore, while the present reserves will be meeting a portion of our needs for many years into the future, that portion will be a smaller and smaller percentage of our requirements. If production was not a limiting factor the reserves noted would meet present and projected needs for approximately 12 years. This estimate is based on the assumption of an average annual rate of growth in domestic consumption of 2 percent compared to 5 percent over the past 15 years, and a complete phase-out of exports to the United States by 1981.

LAC ST. JEAN INTERNATIONAL CROSSING (SWIMMING) COMPETITION

Question No. 2,847—**Mr. Gauthier (Roberval):**

Did the Department of Manpower and Immigration (a) accept (b) carry-out projects in Roberval in connection with the Lac St. Jean International Crossing (Swimming) Competition and, if so, in each case (i) which projects (ii) in what amount, each year since the creation of the contest?

Hon. Bud Cullen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): (a) Yes. (b) Yes. (i), (ii) See list below. Subject: Breakdown of the participation of the Local Initiatives Program in the Lake St. John International Crossing (Swimming) Competition since 1974. Year 1973-74, Project 3H-4863; Title: Construction of bleachers and improvements at the finishing line of the crossing. Grant: $17,280; Year 1974-1975, Project AH-3608-9; Title: Construction of a wharf. Grant: $17,262; Year 1975-1976, Project BH-5644; Title: Cultural and sports promotion of the 22nd Crossing; Grant: $21,413; Year 1976-1977, Project CH-3695; Title: Development of grounds at the marina; Grant: $48,110.

Order Paper Questions

SUBSIDIES TO CITY OF ROBERVAL

Question No. 2,848—**Mr. Gauthier (Roberval):**

Since 1956, has the Department of Regional Economic Expansion granted subsidies to the City of Roberval for the construction of a breakwater and rampart, directly or through programmes such as the Winter Capital Projects Programme and, if so, what was the amount annually?

Mr. Ed. Lumley (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): The reply for the Department of Regional Economic Expansion is as follows: DREE was not created until April 1, 1969, and since that time the department has not provided any funds for the construction of a breakwater or rampart in Roberval.

CBC—ANNUAL CONSUMPTION OF PROCESSING AND PRINTING 16 MILLIMETER FILMS IN BRITISH COLUMBIA

Question No. 2,849—**Mr. Lee:**

From 1973 to 1977, what was the annual consumption of processing and printing services for 16 millimetre film, in terms of dollars and footage, by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation in British Columbia?

Hon. John Roberts (Secretary of State): I am informed by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation as follows: Fiscal years: 1972-73, $281,263; 1973-74, 297,465; 1974-75, 292,-426; 1975-76, 296,966; 1976-77, 338,658. These figures include other film laboratory services such as edge numbering, sound mixing and transfer. No cumulative record is maintained of film footage processed and printed, and this information cannot be extracted readily or without an inordinate amount of work, time and expense.

CNR PENSION TRUST FUND

Question No. 2,850—**Mr. McKenzie:**

1. Did the Superintendent of Insurance, in 1967, approve a 60 year period for CNR to pay off their debt to the employees' Pension Trust Fund and, if so, for what reason?

2. Was this an unusually long period of time when the Pension Benefits Standards Act required payment in full by October 1, 1967 and, if it is not, for what reason?

3. Did CNR, upon receiving permission to pay off their $671 million obligation over a period of 60 years on an amortized basis ($29,255 annually), increase the interest rate from 4 per cent to 7½ per cent thus reducing their debt to $300 million and, if so, for what reason?

4. How was the 7½ per cent interest rate arrived at?

5. Was the Superintendent of Insurance aware that the change was to be made at the time he was asked to approve the 60 year repayment period and, if not, was he subsequently informed that this change was being made and given the reasons for it?

6. What information was the Superintendent of Insurance given concerning this matter and what was his response to the CNR Pension Trust Fund?

7. Is this type of change a common occurrence or was this a unique situation?

8. Did the change create a paper surplus of $371,000,000 which would not have to be paid into the pension fund account by CNR and are the pension funds being held owned 100 per cent by employees and pensioners and, if so, did (a) the employees and pensioners receive 100 per cent of the paper surplus and, if not, for what reason (b) CNR receive any part of the paper surplus in their position as a trustee and, if so, for what reason?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): I am informed by the Departments of Finance and Transport as follows: General Comments: From the questions, it would appear that there may not be a common understanding as to the nature of funding under the Pension Benefits Standards Act. Accordingly, so that Canadian National's answers may be meaningful, its understanding is stated as follows: the term "Fully Funded", when applied to a pension plan, describes one which has assets which, with their earnings, are sufficient to provide for all pension and other benefits payable under the terms of the plan in respect of service of employees and former employees; and "Unfunded Liability" is the amount by which the assets of the plan are required to be augmented in order to make it fully funded. It follows, then, that an unfunded liability is not a fixed sum of money, but rather an estimate, prepared by independent professional actuaries, of the amount which, at a particular time, would have to be added to the trust fund in order to make that fund, together with its earnings, adequate to provide for payment of all pension benefits payable under the terms of the plan. In making such an estimate, the actuary bases his opinion upon assumptions related to life expectancies of employees and pensioners, and their spouses, anticipated earnings of the fund, the rate of inflation, and the anticipated rate of change in salary levels. Each of these factors varies, from time-to-time; at intervals of not more than three years each, a plan must be reviewed to establish, among other things, the amount of the unfunded liability arising out of a change in the actuarial methods or bases, and the experience deficiency or surplus, if any. 1. No. A sixty-year period was permitted by the Regulations for Crown corporations.

2. When the Act became effective on October 1, 1967, Crown corporations were permitted a period of sixty years to liquidate deficits that existed on October 1, 1967; other employers having pension plans subject to that Act were permitted a period of twenty-five years.

3 and 4. As at December 31, 1968, on the recommendation of its independent consulting actuaries and investment advisors, reflecting more realistically investment and wage trends, the earlier assumption with respect to investment income was revised from 4 per cent to 7½ per cent; and a 4 per cent wage inflation factor was, for the first time, built into the assumptions. The actuaries concluded that the amount of the unfunded liability of the CN pension plan, as at that date, was, in fact, approximately $300 million rather than the $671 million which had been previously estimated.

5. The Superintendent of Insurance was not aware, on October 1, 1967, of any intention to change the interest rate used to value the obligations under the pension plan. When the change was made in 1968, the Superintendent was aware of the change and was given the reasons for it.

6. Information was given to the Superintendent of Insurance concerning the rate of interest being earned on the assets in the fund and the rate of interest expected to be earned in the future in the light of investments currently being made. Discussions took place with the actuary responsible for the valuation. The choice of the interest rate to be used was the

responsibility of the actuary, not of the Superintendent of Insurance.

7. It is common to change the interest rate used in the valuation of a pension plan when the general level of interest rates is changing. It should be borne in mind that under pension plans such as that of the CNR, the pension benefits of retired employees are determined by a formula that is based on the employees' salary and years of service, not on the investment income of the fund. The contributions by employees are also fixed by a formula related to each employee's earnings: the balance of the cost is met by the employer. If interest rates rise, the employer's cost is reduced; if they fall, his costs are increased.

8. All that occurred in 1968 was a change in the estimate of the amount which would be required to liquidate the initial unfunded liability. It did not create any surplus funds or assets. Accordingly, there was no surplus to distribute or dispose of. All of the assets of the Pension Trust Fund are held in trust to provide for the payment of benefits pursuant to the terms of the CNR pension plans.

INTRANSIT WAREHOUSE IN NORTH SYDNEY

Question No. 2,854—**Mr. Jones:**

1. What is the purpose of the intransit warehouse, funded partially by the Department of Transport, recently opened in North Sydney?

2. Will the warehouse service countries other than France?

3. What are the details of the funding and operation of such a warehouse?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): 1. The purpose of the warehouse is to accommodate inbound and outbound foreign and domestic cargo shipped through North Sydney.

2. The warehouse is a public shed and as such will serve general cargo to and from any country.

3. Transport Canada funded the construction of the warehouse at a cost of $101,123.58 and will operate it as a public facility. Gateway Marine Services Ltd. of North Sydney and Armement Paturel Frères of St. Pierre et Miquelon will be the main users of the warehouse and have signed an agreement with Transport Canada regarding their use of the facility.

FEDERAL TAX ON LIFE INSURANCE POLICIES

Question No. 2,856—**Mr. Rynard:**

1. Is there a federal tax on an insurance policy of a 25 year old man, dying at age 50 for a (a) $100,000 whole life (b) $50,000 whole life (c) $50,000 term (d) $100,000 term life with wife as beneficiary (e) $200,000 term with wife as beneficiary and, if so, in each, what (i) is the tax (ii) premiums are tax deductible (iii) countries allow insurance premiums as tax deductions (iv) countries have no tax on life insurance policies?

2. Since the Government of Ontario has a two percent tax on premiums, was there any consultation with the Province before the federal tax legislation was considered?

3. What consideration, if any, was given to larger policies being written to offset the loss in value of the purchasing dollar?

4. What consideration, if any, was given to the difference in the gain or cash value or endowment proceeds to the death benefit?

5. On what basis was a death benefit considered as a cash gain over the fact that it was payment for the loss entailed by future earning power or partnership?

6. On what basis was it concluded that money borrowed on a life insurance policy was not used for investment to earn income?

7. How much consideration was given to the incentive of individual security or the individual attempting to provide for his family and his own security?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): 1. (a) A proposal introduced in the 1977 budget and incorporated in Bill C-56 will treat as income when a life insurance policy is terminated by death the amount, if any, by which the cash surrender value of the policy immediately before death exceeds the cost of the policy. The aggregate of such gains will be reduced by $10,000 if the policyholder was the person whose life was insured. In the absence of data as to the cash surrender value and the cost of the policy (generally premiums paid minus policy dividends) neither the amount to be included in income nor the tax can be determined. (b) Same as (a). (c) The proposal will only apply to cash value insurance, consequently it has no application for term insurance—the proceeds of which remain exempt from income tax. (d) Same as (c). (e) Same as (d). The tax treatment of life insurance proceeds and of companies varies from country to country and it is not possible to give a listing of the countries that allow premiums as deductions. There is a tax of one form or another, either on the policyholder or on the insurance company, in most countries.

2. No.

3. The budget proposal was designed to tax the investment income earned on a life insurance policy. This form of income will be treated as any other form of investment income. The inflation factor is recognized by the indexing of the personal income tax.

4. Only the portion of the policy proceeds that represent investment income is subject to tax. The portion of the proceeds that represent a mortality gain remains exempt from tax.

5. See answer to question 3.

6. Interest paid on a policy loan is to be treated as a premium thus serving to increase the cost of the policy and reducing the taxable gain if any. Under the existing rules if a policyholder paid interest on a policy loan, the proceeds of which were used for a purpose other than to earn income, he was not entitled to any tax relief in respect of the interest. The amendment will ensure that all policyholders who pay interest on policy loans will receive the same income tax treatment in respect of that interest.

7. See answer to question 3.

BELLEVILLE HARBOUR COMMISSIONERS—SALARIES

Question No. 2,857—**Mr. Robinson:**

What is the salary of the Belleville Harbour Commissioners?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): Chairman, $1,000—$1,250 annually; Commissioner (acting as secretary), $750—$1,000 annually; Other Commissioner, $500—$750 annually.

Order Paper Questions

COMMUNITY AIRPORT FACILITIES FUND

Question No. 2,858—**Mr. Brisco:**

For each year 1970 to 1977, what amount of federal funding was provided to the Community Airport Facilities Fund and what was the number of applications for assistance under the programme in each year?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): (a) Actual Capital Expenditures: 1970-71, 829,628; 1971-72, 932,000*; 1972-73, 1,504,697; 1973-74, 2,082,915; 1974-75, 1,126,119; 1975-76, 1,467,573; 1976-77, 1,555,899. (b) Number of Applications Received: 1970-71, 25; 1971-72, 20; 1972-73, 47; 1973-74, 41; 1974-75, 68; 1975-76, 59; 1976-77, 41; 1977-78, 18 (to July 15).

* rounded to nearest 000's.

BILINGUAL PUBLIC SERVANTS

Question No. 2,861—**Mr. McKenzie:**

1. How many bilingual public servants in departments, agencies and Crown corporations are required to use a second official language in the performance of their duties?

2. What is the total amount of compensation the government owes to such public servants who fall under the agreement that was reached with employee unions that the government would pay compensation retroactive to November 1, 1976?

3. Did the Prime Minister receive a letter dated June 21, 1977 from Mr. C. L. Lockhart, President of the Professional Institute of the Public Service of Canada, in regard to the implementation of compensation for bilingual public servants and, if so, what was the response to the letter?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): I am informed by the Treasury Board Secretariat and the Prime Minister's Office as follows: 1. For those departments and agencies for which the Treasury Board is the employer, the information recorded in the Official Languages Information System as of July 1, 1977 indicates that there were 68,643 positions identified as bilingual, or requiring the use of both official languages. Of this total, 16,253 bilingual positions were vacant and 52,390 bilingual positions were filled. Of the latter, 40,954 incumbents met the language requirements of their position.

2. The amount of compensation to be provided to qualified employees required to work in both official languages will be the subject of consultations with employee unions. These consultations are just about to begin. Consequently, the total amount owing, in meeting the commitment that payment would be made retroactive to November 1, 1976, has not yet been determined.

3. Yes. A response is being prepared. The exchange is private, but Mr. Lockhart may wish to make the reply public.

PROPANE GAS REFRIGERATORS

Question No. 2,863—**Mr. Halliday:**

1. Are propane gas refrigerators manufactured in Canada and, if so, in what locations and by whom?

2. Are there custom tariffs or other duties on the importation of such refrigerators and, if so, what are they?

[Mr. Lang.]

Mr. Hugh Poulin (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): In so far as the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce is concerned: 1. According to the Electrical and Electronics Manufacturers Association of Canada, there are no regular sized propane gas refrigerators manufactured in this country. However, the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce is aware of one company, Escort Cooler Co. Ltd., 728 Dundas East, Mississauga, Ontario, that manufactures a light weight portable refrigerator which has a capacity of 1.3 cubic feet and can be powered by propane gas, 12 volt or 110 volt electricity.

2. Tariffs on non-electric refrigerators according to Schedule A are as follows: British Preferential Tariff 20 percent; Most Favoured Nations Tariff 27½ percent; General Tariff 30 percent.

LEASED PROPERTIES IN NATIONAL CAPITAL REGION

Question No. 2,864—**Mrs. Pigott:**

1. Does the government lease properties in the National Capital Region and, if so, how many?

2. What person, agency or department is responsible for tabulating and overseeing properties leased by the government?

3. What are the annual rental costs for the new Industry, Trade and Commerce Building at 240 Sparks Street, Ottawa and what is the length of the lease?

4. In what year was final approval granted for the construction of the Building?

Hon. Judd Buchanan (Minister of Public Works): 1. Yes, 223 properties leased by Department of Public Works.

2. Department of Public Works tabulates and oversees only those properties under DPW responsibility.

3. $6,100,000. Term of lease—35 years.

4. 1974.

OTTAWA BUILDINGS—LEASES, COMMITMENTS AND PENALTIES

Question No. 2,865—**Mrs. Pigott:**

1. Will the government be required to pay any penalties for breaking office leases in Ottawa buildings in which it will leave vacant space as a result of departmental moves to Hull and, if so, what will be the approximate total amount of such penalties?

2. Is the government committed to any lease payments in the Ottawa offices to be vacated as a result of the moves to Hull beyond the date of each of the respective moves and, if so, what is the duration and annual cost of each lease commitment?

Hon. Judd Buchanan (Minister of Public Works): 1. No, the department does not plan to buy out any leases at the present time; therefore, there will be no penalties.

2. The department is not committed to any lease payments as a result of the moves to Hull. Where leases continue beyond the expected moving dates of the departments to be relocated to Hull, the vacated space will be reused by other government departments and agencies.

UNIVERSITY OF MONCTON

Question No. 2,867—**Mr. Jones:**

1. Does the University of Moncton recreational and sports facilities receive funds from the government and, if so (a) from which department (b) in what amount (c) what is the percentage of these funds in relation to the whole?

2. What steps are or have been taken to assure that there is no discrimination by reason of race, religion or language in the use of the government funded facilities?

3. Is the government aware of any discrimination in the use of the facilities in the summer of 1977 and, if so, have any corrective steps been taken?

4. Will the government continue funding where there is discrimination by reason of language?

Hon. Marc Lalonde (Minister of National Health and Welfare): 1. Yes; (a) Department of National Health and Welfare, Fitness and Amateur Sport Branch; (b) $100,000; (c) 5 per cent of total national program.

2. Funds are provided for facilities which can be used by all citizens in the area and particularly all university students enrolled in the institution concerned.

3. No.

4. There is no other contribution to be provided to University of Moncton.

UIC—KEY DATA CANADA

Question No. 2,868—**Mr. Cossitt:**

Has Key Data Canada ever made use of the Unemployment Insurance Commission's computer system in Quebec and, if so, in each case (a) on what dates (b) at what times of day (c) for what lengths of time (d) what are the names and job designations of all officials authorizing such use and specifically did Mr. Robert Kingsley, Mr. Dorval Mainville or Mr. Gabriel Beland have anything to do with the arrangements with Key Data Canada (e) what is the total sum of money paid for the use of the computer system and to whom was it paid (f) what are the names and job designations of all employees who worked overtime or otherwise for such purposes and, in each case (i) what were they paid (ii) who paid them (iii) was the money paid in cash in envelopes addressed to each employee or were cheques involved?

Hon. Bud Cullen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): The matter has been referred to the RCMP for investigation. Upon completion of the investigation the question will be answered.

REMOVAL OF FLUORESCENT LIGHTS

Question No. 2,869—**Mr. McKenzie:**

1. Were any fluorescent lights removed from the Canadian Grain Commission Building at 303 Main Street, Winnipeg, Manitoba as an energy conservation measure or for any other reason and, if so (a) how many (b) on what date (c) at what cost?

2. Were the lights disposed of and (a) if so, in what manner (b) if not, have they been stored for future use?

Hon. Judd Buchanan (Minister of Public Works): 1. Yes; (a) 3,695; (b) June 14-22, 1977; (c) $1,147.00.

2. Yes. (a) Approximately 3,600 fluorescent tubes were destroyed. These lamps had less than one year of useful life remaining, therefore would have been a net liability to the department if placed in storage and used for relamping. (b) Approximately 100 fluorescent tubes with a significant remaining useful life were retained in storage for future use.

"THE 1976 INCOME, ASSETS AND DEBT QUESTIONNAIRE"

Question No. 2,870—**Mr. Bawden:**

1. What is the purpose of the Statistics Canada questionnaire "The 1976 Income, Assets and Debt Questionnaire"?

2. (a) Is the information confidential to Statistics Canada (b) is the information distributed among various departments and, if so, which departments?

3. Are there any penalties for failing to respond to the Questionnaire and, if so (a) what are they (b) have any persons been prosecuted?

4. (a) How many questionnaires were distributed in Canada (b) how many were returned answered (c) how many persons refused to answer?

5. What procedure does the Department follow when a person refuses to answer the Questionnaire?

6. Are respondents informed that they need not answer the Questionnaire or are they told that they must answer it or face a fine or imprisonment?

7. Are any safety provisions taken by the Department to ensure that irresponsible persons do not get their hands on this very confidential and private information and, if so, what are they?

8. Do the enumerators provide evidence to the respondents as to their authority to receive the information?

9. Has the Department instituted any measures to ensure that its employees do not pass the information on to other government departments, private firms or individuals and, if so, what are they?

10. What is the total cost of the Questionnaire Programme and what is the cost per Questionnaire?

Mr. Hugh Poulin (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): Statistics Canada reports the following: 1. The only way in which factual information on incomes, assets and debts can be obtained on a confidential basis is through the Survey of Consumer Finance. Similar surveys on the asset and debt situation of Canadian families were taken in 1956, 1959, 1964 and 1970. There are strong indications that considerable changes have taken place in the financial situation of Canadians in the past seven years and a much needed update is required for policy and research purposes in many fields of government, labour and private enterprise. The results of the survey will also indicate which groups of the Canadian population are most affected by inflation. It should be noted that Statistics Canada collects income data annually through household surveys.

2. (a) Yes; (b) Government departments only receive data in a form which does not allow identification of respondents. They have no access to the original questionnaire.

3. (a) Under the Statistics Act 1971 there can be prosecutions for failure to respond to a Statistics Canada questionnaire. The maximum penalties for a breach of the Statistics Act are fine not exceeding $500 or imprisonment for a term not exceeding three months, or both. (b) In sample surveys of individuals, Statistics Canada has not found it necessary to prosecute as it is the bureau's policy to seek the voluntary cooperation of the public. This has been successful. There have been no cases of prosecution in sample household surveys.

4. (a) Questionnaires were distributed to 17,500 households across the country. (b) and (c) The final response and non-response rates to this survey have not yet been calculated since

processing procedures are still in progress. It should be noted that refusals are only one component of non-response. Other components include households in which Statistics Canada was unable to contact any member during the survey period or households which were not required to complete the survey due to special circumstances (e.g. serious illness in the household).

5. Persons who refuse to complete a questionnaire are contacted by supervising officials of the bureau. Any questions relative to the survey are answered and respondents are given a detailed explanation of the reasons why the information is being sought. These explanations usually result in completion of the questionnaire.

6. The interviewer does not inform respondents that the questionnaire need not be answered nor are they told by the interviewer they must answer it or face a fine or imprisonment.

7. The documents containing this information are held in a specially secured controlled access area, available only to employees with "a need to know" in pursuance of their duties. All these employees are sworn to secrecy under the Statistics Act with severe penalties for any breach.

8. Yes. Interviewers hold official Statistics Canada identification cards which are shown to each respondent before the interview takes place.

9. The Statistics Act provides for severe penalties on conviction of up to $1,000 fine and/or six months imprisonment for any divulgence of information by Statistics Canada staff obtained in the course of his/her duties.

10. The cost of collecting the information is estimated at $358,000 or $20 per household. Wages to temporary employees hired to carry out the survey account for a very large part of this amount.

ONE PARENT ASSISTANCE SUBSIDIES IN ABITIBI

Question No. 2,872—**Mr. Laprise:**

Since 1972, have one-parent families assistance subsidies been granted in the Constituency of Abitibi and, if so (a) how many (b) in which locations (c) of what amount, in each case?

Hon. Marc Lalonde (Minister of National Health and Welfare): In keeping with the nature of the cost-shared programs administered by the Department of National Health and Welfare under the Canada Assistance plan, information of this type would be available from provincial authorities only.

AUDITOR GENERAL'S SALARY

Question No. 2,873—**Mr. Robinson:**

What is the salary of the Auditor General?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): $60,000 per annum, effective April 1, 1977 (in accordance with Section 56(2) of the Financial Administration Act).

[Mr. Poulin.]

AIR CANADA FLIGHT TO CANADA

Question No. 2,874—**Mr. Cossitt:**

1. Did Air Canada cease operating its Sunday day-time flight to England and, if so (a) on what date (b) for what reason?

2. What was the filled seat capacity percentage during the past four years the flight was in operation?

3. Will the flight be re-established and, if so, on what date?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): The management of Air Canada advises as follows:

1. Yes. (a) October 24, 1976. (b) The day-time flight was a more costly operation than the overnight service because time differences and airport curfews made it necessary for the aircraft to layover in London during the late evening and early morning hours. Also, passenger demand on the transAtlantic routes was for wide-body aircraft and to have placed one of these aircraft on a day-time flight would have made the operation even less economical.

2. Data for this complete period is not available. However, during the last 12 months of operation the day-time flight averaged a 50% load factor.

3. There are no immediate plans to re-establish a day-time service. However, a future operation, subject to market conditions, demand and economics, cannot be precluded.

REGIMENTAL TIE

Question No. 2,880—**Mr. O'Sullivan:**

1. Do the Governor General's Footguards have a regimental tie and, if so (a) is it available for purchase to members of the regiment and at what cost (b) is it available for purchase to others and, if so, to whom?

2. Has the Post Office Department recently issued to some of its employees a tie similar to that worn as the regimental tie of the Governor General's Footguards and, if so (a) is the tie identical and, if not, what is the difference (b) what is the cost per tie to each employee (c) how many have been issued or sold to employees (d) at the time of its purchase, were departmental officials aware of the similarity of the tie to that of the Governor General's Footguards (e) has the Department had any communication from the Department of National Defence concerning the tie?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): I am informed by the Departments of National Defence and Post Office as follows: 1. Yes. (a) It is available to members of the Regiment at the regimental kitshop at $4./tie. (b) The tie can be bought by anyone at certain civilian/military tailors.

2. Since 1976, the Post Office Department has issued items of clothing to counter sales clerks consisting of maroon and blue jackets, white shirts and ties for males, and scarves for females. (a) There are two styles of ties issued: (1) Style A—three stripes running left to right. Width and colour of stripes: maroon, 1-1/8″; blue, 1-1/8″; white, 1/8″; (2) Style B—two stripes running left to right. Width and colour of stripes: maroon, 1″; blue, 1″; The Governor General's Footguards regimental tie has two stripes, maroon and navy, each 1″ wide—stripes run right to left (opposite direction to Post Office tie). There is a similarity between this tie and the Post Office tie Style B, but they are not identical. (b) Cost per tie

$1.47. Employees issued with two ties each year, one of each style. (c) Approximately 15,000 ties of each style issued. No sales. (d) Post Office officials were not aware of similarity between Style B tie and Governor General's Footguards tie when the style was originally approved. (e) No communication has taken place with the Department of National Defence concerning this tie.

GOVERNMENT AIRCRAFT

Question No. 2,881—**Mr. Reid:**

What is the government's policy on the use of government aircraft by Parliamentarians and what are the costs of such use?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): I am informed by the Departments of Transport and National Defence as follows: 1. For approximately 30 years, Transport Canada and the Department of National Defence have operated aircraft for the use of cabinet ministers of successive governments. This is part of the responsibility shared by the two departments for providing airlifts for Members of the Royal Family, the Governor General, the Prime Minister, Ministers of the Crown, foreign dignitaries visiting Canada, Parliamentary Committees, or delegations on official business and, occasionally, senior federal officials on government business. The flight operations of Transport Canada are confined mainly to the North American continent, while the Department of National Defence provides flights both within North America and overseas.

2. The cost for flying the aircraft, the number of aircraft now in service, and their passenger capacity are as follows:

	Type	No. in Service	Passenger Capacity	Operating Cost per hour 1975-76
Transport Canada	Jetstar	3	8	$553.00
	Viscount	2	22	415.00
	King Air	1	4	118.00
D.N.D.	Boeing 707	5	170	$1,241.00
	Cosmopolitan	5(7)	38	547.00
	Falcon	4	8	751.00

The hourly cost figures stated above include the incremental costs incurred by operating the aircraft, rather than leaving them idle on the ground. They therefore include the cost of fuel and oil consumed and an annually calculated hourly cost allocation covering standard prorated maintenance, repair and overhaul costs, ground handling charges and landing fees and overtime or temporary duty expenses of the crews.

3. The following table shows the time required for flights between Ottawa and different points in Canada: see below.

4. The use of government owned aircraft by ministers of the Crown has been considered by successive governments to be legitimate use of public funds. The central government of a country as large as Canada cannot rely exclusively on commercial services for the travel requirements of cabinet ministers and/or visiting foreign dignitaries. Ministers' responsibilities are not limited to the Ottawa area. They must be able, with a minimum of delay, to travel to various areas of the country to carry out those responsibilities, and frequently require travel facilities on short notice. Government owned aircraft make it possible for ministers to accept engagements in distant parts of Canada and yet to be in Ottawa for important work as late as possible before and as soon as possible after the engagement. Moreover, they allow ministers to work in privacy while travelling and, particularly for the Prime Minister and foreign dignitaries, to maintain the level of security required without causing inconvenience to the travelling public on commercial airlines (see page 8618 of *Hansard* for December 11th, 1973). Guidelines governing the use of government aircraft by cabinet ministers were first established in June, 1963, to formalize the practices generally adhered to over the previous years. These guidelines state that ministers on government business may use government aircraft: (a) when the flight is being made to a point where there is no commercial air service; where no space is available on a commercial air service; or where because of difficulties in routings or time tables, substantial savings of essential time can be made by using departmental aircraft in place of commercial service; (b) where sudden changes in plans require emergency movement; (c) in instances where ministers are travelling with official parties of some size which need to travel together and where advantage can be gained by use of a specific aircraft. In the cabinet system of government, a minister's responsibilities extend well beyond the operations of his department across the country. Ministers must meet with provincial and local government officials and with private groups to explain and develop programmes and policies. In addition, ministers have a major responsibility for ensuring that Canadians across the country remain informed about government actions, and therefore often accept speaking engagements outside Ottawa. As far as the use of government aircraft is concerned, a minister's responsibility for his political party is considered separate from his ministerial responsibilities. Naturally, however, the demands placed on a minister's time by constituency work complicate scheduling and make it all the more important that essential time not be sacrificed by inefficient travel arrangements.

5. When ministers use government aircraft, they may choose the individuals who will accompany them. In most cases these individuals are members of the minister's staff or departmental officials. However, ministers often extend invitations to members of parliament travelling to the same destination and sometimes to newspeople interested in their activities and to other individuals.

6. Ministers and members of parliament and their dependents may also be provided space on regular DND flights within Canada and to Europe with the approval of the minister.

7. Government expenditures for DND and Transport flight operations are open to the scrutiny of parliament when estimates, public accounts, and reports of the Auditor General are considered by the appropriate committees of the House.

Order Paper Questions

Ottawa	Nautical Miles	Jetstar		Viscount		King Air		Falcon		Cosma		707	
		Outbond	Return	Outbond	Return	Outbond	Return	Outbond	Return	Outbond	Return	Outbond	Return
Bagotville	265	:50	:55	1:20	1:30	1:25	1:40	1:00	1:10	1:20	1:25	1:00	1:00
Baie Comeau	403	1:15	1:20	1:45	2:00	—	—	1:15	1:25	1:40	1:50	1:15	1:20
Brandon	1059	3:00	2:35	—	—	—	—	3:10	2:40	4:15	3:40	2:45	2:30
Brantford	246	—	—	—	—	1:30	1:15	1:00	:55	1:20	1:15	—	—
Calgary	1596	* 5:25	3:40	* 8:15	* 6:40	—	—	* 5:45	* 5:10	6:15	5:20	4:00	3:40
Charlo	435	1:10	1:20	1:55	2:05	2:10	2:30	1:15	1:30	1:45	2:00	—	—
Charlottetown	532	1:35	1:50	2:15	2:35	2:25	3:00	1:30	1:55	2:00	2:25	1:30	1:35
Chatham	480	1:20	1:35	2:00	2:20	—	—	1:20	1:35	1:40	2:05	1:25	1:30
Churchill	1045	2:45	2:45	8:30	7:30	—	—	3:10	2:45	4:20	3:45	2:45	2:30
Churchill Falls	726	1:50	2:10	3:00	3:35	—	—	1:55	2:20	2:30	3:10	—	—
Cold Lake	1556	* 5:15	3:35	* 7:30	* 6:20	—	—	4:25	* 5:05	5:50	5:10	3:45	3:25
Downsview (CFB)	200	:50	:50	1:05	1:00	1:20	1:00	:55	:55	1:05	1:00	:55	:55
Earlton	243	:50	:50	1:10	1:00	1:25	1:15	1:00	1:20	1:15	1:40	—	—
Edmonton	1608	* 5:15	3:40	* 8:15	* 6:35	—	—	4:40	* 5:15	6:15	5:30	4:00	3:40
Fredericton	404	1:15	1:20	1:40	2:05	1:50	2:15	1:10	1:25	1:40	1:55	1:15	1:20
Frobisher	1115	3:10	3:10	5:30	5:30	—	—	3:05	3:25	4:10	4:10	2:45	2:45
Gander	921	2:20	2:40	3:25	4:30	—	—	2:20	2:45	3:10	3:45	2:15	2:30
Goose Bay	796	2:10	2:30	3:00	3:35	—	—	2:05	2:30	2:40	3:20	2:00	2:10
Gore Bay	309	1:05	:55	1:40	1:25	1:45	1:30	:50	1:00	1:05	1:20	—	—
Greenwood	471	1:20	1:35	1:55	2:15	2:15	2:45	1:20	1:35	1:45	2:05	1:20	1:25
Halifax	536	1:30	1:45	2:15	2:35	2:30	3:05	1:30	1:50	1:55	2:20	1:30	1:35
Hamilton	238	1:00	:55	1:15	1:05	1:30	1:15	1:00	:55	1:15	1:10	:55	:55
Inuvik	2645	* 8:45	* 6:30	* 13:30	* 12:00	—	—	**10:20	**10:00	* 9:50	7:35	—	—
Kamloops		* 5:45	5:15	* 9:30	* 7:30	—	—	* 6:20	* 5:40	7:10	6:05	—	—
Kelowna	1820	* 5:45	5:15	* 9:30	* 7:30	—	—	*. 6:15	* 5:35	7:05	6:00	—	—
Kitchener	236	—	—	—	—	1:30	1:15	1:00	:55	1:20	1:15	—	—
La Grande	507	1:30	1:30	2:20	2:20	—	—	1:40	1:40	2:10	2:10	—	—
Lethbridge	1556	* 5:10	* 4:20	8:15	6:40	—	—	* 5:45	* 5:15	6:25	5:20	3:55	3:30
London	285	1:05	1:00	1:30	1:15	1:45	1:25	1:05	1:00	1:20	1:15	1:00	1:00
Medicine Hat	1481	* 5:00	* 4:20	* 8:00	* 6:30	—	—	* 5:45	* 5:05	5:55	5:00	—	—
Moncton	482	1:25	1:35	2:00	2:20	2:15	2:45	1:20	1:35	1:45	2:10	1:25	1:30
Mont Joli	383	1:10	1:20	1:35	1:50	1:50	2:15	1:10	1:25	1:30	1:50	1:10	1:15
Montreal	81	:40	:40	:40	:45	:45	:45	:40	:35	:35	:40	:35	:35
Muskoka	166	:45	:40	1:00	:55	1:10	1:00	:50	:45	:50	:45	—	—
North Bay	173	:55	:50	1:00	:50	1:10	1:00	:50	:50	1:00	1:00	:50	:50
Prince Albert	1328	* 4:45	**4:00	* 7:00	* 5:50	—	—	* 5:25	3:35	5:25	4:40	—	—
Quebec	215	:45	:50	1:00	1:10	1:10	1:20	:55	:55	1:00	1:10	:55	:55
Regina	1233	3:30	2:55	* 6:50	* 5:30	—	—	* 5:05	3:00	5:05	4:05	3:10	2:55
Rivière du Loup	309	1:10	1:20	1:40	2:00	1:50	2:10	1:00	1:10	1:15	1:25	—	—
Roberval	269	1:05	1:15	1:10	1:25	1:25	1:40	:55	1:05	1:05	1:15	—	—
Rouyn	235	:50	:50	1:15	1:15	1:25	1:15	1:00	1:10	1:10	1:20	—	—
Sarnia	336	1:00	1:00	1:45	1:35	2:00	1:40	1:25	1:10	1:45	1:30	—	—
Saint John N.B.	430	1:15	1:20	1:45	2:00	2:05	2:25	1:15	1:25	1:35	1:55	1:15	1:20
Saskatoon	1328	3:40	3:10	* 7:00	* 5:50	—	—	5:25	3:35	5:25	4:40	3:20	3:05
Sault Ste. Marie	387	1:30	1:15	1:55	1:35	2:15	1:55	1:25	1:15	1:45	1:35	1:15	1:10
Sept-Îles	512	1:35	1:50	2:00	2:35	2:25	2:55	1:30	1:40	1:50	2:00	1:25	1:30
Sherbrooke	164	:50	:55	1:00	1:10	1:00	1:10	:50	:50	1:00	1:00	—	—
St. Catharines	203	:55	:55	1:10	1:00	1:20	1:10	1:00	:55	1:10	1:05	—	—
St. Hubert	96	:40	:40	:45	:50	:45	:50	:35	:35	:45	:40	:40	:40
Stephenville	759	2:00	2:25	2:50	2:25	—	—	1:55	2:20	2:35	3:00	1:55	2:05
Sudbury	232	:55	:55	1:15	1:10	1:30	1:15	1:05	1:00	1:10	1:10	:55	:55
Summerside	506	1:30	1:45	2:00	2:25	2:20	2:55	1:30	1:45	1:55	2:10	1:25	1:30
Sydney	663	1:45	2:05	2:45	3:20	3:00	3:45	1:45	2:10	2:25	2:45	1:45	1:55
Syracuse	140	:50	:50	1:00	1:00	1:00	1:00	:45	:45	:50	:50	:50	:50
Thunder Bay	617	1:55	1:40	2:50	2:25	3:30	2:45	2:10	1:50	2:45	2:20	1:45	1:40
Timmins	340	1:20	1:10	1:40	1:25	2:00	1:40	1:20	1:10	1:45	1:35	—	—
Norbay	976	2:30	2:50	3:40	4:40	—	—	2:35	3:00	3:30	4:00	2:25	2:35
Toronto	227	1:00	:50	1:15	1:00	1:20	1:05	:55	:55	1:05	1:00	:55	:55
Trenton	124	:40	:40	:45	:45	:55	:50	:40	:40	:50	:50	:45	:45
Trois-Rivières	141	:45	:50	:55	1:00	1:00	1:00	:45	:45	:50	:50	—	—
Val D'Or	191	:50	:50	1:00	1:00	1:15	1:05	:55	:55	1:05	1:05	1:00	1:00
Vancouver	1962	* 6:10	* 5:30	* 10:00	* 7:45	—	—	* 7:00	* 6:20	7:50	6:30	4:45	4:20
Victoria	1998	* 6:15	* 5:35	* 10:10	* 8:00	—	—	* 7:10	* 6:30	* 9:00	6:35	4:50	4:25
Whitehorse	2490	* 8:45	* 6:45	* 13:00	* 10:25	—	—	*10:05	** 8:45	*11:05	* 9:40	5:25	4:55
Windsor	360	1:15	1:05	1:50	1:40	2:20	1:55	1:20	1:10	1:40	1:30	1:10	1:10
Winnipeg	920	2:40	2:20	4:30	3:30	—	—	2:55	2:30	3:50	3:20	2:25	2:15
Yarmouth	496	1:20	1:30	2:05	2:35	2:20	2:55	1:20	1:30	1:40	1:55	1:25	1:30
Yellowknife	1860	* 6:15	* 5:25	* 10:00	* 8:00	—	—	* 7:25	* 6:25	6:35	5:30	4:05	3:45

Legend: * (each) One hour stop en route for refuelling (included in route times)

Notes: — 1. Route times include—15 min ground taxiing—appropriate wind factor applied to longer stage distances.

2. Distances shown are approximate only and will vary depending on the type of aircraft/route used.

3. The en route times provided are for guidance only; they should not be used for operational planning.

AIRCRAFT TO FREIGHT SERVICES

Question No. 2,884—**Mr. Broadbent:**

1. What is the number of DND aircraft, in the service of Air Transport Command, available to service points in (a) Northern Ontario (b) Northern Quebec (c) the Eastern Arctic?

2. How many are equipped to carry freight and, in each case, what is the type of aircraft, its load capacity and base airport?

[Mr. Goodale.]

3. What is the average number of trips per month, carrying freight, to (a) Northern Ontario (b) Northern Quebec (c) the Eastern Arctic?

4. What is the average excess capacity by weight and volume per flight (freight) to (a) Northern Ontario (b) Northern Quebec (c) the Eastern Arctic?

Hon. Barney Danson (Minister of National Defence): 1. (a), (b), (c) and 2. The Department of National Defence does not have a scheduled freight service to Northern Ontario, Northern Quebec and the Eastern Arctic. Air Transport Group has the following type and number of aircraft capable of carrying freight into Canada's northern regions. CC130 Hercules—12 at CFB Trenton and 12 at CFB Edmonton; CC115 Buffalo—5 at CFB Trenton. Load Capacities: CC130 Hercules—Normal 30,000 lbs for 2,500 miles, maximum 45,000 lbs for 1,500 miles; CC115 Buffalo—Normal 4,000 lbs for 1,400 miles, maximum 10,000 lbs for 300 miles.

3. and 4. See Part 1 and 2 above.

P.M.'S TRIP TO WESTERN CANADA

Question No. 2,885—**Mr. Cossitt:**

1. What was the cost to the taxpayer of the Prime Minister's recent trip to Western Canada during which he met with the West German Chancellor, including the cost for all those accompanying him?

2. In addition to the meeting(s) with Chancellor Schmidt, what were the other places visited and functions attended and, in each case, which were of a political nature, in whole or in part, and who was the sponsoring organization?

3. Will the Liberal Party of Canada reimburse the public treasury for all portions of the trip that were not government business and (a) if so, on what date and in what amount (b) if not, for what reason?

4. What are the names and job designations of all persons travelling with the Prime Minister on each section of his trip?

5. Of the total cost of the trip, how much was for (a) the use of government owned aircraft and other transportation (b) food and drink by the Prime Minister and for those accompanying him?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President to the Privy Council): 1. to 5. See reply to question 2,881 answered today.

CBC INTERNATIONAL SERVICE

Question No. 2,886—**Mr. Cossitt:**

Did the statement of June 1977 entitled "Touchstone for the CBC" written by CBC President A. W. Johnson make any mention of the international service of CBC and, if not (a) for what reason (b) is it considered unimportant and unworthy of comment (c) is Mr. Johnson aware that certain questions concerning the international service have remained unanswered on the *Order Paper* during the First and Second Sessions of the 30th Parliament, at least up until the date this question was asked and, if so, what are the reasons for such a situation?

Hon. John Roberts (Secretary of State): I am informed by the CBC as follows: 1. No. (a), (b) Radio Canada International is considered an extremely important component of the CBC, but by no means all the services and plans of the corporation were mentioned in "Touchstone for the CBC". It was designed as a blueprint for the domestic broadcasting services.

In so far as the Secretary of State is concerned: 1. (c) The government takes responsibility for the answers it provides to questions and for the process involved in replying to such questions. It is not appropriate therefore to provide information about internal administrative arrangements.

Order Paper Questions

STUDENT SUMMER EMPLOYMENT PROGRAM—1977

Question No. 2,887—**Mr. Marshall:**

1. With reference to the answer to Question No. 2,426, what is the breakdown, by province, of the number of students and allocation of funding for (a) reserve training (4,000 students at a planned cost of $6.029 million) (b) community assistance (1,450 students at a planned cost of $1.885 million) (c) cadet training (1,053 students at a planned cost of $2.998 million)?

2. Is KATIMAVIK a DND programme and, if not, which department is responsible for it?

Hon. Barney Danson (Minister of National Defence): 1. (a), (b) and (c); The data is presented in the following table. However, it is presented by regions rather than by provinces since actual expenditures by provinces will not be available till late October when final reports are received.

2. KATIMAVIK is administered by a private corporation formed for this purpose but funded by the government. This corporation reports to the government through the Hon. Barney Danson, Minister of National Defence.

Student Summer Employment Program 1977—By Regions

Program	Region	Number of Students		Funding
Reserves	Pacific	560		$ 844,060
	Prairie	400		602,900
	Central	1,000		1,507,250
	Eastern	1,120		1,688,120
	Atlantic	920		1,386,670
			Total	6,029,000
Community Assistance	Pacific	195		253,500
	Prairie	215		279,500
	Central	280		464,000
	Eastern	360		468,000
	Atlantic	400		520,000
			Total	1,885,000
Cadet Training	Northern	4		35,000
	Pacific	96		455,000
	Prairie	120		465,000
	Central	223		730,000
	Eastern	400		750,000
	Atlantic	210		563,000
			Total	2,998,000

NEWFOUNDLAND CROWN CORPORATION

Question No. 2,889—**Mr. Marshall:**

Have any proposals been made to the government by the Newfoundland Crown corporation established to oversee certain development aspects of its fishing industry and, if so, what are they?

Hon. Roméo LeBlanc (Minister of Fisheries and the Environment): No.

DEFOLIATION OF TREES

Question No. 2,894—**Mr. Malone:**

1. Was a Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development grant made to the Hobbema Indian Reserve, Alberta, for the defoliation of trees and, if so, what was the amount of the grant in (a) 1976 (b) 1977?

2. How many acres of trees were to be defoliated?

3. What chemical was to be used in the defoliation?

4. What risks or potential risks to the health of animals or humans can occur with such defoliation chemical?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): I am informed by the Departments of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, Agriculture and National Health and Welfare as follows:

1. The Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development did not grant any funds to the Hobbema Indian reserve for the defoliation of trees in 1976 and 1977. This particular program was funded by the Montana Band (40 per cent) and the Province of Alberta (60 per cent).

2. Approximately 100 acres were defoliated.

3. The chemical used was 2-4D-20 Ester.

4. The Department of Agriculture is not aware of any risks or potential risks to the health of animals that might arise from the use of 2-4-D Ester when used in accordance with directions carried on labels registered under the authority of the Pest Control Products Act. In so far as the Department of National Health and Welfare is concerned: This chemical is the commonly used one in many products available in garden stores and plant nurseries. The pharmacology is not well characterized. Both the acute and chronic toxicities to laboratory animals are low, and there seems to be no significant difference between 2-4-D and its various salts and esters in terms of their action and potency. All animal species tested react similarly, and the acute oral LD50 value is in the range of 300 to 700 mg. per kg. (LD50 is the lethal dose that kills 50 percent of laboratority animals). Clinical reports of poisoning are rare. Peripheral neuropathy has been described in elderly patients who had percutaneous absorption of the spilled chemical. This condition has not been reported among persons occupationally exposed.

MANITOBA INSTITUTE OF MANAGEMENT

Question No. 2,895—**Mr. Beatty:**

1. As of July 13, 1977, was the Chairman of the Farm Credit Corporation a director of the Manitoba Institute of Management and, if not, on what date did he resign his directorship?

2. Did the Chairman of the Farm Credit Corporation sign a Declaration and Promise of Fidelity and Secrecy stating, in part, that he "will not hold an outside office or employment that could place on (him) demands inconsistent with (his) official duties or call in question (his) capacity to perform those duties in an objective manner," that he "will not hold directorships in associated or non-associated commercial corporations without the prior consent, in writing, of the Chairman of the Corporation whether or not such directorships are remunerated" and that he "will not accept or offer or agree to accept from a person having dealings with the Corporation, a commission, reward, advantage or benefit of any kind directly or indirectly by (himself) or through a member of (his) family or through anyone for (his) benefit, unless (he has) prior consent in writing from the Chairman of the Corporation; and (he is) aware that such action by an official or an employee of the government is an offence under Section 110(1)(c) of the Criminal Code" and, if so, on what date?

3. Did the Director of the Farm Credit Corporation, since his appointment, receive any commission, rewards, advantages or benefits from the Manitoba Institute of Management and, if so (a) on what date and in what form (b) did he disclose the information to the Minister of Agriculture or the Board of Directors of the Farm Credit Corporation (c) were such benefits received with the approval in writing of the (i) Minister of Agriculture (ii) Board of Directors of the Farm Credit Corporation?

[Mr. Malone.]

4. What are the regulations concerning the disclosure of outside directorships held by Order-in-Council appointees to the Ministers to whom they report and on what date did the Chairman of the Farm Credit Corporation first report his directorship with the Manitoba Institute of Management to the Minister of Agriculture?

Hon. E. F. Whelan (Minister of Agriculture): Farm Credit Corporation advises: 1. Yes.

2. No. The Declaration and Promise of Fidelity and Secrecy applies to employees of the corporation. As a governor in council appointee, Dr. Kristjanson is in compliance with the guidelines for such appointees. On December 18, 1973, the Prime Minister informed the House that persons appointed by the governor in council to senior positions in Crown corporations are subject to the same general guidelines, including those concerning outside directorships, as members of the cabinet. The guidelines for cabinet members were outlined to the House on July 18, 1973.

3. No. (a)(b)(c) N/A.

4. The Minister of Agriculture was informed on September 10, 1975.

ATOMIC ENERGY OF CANADA LIMITED—PAYMENTS TO AGENTS

Question No. 2,896—**Mr. Lawrence:**

For the fiscal year (a) 1974-75 (b) 1975-76 (c) 1976-77, how much did Atomic Energy of Canada Limited pay to (i) the Marubeni Corporation, Japan (ii) the Labkar Company Limited, Iran (iii) Roberto L. Lannes, Uruguay (iv) Kostas Karayannis, Greece, as an agent and what was the purpose of and services rendered for such payments?

Hon. Alastair Gillespie (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Atomic Energy of Canada Limited reports as follows:

	(a) 1974-75	(b) 1975-76	(c) 1976-77
Marubeni Corporation, (i) Japan	$86,484.75	$91,528.55	$64,384.84
Labkar Company (ii) Limited, Iran	4,830.16	38,831.24	2,993.60
Roberto L. Lannes, (iii) Uruguay	968.00	7,673.23	12,026.36
Kostas Karayannis, (iv) Greece	16,035.77	5,003.07	2,107.70

Payments to the agents in question represent commissions on sales of equipment and products relating to the medical and therapeutic application of ionizing radiation, principally for the treatment of cancer. The payments also comprise remunerations for their maintenance of capability and their responsibility to provide installation and servicing of the equipment sold while warranties are in force.

GOLDEN ARC PUBLISHING LTD.

Question No. 2,897—**Mr. O'Sullivan:**

1. Was a letter received by Sport Canada dated January 14, 1975, addressed to Dr. T. R. Bedecki, Director, from the honourable Member for Hamilton-Wentworth, enquiring as to the possibility of assistance for the continued

publication of equestrian journals published by Golden Arc Publishing Ltd., Ancaster, Ontario and was a reply sent and, if not, for what reason?

2. Was a letter received by the (a) Secretary of State (b) Minister of Agriculture dated January 14, 1975, from the honourable Member for Hamilton-Wentworth, enquiring as to the possibility of assistance for the continued publication of equestrian journals by Golden Arc Publishing Ltd., Ancaster, Ontario and, in each case, did the reply indicate that such assistance was available under existing government programmes, either under the Department or programmes known to the Minister?

3. Has the Young Canada Works Programme funded the equestrian publication *Equipoise* in Hamilton, Ontario and, if so (a) how much was the grant (b) did the conditions of the grant allow the publication to accept and run advertisements free of charge in competition with privately published equestrian magazines?

4. How does the government reconcile the funding of an equestrian publication such as *Equipoise* with its refusal to assist the continued publication of other equestrian magazines such as those published by Golden Arc Publishing Ltd.?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): I am informed by the Minister of State (Fitness and Amateur Sport), the Department of the Secretary of State, Agriculture and Employment and Immigration as follows: 1. Yes; a reply was sent to Golden Arc Publishing Ltd., on February 13, 1975.

2. (a) A letter dated January 14, 1975 from Mr. S. O'Sullivan, member for Hamilton-Wentworth was received by the former Secretary of State, the Hon. J. Hugh Faulkner. In reponse to Mr. O'Sullivan's query regarding the possibility of assistance for Golden Arc Publishing Limited, the Secretary of State replied on February 17, 1975 that aid to publishing ventures was available under the auspices of the Canada Council, but that such aid was limited to periodicals of either a literary, artistic or scholarly nature. It was suggested, therefore that a representative of Golden Arc Publishing Limited contact officials of the council to discuss the nature of the assistance available. Officials of the Canada Council advise that they were never approached in this regard. (b) Yes, the letter was received. The reply prepared by the department advised that Agriculture Canada has no program to provide financial assistance to the publishing industry. The reply further advised that the Canada Council administers a broad program of aid to the publishing industry of Canada.

3. Yes. (a) The project was funded for $8,265. (b) The publication may accept and run advertisements free of charge.

4. The Fitness and Amateur Sport Branch has not funded either the equestrian publication, "Equipoise", nor the equestrian journals published by Golden Arc Publishing Ltd. Neither the Secretary of State's department nor the Canada Council have funded the equestrian publication entitled "Equipoise."

GRANT AWARDED TO ENGLISH MINORITY IN THE PROVINCE OF QUEBEC

Question No. 2,898—**Mr. Jones**

Was a grant awarded to the English minority in the Province of Quebec similar to that recently awarded to *La Société Franco-Manitobaine* St. Boniface, Manitoba under the Official Language Minority Groups Directorate, Secretary of State Department and, if so, in what amount and to whom?

Hon. John Roberts (Secretary of State): Yes. Grants, totalling $93,875, were awarded to the English minority in the Province of Quebec as follows:

	1976-77
Quebec Farmer's Association	$20,100
Committee for Anglophone Social Action	36,775
Anglo-Québec en mutation	25,000
Pontiac Social Planning Council	12,000

DEPARTMENT OF NATIONAL DEFENCE TRAINING

Question No. 2,900—**Mr. Jones:**

Are there any provisions for the training of personnel to work in the new $3 million isolation unit to be built in Ottawa and, if so, what is the length and nature of the training programme?

Hon. Barney Danson (Minister of National Defence): The Department of National Defence has formulated a training plan that calls for continuous part-time training of sufficient numbers of doctors, nurses, medical assistants, X-Ray and laboratory technicians, and maintenance and housekeeping staff, to ensure rapid activation of the facility whenever needed. The plan calls for a small cadre of full-time supervisory and training personnel to develop and perfect the techniques necessary for effective nursing while maintaining absolute isolation of highly infective cases. These techniques are based on recent experience using presently available, less sophisticated equipment, and the experience of others in the U.S.A. and the U.K. The present training concept is to develop a basic course of several weeks duration for the large number of hospital staff potentially needed for full operation of the unit, to be followed by the periodic short refresher courses.

SALARIES OF CFDC OFFICIALS

Question No. 2,901—**Mr. Robinson:**

What is the salary of the (a) Executive (b) Director (c) Chairman (d) Vice-Chairman (e) board members of the Canadian Film Development Corporation?

Hon. John Roberts (Secretary of State): I am informed by the Canadian Film Development Corporation as follows: (a) Not applicable; (b) Director: $31,500 to $41,500; (c) Chairman: $150.00 per working day, maximum $25,000 per annum; (d) Vice-President: $125.00 for each day on which he attends a meeting, or per working day when acting in absence of chairman; (e) Members: $125.00 for each day on which they attend a meeting.

RETURN REPLY CARD ER-2-7 "LET'S TALK BUSINESS"

Question No. 2,903—**Mr. McKenzie:**

1. Did the Industrial Incentives Branch of the Department of Regional Economic Expansion commence use of the return reply card ER-2-7 titled "Let's Talk Business" and, if so (a) on what date (b) in what publications has it appeared and (i) on what dates (ii) at what cost?

2. Since its first appearance, how many responses have been received?

Order Paper Questions

Mr. Ed. Lumley (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): The reply for the Department of Regional Economic Expansion is as follows: 1. The Industrial Incentives Branch of the Department of Regional Economic Expansion is using the return reply card ER-2-7 titled "Let's Talk Business" (a) which was first placed in service on July 10, 1977; (b) for use in Air Canada's in-flight publication "En Route"; (i) the July-August 1977 issue only; (ii) at a cost of $2200.00.

2. The responses to the insert in the July/August 1977 issue of "En Route" are only beginning to arrive. As of July 31 eleven reply cards had been received. A previous insert in the December 76/January 77 issue of "En Route" resulted in 337 responses.

MRS. DEBORAH A. PAGE-DICK

Question No. 2,904—**Mr. Cossitt:**

1. Did Corporal Wayne Schmiller of the RCMP conduct an investigation of Mrs. Deborah A. Page-Dick and, if so (a) did he represent the Security Division (b) what was the purpose of the investigation (c) did Corporal Schmiller advise those he interviewed that the purpose of the investigation was that Mrs. Page-Dick had applied for a government position (d) was the investigation carried out approximately four months after Mrs. Page-Dick had actually left the Public Service?

2. Did Mrs. Page-Dick leave the Public Service on November 16, 1976?

3. What is a full explanation of the apparent infringement of the private rights of a citizen by this investigation?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): I am informed by the Departments of the Solicitor General and Manpower and Immigration as follows: 1. Yes. (a) Yes. (b) The investigation was conducted in response to an official request from the Department of Manpower and Immigration because Mrs. Page-Dick required a security clearance. (c) Yes. (d) Security screening enquiries were initiated in July 1976 and were terminated in March 1977 upon notice being received from the Department of Manpower and Immigration that Mrs. Page-Dick was no longer in its employ.

2. No. Mrs. Page-Dick left the Public Service on December 2, 1976.

3. See answer to Part 1(d).

SALARIES

Question No. 2,907—**Mr. Robinson:**

What is the salary of the (a) Executive (b) Director (c) Chairman (d) Vice-Chairman (e) board members of the Canadian International Development Agency?

Mr. Fernand E. Leblanc (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State for External Affairs): These positions do not exist in the Canadian International Development Agency and therefore the question is not applicable.

[Mr. McKenzie.]

DISPOSAL OF CANADIAN STAMP IN CANADA

Question No. 2,909—**Mr. Gillies:**

1. Did the Post Office Department or any other agency under the direction of the Department, within the past eighteen months dispose of a quantity of Canadian stamps in Canada at less than face value and, if so (a) what issues were involved (b) at what price, relative to face value, were they sold (c) what was the total price?

2. Were the stamps sold by public tender and, if so, how were bids obtained?

Hon. J.-J. Blais (Postmaster General): 1. Yes; (a) 12 Olympic Stamps were involved. (b) The stamps were sold in bulk for $3.15 which was $1.85 below their face value. They formed part of an Olympic Souvenir Stamp Case and were affixed to a panel embedded in the lid of the case. The Olympic Souvenir Stamp Case was sold to generate revenue in financial support of the 1976 Summer Olympics. Toward the end of 1976 when it was realized there would be a surplus inventory of the case, bulk sales at a special price were authorized to sell-off this inventory and to thereby maximize net revenues to be credited to the Olympics. (c) $155,600.

2. No

SOLAR ENERGY SOCIETY OF CANADA

Question No. 2,910—**Mr. Gauthier (Roberval):**

1. Is the Solar Energy Society of Canada incorporated and, if so, what are the names of the directors?

2. (a) What are the Society's source of funds (b) has the government made grants to the Society and, if so, in what amount each year since its incorporation?

3. To date, what are the Society's achievements?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): I am informed by the National Research Council and the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources as follows: 1. The Solar Energy Society of Canada was incorporated in Winnipeg, Manitoba on the October 18, 1974, as a non-profit corporation under part 3 of the Manitoba Companies Act. The society is managed by a 12 member board of directors which are nominated and elected. Detailed business is performed by a "Winnipeg Executive" which is comprised of members of the board: the Chairman and/or Vice-Chairman, the Secretary, the Treasurer (Vice-Chairman Finance) and the Chairman of the Editorial Board. The minutes of the meetings of the Winnipeg Executive are circulated to all members of the board and decisions on important items are made by letter ballot or approved at full board meetings. There are 15 Chapters and 6 regions; British Columbia, Prairie, Ontario, Quebec, New Brunswick and Newfoundland. A regional director who is a member of the board coordinates the activities in each region. Directors of the Solar Energy Society of Canada Incorporated: Prof. Peter J. Catania Director, Prairie Region; Doug Lorriman, Director, Ontario Region; Prof. Ray Chant, Chairman of the Board Director, Chapters; Ernest Robertson, Vice-Chairman, Director, Government Relations; Dr. Henry Flynn, Director, Energy Economics; Edward A. Speers, Treasurer, Vice-Chairman, Finances; Robert Gemmel, Secretary; Prof. Robert K. Swartman, Director, Programmes; Erich Hoffmann, Director, Pacif-

ic Region; Prof. John D. Welch, Director, Membership, Chairman, Editorial Board; Tom Lawand, Director, International Affairs, Past Chairman; Gerry Wright, Co-ordinator, 1977 SESCI, Conference; Jacques Beaudet, Director, Quebec Region; Bryan Cook, Director, Government Liaison; Dr. Jim Bolton, Director, Science and Technology, Chairman, Resolutions Committee; Fred Hamilton, Associate Director; Jim Collins, Director, Public Relations; Prof. Verne Ireton, Director, Atlantic Region; Dr. Alan D. Robb, Director, Newfoundland Region.

2. (a) The society has three sources of funds, a $10 annual registration fee, corporate memberships of $250 for industry and the profits of the sale of 12 periodicals. On a local level, each chapter has a minimal annual fee and to supplement this, other activities are carried out such as selling books on solar heaters, houses, etc. In addition to this, half of the corporate membership goes to the local chapter in the region in which the industry is located. (b) The Department of Energy, Mines and Resources has made one grant of $35,400 to the society to help defray its operations. There have been also some grants made for conferences; both Central Mortgage and Housing and the Division of Building Research of the National Research Council made grants of $2,500 to the society for publishing the proceedings of the "Potential of Solar Energy for Canada" conference which was held in Ottawa in June of 1975. A $2,400 grant was also made by the National Research Council for the "Sharing the Sun '76" conference which was held in Winnipeg in August, 1976. The department of industry and commerce of the Manitoba government made a grant of $5,000 to the society for this conference as well.

3. Besides being a means of creating a public awareness of the utilization of solar energy in Canada, the Conferences held by the society have served to create government interest in solar energy. This in turn will hopefully lead to increased government expenditure on research in the area of solar energy. In particular, the joint conference of the American section of the International Solar Energy Society and SESCI: "Sharing the Sun '76", which was held in Winnipeg in August, 1976 brought an awareness of international developments to the attention of the various levels of the government in Canada. Another major accomplishment of the Winnipeg conference was that the wide range of technical and policy papers which were presented have been outlined in 10 volumes of proceedings. These volumes constitute a very comprehensive documentation of the international status of solar energy. The chapters have concentrated on the dissemination of information on solar energy to the public by means of public meetings, extra copies of their newsletters, etc. With the same purpose in mind, chapter members have also given courses and lectures on such topics as the construction of your own solar water heater. A course such as this was given at Ryerson last year. The London chapter held a picnic where all the food was cooked on solar cookers and a contest was held by the B.C. chapter for the best solar collector designs. These are just two examples of some of the novel activities which were carried out by the individual chapters.

AMOUNT SPENT IN KOOTENAY WEST

Question No. 2,911—**Mr. Brisco:**

What is the best estimate of the amount spent by the Department of Communications in the Constituency of Kootenay West from (a) 1968 to 1974 (b) 1974 to date?

Mr. Ross Milne (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Communications): The answer to the above question is "Nil".

AMOUNT SPENT BY DREE IN KOOTENAY WEST

Question No. 2,914—**Mr. Brisco:**

What is the best estimate of the amount spent by the Department of Regional Economic Expansion in the Constituency of Kootenay West from (a) 1968 to 1974 (b) 1974 to date?

Mr. Ed. Lumley (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): The reply for the Department of Regional Economic Expansion is as follows: The estimated expenditures by the Department of Regional Economic Expansion in the constituency of Kootenay West by departmental program are: (a) for the period April 1, 1969, to March 31, 1974: ARDA $118,898, RDIA $618,625; (b) for the period April 1, 1974, to July 20, 1977: Special ARDA $8,048, RDIA $1,154, 760.

EXPENDITURES—KOOTENAY WEST

Question No. 2,915—**Mr. Brisco:**

What is the best estimate of the amount spent by the Department of Fisheries and the Environment in the Constituency of Kootenay West from (a) 1968 to 1974 (b) 1974 to date?

Hon. Roméo LeBlanc (Minister of Fisheries and the Environment): The amount spent by the Department of Fisheries and the Environment in the constituency of Kootenay West from (a) 1968 to 1974 is $2,472,900; (b) 1974 to present is $2,184,000.

AMOUNT SPENT BY DEPARTMENT OF SUPPLY AND SERVICES IN KOOTENAY WEST

Question No. 2,916—**Mr. Brisco:**

What is the best estimate of the amount spent by the Department of Supply and Services in the Constituency of Kootenay West from (a) 1968 to 1974 (b) 1974 to date?

Hon. Jean-Pierre Goyer (Minister of Supply and Services): The department maintains records by cities and provincial boundaries and not by constituency boundaries.

EXPENDITURES—CONSTITUENCY OF KOOTENAY WEST

Question No. 2,917—**Mr. Brisco:**

What is the best estimate of the amount spent by the Department of the Solicitor General in the Constituency of Kootenay West from (a) 1968 to 1974 (b) 1974 to date?

Hon. Francis Fox (Solicitor General): Royal Canadian Mounted Police: (a) $6,890,412 for the years 1969/70 to

1974/75. No records are available for the year 1968/69. (b) $4,856,888 for the fiscal years 1975/76 and 1976/77. Ministry Secretariat, Canadian Penitentiary Service and the National Parole Service, National Parole Board: Nil.

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS EXPENDITURES IN KOOTENAY WEST

Question No. 2,918—**Mr. Brisco:**

What is the best estimate of the amount spent by the Department of Public Works in the Constituency of Kootenay West from (a) 1968 to 1974 (b) 1974 to date?

Hon. Judd Buchanan (Minister of Public Works): (a) The amount of money spent by the Department of Public Works from its own appropriations from April 1, 1971 to March 31, 1974 was $878,708. A total of $1,180,485 was spent by the Department of Public Works on behalf of other government departments. (b) The amount of money spent by the Department of Public Works from its own appropriations from April 1, 1974 to June 30, 1977 was $1,002,930. A total of $783,352 was spent by the Department of Public Works on behalf of other government departments. Information for the period prior to April 1, 1971 is unavailable as the government's Record Disposal Policy requires financial information to be retained for a period of six years only.

EXPENDITURES OF DEPARTMENT IN KOOTENAY WEST

Question No. 2,921—**Mr. Brisco:**

What is the best estimate of the amount spent by the Department of National Health and Welfare in the Constituency of Kootenay West from (a) 1968 to 1974 (b) 1974 to date?

Hon. Marc Lalonde (Minister of National Health and Welfare): The schedule below lists only those grants and contributions which are clearly identifiable as belonging to this Constituency:

	(a) 1968-74	(b) 1974-77
Fitness and Amateur Sport Program		
Grants-in-aid to student athletes	$10,000	$ 2,400
Social Service Programs		
New Horizons-Contributions toward projects aimed at providing opportunities for people retired from the labour force to help themselves, other Canadians and the community	$86,511	$112,525
Family Planning—Grants to assist in the development of provincial, municipal and voluntary services and for specific projects in this area.		$150,000
	$96,511	$264,925

AMOUNT SPENT BY NATIONAL MUSEUMS IN KOOTENAY WEST

Question No. 2,922—**Mr. Brisco:**

What is the best estimate of the amount spent by the National Museums Corporation in the Constituency of Kootenay West from (a) 1968 to 1974 (b) 1974 to date?

[Mr. Fox.]

Hon. John Roberts (Secretary of State): I am informed by the National Museums: The Museum Assistance Programmes, since their inception in 1972, have awarded grants totalling $145,700 to the Kootenay Doukhobor Historical Society National Exhibition Centre in the Constituency of Kootenay West. (a) In the 1973-74 fiscal year, a grant of $100,000 (under the Capital Assistance Programme) was awarded to the Kootenay Doukhobor Historical Society National Exhibition Centre to assist the construction of the National Exhibition Centre facility. (b) from 1974 to date, three grants totalling $45,700 have been awarded the Kootenay Doukhobor Historical Society National Exhibition Centre, as follows: 1976-77: $20,000 under the Core-Funding Assistance Programme; 1977-78: $20,000 under the Core-Funding Assistance Programme; $5,700 under the Special Activities Assistance Programme; total $45,700.

POST OFFICE EXPENDITURES IN KOOTENAY WEST

Question No. 2,923—**Mr. Brisco:**

What is the best estimate of the amount spent by the Post Office Department in the Constituency of Kootenay West from (a) 1968 to 1974 (b) 1974 to date?

Hon. J.-J. Blais (Postmaster General): The Post Office Department does not keep records of expenditures by electoral constituencies.

CBC—AMOUNT SPENT IN KOOTENAY WEST 1968 TO DATE

Question No. 2,924—**Mr. Brisco:**

What is the best estimate of the amount spent by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation in the Constituency of Kootenay West from (a) 1968 to 1974 (b) 1974 to date?

Hon. John Roberts (Secretary of State): I am informed by the CBC as follows: (a) $548,118, (b) $710,027.

EXPENDITURES IN CONSTITUENCY OF KOOTENAY WEST

Question No. 2,925—**Mr. Brisco:**

What is the best estimate of the amount spent by the Department of Transport, in respect of (a) air (b) water (c) rail (d) road transportation, including subsidies recommended by the Canadian Transport Commission in the Constituency of Kootenay West from (i) 1968 to 1974 (ii) 1974 to date?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): (a) (i) 368,148, (ii) 1,388,145; (b) (i) nil, (ii) nil; (c) (i) nil, (ii) nil; (d) (i) nil, (ii) nil.

EXPENDITURES—KOOTENAY WEST

Question No. 2,926—**Mr. Brisco:**

What is the best estimate of the amount spent by the Department of Manpower and Immigration, including expenditures under (a) LIP (b) Canada Works and Young Canada Works (c) other job creating programmes in the Constituency of Kootenay West from (i) 1968 to 1974 (ii) 1974 to date?

Hon. Bud Cullen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): (i) (a) $1,029,342; (b) N/A; (c) not available; (ii) (a) $1,581,-

899; (b) $303,085; (c) $225,283 (OFY, LEAP, and Summer Job Corps).

IMPORT PERMITS—EGGS

Question No. 2,929—**Mr. Beatty:**

1. How many different companies received import permits for eggs during the period January 1, 1976 to May 31, 1977?

2. During the same period, how many import permits were issued to each company?

3. What was the quantity of eggs imported by each company during the period?

Mr. Hugh Poulin (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): 1. There were 188 companies issued with import permits to import eggs into Canada during the period January 1, 1976 to May 31, 1977.

2. In view of the commercial confidentiality that is attached to permits issued to import goods listed on the Import Control List, it is not possible to divulge how many import permits were issued to each company to import eggs during the period January 1, 1976 to May 31, 1977. However, during the same period, a total of 330 permits were issued to 188 companies.

3. A total of 655,560 boxes, containing 15 dozen of eggs each, were authorized for importation into Canada during the same period.

DISCUSSIONS WITH PUBLIC SERVICE ALLIANCE REGARDING MOVES FROM NATIONAL CAPITAL REGION

Question No. 2,931—**Mr. Darling:**

1. Were discussions held with the Public Service Alliance of Canada prior to the date that moves were announced from the National Capital Region of the (a) Unemployment Insurance Commission, Annuities and Central Index Units to Bathurst, New Brunswick (b) Department of Supply and Services (i) Superannuation Division to Moncton, New Brunswick (ii) Cheque Redemption Control Division to Matane, Quebec (c) Department of Veterans Affairs, Pension Commission Board *et al* to Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island (d) Department of National Revenue, Taxation Data Centre to (i) St. John's, Newfoundland (ii) Chicoutimi-Jonquière, Quebec (iii) Shawinigan, Quebec (iv) Winnipeg, Manitoba (v) Surrey, British Columbia (e) Department of the Environment, Canadian Hydrographic Service to (i) Victoria, British Columbia (ii) Burlington, Ontario (iii) Quebec City (iv) Dartmouth, Nova Scotia and, if so, what were such discussions?

2. Were discussions held in relation to the moves with the (a) local governments in the cities (b) provincial governments in the provinces to which such units will move, prior to the date the moves were announced and, if so, in each case, what were such discussions?

Hon. Robert K. Andras (President of the Treasury Board): 1. Discussions were held with the Public Service Alliance of Canada either at the national level or component level prior to the date of the relocation announcement of the government units listed in Part 1 of question 2,931. Discussions were held on such matters as the number of staff-years to be relocated, the identity of the work unit to be relocated, the name of the receiving community, the expected date of the relocation, and/or the expected date of the public announcement.

2. Discussions with the local and provincial governments were not held prior to the dates the relocations were announced.

SALARIES OF CANADIAN PATENTS AND DEVELOPMENT LIMITED

Question No. 2,933—**Mr. Robinson:**

What is the salary of the (a) Executive (b) Director (c) Chairman (d) Vice-Chairman (e) board members of Canadian Patents and Development Limited?

Hon. James Hugh Faulkner (Minister of State for Science and Technology): In so far as Canadian Patents & Development Limited is concerned: (a) General Manager Salary range $33,750—$38,750; (b) N/A; (c) N/A; (*d*) N/A; (*e*) N/A.

SALARY OF EXECUTIVE OFFICERS—CANADIAN PENITENTIARY SERVICE

Question No. 2,936—**Mr. Robinson:**

What is the salary of the (a) Executive (b) Director (c) Chairman (d) Vice-Chairman (e) board members of the Canadian Penitentiary Service?

Hon. Francis Fox (Solicitor General): The titles and salary range of the Canadian Penitentiary Service Senior Management Group are as follows:

Title	Salary Range
Commissioner	$41,000—$54,000
Deputy Commissioner Inmate Programs	$33,300—$46,300
Deputy Commissioner Operational Services	$33,300—$46,300
Deputy Commissioner Security	$33,300—$46,300
Director General Medical Services	$37,500—$52,300
Director General Human Resources	$29,000—$40,800
Regional Directors (5)	$29,000—$40,800

DEMPSTER HIGHWAY PROJECT

Question No. 2,942—**Mr. Nielsen:**

1. Was the Eagle River Bridge Construction property destroyed upon completion of the Dempster Highway project this year?

2. Was any government property burned or otherwise destroyed at that time and (a) if so, for what reason was the property disposed of in this manner (b) if not, in what manner was the property disposed of upon completion of the project?

3. What was the original landed cost of such property at the Camp Site?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): I am informed by the Departments of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, National Defence and Public Works as follows: 1 and 2. All DIAND property was retained by the department except the bridge steel cartes and miscellaneous construction items which were turned over to the Yukon government's department of public works for maintenance on the Dempster Highway. Property used by DND on this project was returned to DND stocks or to DPW for their use or disposal except the scrap wood and the incomplete shell of a prefabricated building which were

disposed of by burning as they could not be economically recovered from the site. DPW property was assigned to Crown Assets for disposal.

3. The original landed cost is not known as most of the equipment on site was obtained from the Department of National Defence at the time of the turn-over of the Alaska Highway in 1964.

FISCAL YEAR EXPENDITURES FOR WESTERN PROVINCES SINCE 1968

Question No. 2,945—**Mr. Epp:**

1. What was the amount of spending by the Department of Manpower and Immigration in (a) Canada (b) British Columbia (c) Alberta (d) Saskatchewan (e) Manitoba in the year (i) 1968 (ii) 1969 (iii) 1970 (iv) 1971 (v) 1972 (vi) 1973 (vii) 1974 (viii) 1975 (ix) 1976?

2. For each of the same years, what percentage was spent in Western Canada?

Hon. Bud Cullen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration):

($000's)

	1970-71	1971-72	1972-73	1973-74	1974-75	1975-76	1976-77
1. Expenditures Under Operating Budget							
Canada	94,440	110,446	132,983	154,775	200,263	228,382	257,605
British Columbia/Yukon	9,164	10,827	12,814	14,717	19,722	21,277	24,718
Alberta/Northwest Territories	3,659	4,192	4,916	5,681	8,280	9,287	10,748
Saskatchewan	1,914	2,125	2,737	3,219	4,569	4,310	5,228
Manitoba	4,247	5,076	6,282	7,458	9,662	10,486	11,789
	18,984	22,220	26,749	31,075	42,233	45,360	52,483
2. Percentage Spent in Western Canada	20.1%	20.1%	20.1%	20.1%	21.1%	20.4%	19.9%

NOTE: Expenditures are not available prior to 1970-71.

DREE SPENDING IN WESTERN CANADA

Question No. 2,946—**Mr. Epp:**

1. What was the amount of spending by the Department of Regional Economic Expansion in (a) Canada, (b) British Columbia, (c) Alberta, (d) Saskatchewan, (e) Manitoba in the year; (i) 1968 (ii) 1969 (iii) 1970 (iv) 1971 (v) 1972 (vi) 1973 (vii) 1974 (viii) 1975 (ix) 1976?

2. For each of the same years, what percentage was spent in Western Canada?

Hon. Marcel Lessard (Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): 1. (a), (b), (c), (d) and (e): The Department of Regional Economic Expansion was formed in 1969. Expenditures for each fiscal year are shown in the attached table.

2. See following table.

1. Total expenditures by the Department of Regional Economic Expansion by fiscal years in thousands of dollars is as follows:

(a) Canada	Budgetary	Non-Budgetary	Total
1969-70	179,349	40,180	219,529
1970-71	260,512	70,295	330,807
1971-72	308,634	36,213	344,847
1972-73	300,093	64,771	364,864
1973-74	361,729	62,615	424,344
1974-75	381,581	56,973	438,554
1975-76	449,017	34,464	483,481
1976-77	443,150	26,528	469,678

(b) British Columbia	Budgetary	Non-Budgetary	Total
1969-70	4,775	—	4,775
1970-71	5,797	—	5,797
1971-72	10,843	—	10,843
1972-73	4,653	—	4,653
1973-74	4,179	—	4,179
1974-75	6,157	—	6,157
1975-76	9,388	—	9,388
1976-77	8,783	—	8,783

2. Percentage spent in Western Canada.

(c) Alberta	Budgetary	Non-Budgetary	Total
1969-70	16,173	—	16,173
1970-71	12,426	660	13,086
1971-72	8,032	986	9,018
1972-73	16,459	599	17,058
1973-74	24,183	1,115	25,298
1974-75	14,972	1,097	16,069
1975-76	16,498	1,249	17,747
1976-77	15,810	515	16,325

(d) Saskatchewan	Budgetary	Non-Budgetary	Total
1969-70	14,834	—	14,834
1970-71	16,335	675	17,010
1971-72	17,684	442	18,126
1972-73	13,293	525	13,818
1973-74	16,288	423	16,711
1974-75	25,106	1,698	26,804
1975-76	37,894	2,134	40,028
1976-77	41,624	1,929	43,553

(e) Manitoba	Budgetary	Non-Budgetary	Total
1969-70	16,131	—	16,131
1970-71	15,125	1,214	16,339
1971-72	16,932	922	17,854
1972-73	23,220	1,179	24,399
1973-74	13,862	962	14,824
1974-75	26,878	1,581	28,459
1975-76	29,941	1,237	31,178
1976-77	35,274	1,564	36,838

	Budgetary	Non-Budgetary	Total
1969-70	28.95	—23.65	
1970-71	19.07	3.63	15.79
1971-72	17.33	6.49	16.19
1972-73	19.20	3.56	16.42
1973-74	16.18	3.99	14.38
1974-75	19.16	7.68	17.67
1975-76	20.87	13.41	20.34
1976-77	22.90	15.11	22.46

[Mr. Goodale.]

MINISTRY OF STATE FOR SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY EXPENDITURES

Question No. 2,948—**Mr. Epp:**

1. What was the amount of spending by the Ministry of State for Science and Technology in (a) Canada (b) British Columbia (c) Alberta (d) Saskatchewan (e) Manitoba in the year (i) 1968 (ii) 1969 (iii) 1970 (iv) 1971 (v) 1972 (vi) 1973 (vii) 1974 (viii) 1975 (ix) 1976?

2. For each of the same years, what percentage was spent in Western Canada?

Mr. James Hugh Faulkner (Minister of State for Science and Technology): In so far as the Ministry of State for Science and Technology is concerned: 1. (a) Canada: (i) 1968, N/A; (ii) 1969, N/A; (iii) 1970, N/A; (iv) 1971, N/A; (v) 1972, $2,031,482.00; (vi) 1973, $4,524,902.00; (vii) 1974, $4,632,-413.00; (viii) 1975, $4,170,696.00; (ix) 1976, $4,693,601.00; (b) British Columbia—1968 to 1976—N/A; (c) Alberta—1968 to 1976—N/A; (d) Saskatchewan—1968 to 1976—N/A; (e) Manitoba—1968 to 1976—N/A.

2. N/A.

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS EXPENDITURES IN WESTERN CANADA

Question No. 2,949—**Mr. Epp:**

1. What was the amount of spending by the Department of Public Works in (a) Canada (b) British Columbia (c) Alberta (d) Saskatchewan (e) Manitoba in the year (i) 1968 (ii) 1969 (iii) 1970 (iv) 1971 (v) 1972 (vi) 1973 (vii) 1974 (viii) 1975 (ix) 1976?

2. For each of the same years, what percentage was spent in Western Canada?

Hon. Judd Buchanan (Minister of Public Works): 1. (a) to (e) (i), (ii), (iii): Not applicable. Information not available as the Government Record Disposal Policy requires financial information to be retained for a period of six years only.

	Year	(a) Canada	(b) British Columbia	(c) Alberta	(d) Saskatchewan	(e) Manitoba
		($000's)	($000's)	($000's)	($000's)	($000's)
(iv)	1971-1972	$344,950	$22,927	$ 9,924	$ 4,169	$14,277
(v)	1972-1973	383,581	28,933	12,463	4,374	13,277
(vi)	1973-1974	499,605	35,360	19,729	6,378	13,054
(vii)	1974-1975	566,042	43,362	20,765	6,070	15 334
(viii)	1975-1976	675,672	52,251	19,621	7,688	16,268
(ix)	1976-1977	746,482	71,575	28,906	10,096	18,664

2. (a) to (e) (i), (ii), (iii): Not applicable. See note above. Percentage spent in western Canada (includes Yukon and Northwest Territories) (iv) 1971-72 18.9 per cent; (v) 1972-73 18.7 per cent; (vi) 1973-74 18.2 per cent; (vii) 1974-75 18.9 per cent; (viii) 1975-76 17.6 per cent; (ix) 1976-77 21.2 per cent.

DEPARTMENT OF INDIAN AFFAIRS AND NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT EXPENDITURES

Question No. 2,950—**Mr. Epp:**

1. What was the amount of spending by the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development in (a) Canada (b) British Columbia (c) Alberta (d) Saskatchewan (e) Manitoba in the year (i) 1968 (ii) 1969 (iii) 1970 (iv) 1971 (v) 1972 (vi) 1973 (vii) 1974 (viii) 1975 (ix) 1976?

2. For each of the same years, what percentage was spent in Western Canada?

Hon. James Hugh Faulkner (Minister of Science and Technology): 1. (a) Canada; (i) 1968-69; $260,746,313; (ii) 1969-70; $305,760,260; (iii) 1970-71; $349,202,471; (iv) 1971-72; $431,114,057; (v) 1972-73; $508,299,561; (vi) 1973-74; $600,-328,742; (vii) 1974-75; $671,884,094; (viii) 1975-76; $852,-164,149; (ix) 1976-77, $982,488,592*

*1976-77 expenditures could change slightly from those shown as final figures are not yet available in all cases.

(b) British Columbia: (i) 1968-69; $29,792,000**; (ii) 1969-70; $39,643,000**; (iii) 1970-71; $49,671,000* * é (iv) 1971-72; $55,487,000; (v) 1972-73; $55,455,000; (vi) 1973-74; $62,374,000; (vii) 1974-75, $69,338,000; (viii) 1975-76, $77,566,000; (ix) 1976-77, $94,863,000..

**Includes Indian and Eskimo Affairs Program expenditures in the Yukon.

(c) Alberta; (i) 1968-69 $27,137,000; (ii) 1969-70, $32,092,-000; (iii) 1970-71, $38,395,000; (iv) 1971-72, $46,775,000; (v) 1972-73, $51,081,000; (vi) 1973-74, $62,039,000; (vii) 1974-75, $71,095,000; (viii) 1975-76, $86,176,000; (ix) 1976-77, $96,716,000; (d) Saskatchewan: (i) 1968-69 $19,796,000; (ii) 1969-70, $25,145,000; (iii) 19700-71, $29,447,000; (iv) 1971-72, $34,734,000; (v) 1972-73 $39,486,000; (vi) 1973-74, $48,622,000; (vii) 1974-75, $60,225,000; (viii) 1975-76, $68,273,000; (ix) 1976-77, $83,591,000; (e) Manitoba: (i) 1968-69, $19,405,000; (ii) 1969-70, $23,323,000; (iii) 1970-71, $29,294,000; (iv) 1971-72, $36,428,000; (v) 1972-73, $38,691,000; (vi) 1973-74, $50,301,000; (vii) 1974-75, $60,605,000; (viii) 1975-76, $72,046,000; (ix) 1976-77 $89,014,000.

2. (i) 1968-69, 37 per cent; (ii) 1969-70, 39 per cent; (iii) 1970-71, 42 per cent; (iv) 1971-72, 40 per cent; (v) 1972-73, 36 per cent; (vi) 1973-74, 37 per cent; (vii) 1974-75, 39 per cent; (viii) 1975-76, 36 per cent (ix) 1976-77, 38 per cent;

EXPENDITURES WESTERN CANADA

Question No. 2,951—**Mr. Epp:**

1. What was the amount of spending by the Department of Agriculture in (a) Canada (b) British Columbia (c) Alberta (d) Saskatchewan (e) Manitoba in the year (i) 1968 (ii) 1969 (iii) 1970 (iv) 1971 (v) 1972 (vi) 1973 (vii) 1974 (viii) 1975 (ix) 1976?

2. For each of the same years, what percentage was spent in Western Canada?

Hon. E. F. Whelan (Minister of Agriculture):

1.		(a) Canada	(b) British Columbia	(c) Alberta	(d) Saskatchewan	(e) Manitoba
(i)	1967-68	272,996,819	11,446,108	25,391,252	29,300,643	18,085,485
(ii)	1968-69	262,355,871	11,975,633	25,463,221	14,496,358	15,862,667
(iii)	1969-70	352,598,403	10,660,147	22,987,172	12,699,724	15,083,895
(iv)	1970-71	238,574,483	10,346,732	21,269,755	14,477,547	15,416,468
(v)	1971-72	256,112,751	11,224,120	16,765,230	12,377,488	14,073,905
(vi)	1972-73	282,373,943	13,037,851	19,388,040	14,001,950	15,030,538
(vii)	1973-74	396,122,317	19,963,538	40,000,609	27,092,567	26,588,268
(viii)	1974-75	636,749,339	30,891,816	65,228,715	84,598,134	36,145,877
(ix)	1975-76	625,807,148	30,766,810	76,136,434	47,673,988	39,154,399

2.

1967-68—31%	1970-71—26%	1973-74—29%
1968-69—26%	1971-72—21%	1974-75—34%
1969-70—17%	1972-73—22%	1975-76—31%

Order Paper Questions

ENERGY, MINES AND RESOURCES EXPENDITURES

Question No. 2,952—**Mr. Epp:**

1. What was the amount of spending by the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources in (a) Canada (b) British Columbia (c) Alberta (d) Saskatchewan (e) Manitoba in the year (i) 1968 (ii) 1969 (iii) 1970 (iv) 1971 (v) 1972 (vi) 1973 (vii) 1974 (viii) 1975 (ix) 1976?

2. For each of the same years, what percentage was spent in Western Canada?

Hon. Alastair Gillespie (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): 1.

	(i)-(iv) 1968-71	(v) 1972-73	(vi) 1973-74	(vii) 1974-75	(viii) 1975-76	(ix) 1976-77
(a) Canada	Figures not available	$76,465,141	$220,936,149	$100,935,574	$133,057,294	$19,951,396
(b) British Columbia	Figures not available	1,626,660	1,116,658	2,592,920	3,359,813	5,789,507
(c) Alberta	Figures not available	3,837,271	4,605,869	5,222,912	7,543,774	11,986,444
(d) Saskatchewan	Figures not available	152,885	663,888	484,374	818,973	708,425
(e) Manitoba	Figures not available	369,029	449,992	459,991	705,231	953,083
2.	1968-71	1972-73	1973-74	1974-75	1975-76	1976-77
Western Canada	Percentages not available	8%	3%	9%	9%	10%

NOTE: When coding expenditures, the destination of the cheque determines the territorial code to be used. Therefore, the province in which the billing office is located appears to have received the full benefit of the expenditures (i.e. all payments against Air Canada Credit Cards are coded to Manitoba, where their accounting office is located, regardless of where the credit cards were used). Based on this information, territorial expenditure reports are produced. The above figures were extracted from these reports.

DEPARTMENT OF NATIONAL DEFENCE EXPENDITURES

Question No. 2,954—**Mr. Epp:**

1. What was the amount of spending by the Department of National Defence in (a) Canada (b) British Columbia (c) Alberta (d) Saskatchewan (e) Manitoba in the year (i) 1968 (ii) 1969 (iii) 1970 (iv) 1971 (v) 1972 (vi) 1973 (vii) 1974 (viii) 1975 (ix) 1976?

2. For each of the same years, what percentage was spent in Western Canada?

Hon. Barney Danson (Minister of National Defence): 1 and 2.

Distribution of DND Expenditures

($000)

		1968/69	1969/70	1970/71	1971/72	1972/73	1973/74	1974/75	1975/76
1.	Canada	1,264,806	1,405,205	1,431,470	1,757,314	1,872,821	2,074,253	2,265,164	2,689,608
	British Columbia	104,645	135,195	146,512	160,697	191,573	210,400	236,172	268,912
	Alberta	77,960	103,759	109,826	135,961	165,090	186,185	201,196	237,346
	Saskatchewan	18,708	22,196	23,250	27,891	31,274	35,676	40,770	50,641
	Manitoba	63,626	81,775	81,937	90,588	95,344	106,695	118,112	138,260
2.	% Western Canada (Note 1)	19.37%	24.40%	25.26%	23.62%	25.80%	25.98%	26.32%	25.85%

NOTE 1: Percentage has been calculated against DND expenditures in Canada. Provincial amounts include—Civilian and Service Personnel Pay and Allowances.

Travel and transportation.

Pensions and gratuities.

Supplies, including construction, operation and maintenance.

SPECIAL ARDA MANITOBA—RED SUCKER LAKE LOCAL FUR COUNCIL

Question No. 2,956—**Mr. Epp:**

1. Under the Special ARDA Program entered into under agreement between the government and the Province of Manitoba, what amounts of federal moneys were granted to The Red Sucker Lake Local Fur Council in Manitoba?

2. On what dates were the moneys granted and under what terms and conditions?

Mr. Ed. Lumley (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): The reply for the Department of Regional Economic Expansion is as follows: 1. Under the Special ARDA Program, to July 31, 1977, $42,316.80 of

federal moneys were expended to assist the Red Sucker Lake Local Fur Council.

2. Financial assistance was committed on June 6, 1974 under Section 1(d) of the Canada/Manitoba Special Rural Development Agreement, dated July 20, 1971, as follows: "The development of viable supplementary or alternative primary producing activities for the purpose of improving marginal or submarginal incomes of disadvantaged people engaged in such activities."

SPECIAL ARDA MANITOBA—YORK LANDING LOCAL FUR COUNCIL

Question No. 2,957—**Mr. Epp:**

1. Under the Special ARDA Program entered into under agreement between the government and the Province of Manitoba, what amounts of federal moneys were granted to The York Landing Local Fur Council in Manitoba?

2. On what dates were the moneys granted and under what terms and conditions?

Mr. Ed. Lumley (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): The reply for the Department of Regional Economic Expansion is as follows: 1. Under the Special ARDA Program, to July 31, 1977, $8,984.94 of federal moneys were expended to assist the York Landing Local Fur Council.

2. Financial assistance was committed on October 5, 1973 under Section 1(d) of the Canada/Manitoba Special Rural Development Agreement, dated July 20, 1971, as follows: "The development of viable supplementary or alternative primary producing activities for the purpose of improving marginal or submarginal incomes of disadvantaged people engaged in such activities."

SPECIAL ARDA PROGRAM—THE PIKWITONEI LOCAL FUR COUNCIL

Question No. 2,958—**Mr. Epp:**

1. Under the Special ARDA Programme entered into under agreement between the government and the Province of Manitoba, what amounts of federal monies were granted to The Pikwitonei Local Fur Council in Manitoba?

2. On what dates were the monies granted and under what terms and conditions?

Mr. Ed. Lumley (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): The reply for the Department of Regional Economic Expansion is as follows: 1. Under the Special ARDA Program, to July 31, 1977, the following federal moneys were expended: $22,809.55 to Pikwitonei Local Fur Council I; $5,281.93 to Pikwitonei Local Fur Council II.

2. Financial assistance was committed on April 11, 1974 to Pikwitonei Local Fur Council I, under Section 1(d) of the Canada/Manitoba Special Rural Development Agreement, dated July 20, 1971, as follows: "The development of viable supplementary or alternative primary producing activities for the purpose of improving marginal or submarginal incomes of disadvantaged people engaged in such activities." Financial assistance was committed on November 23, 1976 to Pikwitonei Local Fur Council II, under Section 1(d) of the Canada/Manitoba Special Rural Development Agreement, dated July 18, 1975, as follows: "The development of viable supplementary or alternative primary producing activities for the purpose of improving marginal or submarginal incomes of disadvantaged people engaged in such activities."

SPECIAL ARDA PROGRAM—THE NOR-EAST ENTERPRISES LTD.

Question No. 2,959—**Mr. Epp:**

1. Under the Special ARDA Program entered into under agreement between the government and the Province of Manitoba, what amounts of federal moneys were granted to The Nor-East Enterprises Ltd. in Manitoba?

2. On what dates were the moneys granted and under what terms and conditions?

Mr. Ed. Lumley (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): The reply for the Department of Regional Economic Expansion is as follows: 1. Under the Special ARDA Program, to July 31, 1977, $29,196.00 of federal moneys were expended to assist the Nor-East Enterprises Ltd.

2. Financial assistance was committed on June 12, 1973 under Section 1(e) of the Canada/Manitoba Special Rural Development Agreement, dated July 20, 1971, as follows: "The establishment, expansion or modernization of any commercial undertaking engaged in the utilization of primary resources, in processing, in manufacturing or in the provision of services, including tourist facilities, provided that, (i) the undertaking is expressly organized so that at least two-thirds of those employed are disadvantaged people who have previously had little or no access to regular earning and employment opportunities; and (ii) there is adequate provision for such counselling, training and other adjustment measures as are necessary to the employment of disadvantaged people in the undertaking."

SPECIAL ARDA PROGRAM—EINARSON'S TRAILER COURT AND STORE

Question No. 2,960—**Mr. Epp:**

1. Under the Special ARDA Program entered into under agreement between the government and the Province of Manitoba, what amounts of federal moneys were granted to Einarson's Trailer Court and Store in Manitoba?

2. On what dates were the moneys granted and under what terms and conditions?

Mr. Ed. Lumley (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): The reply for the Department of Regional Economic Expansion is as follows: 1. Under the Special ARDA Program, to July 31, 1977, $19,268.39 of federal moneys were expended to assist Einarson's Trailer Court and Store.

2. Financial assistance was committed on June 8, 1973 under Section 1(e) of the Canada/Manitoba Special Rural Development Agreement, dated July 20, 1971, as follows: "The establishment, expansion or modernization of any commercial undertaking engaged in the utilization of primary resources, in processing, in manufacturing or in the provision

of services, including tourist facilities, provided that (i) the undertaking is expressly organized so that at least two-thirds of those employed are disadvantaged people who have previously had little or no access to regular earning and employment opportunities; and (ii) there is adequate provision for such counselling, training and other adjustment measures as are necessary to the employment of disadvantaged people in the undertaking."

SPECIAL ARDA PROGRAM—THE LOUIS RIEL COOPERATIVE—ST. LAURENT

Question No. 2,961—**Mr. Epp:**

1. Under the Special ARDA Program entered into under agreement between the government and the Province of Manitoba, what amounts of federal moneys were granted to The Louis Riel Cooperative at St. Laurent, Manitoba?

2. On what dates were the moneys granted and under what terms and conditions?

Mr. Ed. Lumley (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): The reply for the Department of Regional Economic Expansion is as follows: 1. Under the Special ARDA Program, to July 31, 1977, $57,384.43 of federal moneys were expended to assist The Louis Riel Cooperative.

2. Financial assistance was committed on June 29, 1973 under Section 1(e) of the Canada/Manitoba Special Rural Development Agreement, dated July 20, 1971, as follows: "The establishment, expansion or modernization of any commercial undertaking engaged in the utilization of primary resources, in processing, in manufacturing or in the provision of services, including tourist facilities, provided that (i) the undertaking is expressly organized so that at least two-thirds of those employed are disadvantaged people who have previously had little or no access to regular earning and employment opportunities; and (ii) there is adequate provision for such counselling, training and other adjustment measures as are necessary to the employment of disadvantaged people in the undertaking."

SPECIAL ARDA PROGRAM—THE FISHER RIVER FISHERMEN'S FEDERATION

Question No. 2,962—**Mr. Epp:**

1. Under the Special ARDA Program entered into under agreement between the government and the Province of Manitoba, what amounts of federal moneys were granted to The Fisher River Fishermen's Federation in Manitoba?

2. On what dates were the moneys granted and under what terms and conditions?

Mr. Ed. Lumley (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): The reply for the Department of Regional Economic Expansion is as follows: 1. Under the Special ARDA Program, to July 31, 1977, the following federal moneys were expended: $61,587.00 to Fisher River Fishermen's Federation; $57,529.23 to Fisher River Fishermen's Assoc. II; $16,803.89 to Fisher River Fishermen's Assoc. III.

[Mr. Lumley.]

2. Financial assistance was committed on July 7, 1973 to Fisher River Fishermen's Federation; on July 2, 1974 to Fisher River Fishermen's Assoc. II; and on July 28, 1974 to Fisher River Fishermen's Assoc. III, under Section 1(d) of the Canada/Manitoba Special Rural Development Agreement, dated July 20, 1971, as follows: "The development of viable supplementary or alternative primary producing activities for the purpose of improving marginal or submarginal incomes of disadvantaged people engaged in such activities."

SPECIAL ARDA PROGRAM—CROSS LAKE FISHERMEN'S ASSOCIATION

Question No. 2,963—**Mr. Epp:**

1. Under the Special ARDA Program entered into under agreement between the government and the Province of Manitoba, what amounts of federal moneys were granted to Cross Lake Fishermen's Association in Manitoba?

2. On what dates were the moneys granted and under what terms and conditions?

Mr. Ed. Lumley (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): The reply for the Department of Regional Economic Expansion is as follows: 1. Under the Special ARDA Program, to July 31, 1977, $23,010.51 of federal moneys were expended to assist Cross Lake Fishermen's Association.

Financial assistance was committed on May 30, 1974 under Section 1(d) of the Canada/Manitoba Special Rural Development Agreement, dated July 20, 1971, as follows: "The development of viable supplementary or alternative primary producing activities for the purpose of improving marginal or submarginal incomes of disadvantaged people engaged in such activities."

SPECIAL ARDA PROGRAM—MASIKEESK INN

Question No. 2,964—**Mr. Epp:**

1. Under the Special ARDA Program entered into under agreement between the government and the Province of Manitoba, what amounts of federal moneys were granted to The Masikeesk Inn in Manitoba?

2. On what dates were the moneys granted and under what terms and conditions?

Mr. Ed. Lumley (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): The reply for the Department of Regional Economic Expansion is as follows: under the Special ARDA Program, to July 31, 1977, no federal moneys were expended to assist the Masikeesk Inn.

SPECIAL ARDA PROGRAM—LAKE MANITOBA NARROWS LODGE

Question No. 2,965—**Mr. Epp:**

1. Under the Special ARDA Program entered into under agreement between the government and the Province of Manitoba, what amounts of federal moneys were granted to Lake Manitoba Narrows Lodge in Manitoba?

2. On what dates were the moneys granted and under what terms and conditions?

Mr. Ed. Lumley (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): The reply for the Department

of Regional Economic Expansion is as follows: 1. Under the Special ARDA Program, to July 31, 1977, $72,056.00 of Federal moneys were expended to assist Lake Manitoba Narrows Lodge.

2. Financial assistance was committed on July 20, 1973 under Section 1(e) of the Canada/Manitoba Special Rural Development Agreement, dated July 20, 1971, as follows: "The establishment, expansion or modernization of any commercial undertaking engaged in the utilization of primary resources, in processing, in manufacturing or in the provision of services, including tourist facilities, provided that (i) the undertaking is expressly organized so that at least two-thirds of those employed are disadvantaged people who have previously had little or no access to regular earning and employment opportunities; and (ii) there is adequate provision for such counselling, training and other adjustment measures as are necessary to the employment of disadvantaged people in the undertaking."

SPECIAL ARDA PROGRAM—DELTA LOCAL FUR COUNCIL

Question No. 2,966—**Mr. Epp:**

1. Under the Special ARDA Program entered into under agreement between the government and the Province of Manitoba, what amounts of federal moneys were granted to The Delta Local Fur Council in Manitoba?

2. On what dates were the moneys granted and under what terms and conditions?

Mr. Ed. Lumley (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): The reply for the Department of Regional Economic Expansion is as follows: 1. Under the Special ARDA Program, to July 31, 1977, the following federal moneys were expended: $24,500.47 to Delta Local Fur Council I; $19,080.14 to Delta Local Fur Council II.

2. Financial assistance was committed on February 11, 1974 to Delta Local Fur Council I, under Section 1(d) of the Canada/Manitoba Special Rural Development Agreement, dated July 20, 1971, as follows: "The development of viable supplementary or alternative primary producing activities for the purpose of improving marginal or submarginal incomes of disadvantaged people engaged in such activities." Financial assistance was committed on February 1, 1977 to Delta Local Fur Council II, under Section 1(d) of the Canada/Manitoba Special Rural Development Agreement, dated July 18, 1975, as follows: "The development of viable supplementary or alternative primary producing activities for the purpose of improving marginal or submarginal incomes of disadvantaged people engaged in such activities."

SPECIAL ARDA PROGRAM—DELTA FISHERMEN'S FEDERATION

Question No. 2,967—**Mr. Epp:**

1. Under the Special ARDA Programme entered into under agreement between the government and the Province of Manitoba, what amounts of federal monies were granted to The Delta Fishermen's Federation in Manitoba?

2. On what dates were the monies granted and under what terms and conditions?

Mr. Ed. Lumley (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): The reply for the Department of Regional Economic Expansion is as follows: 1. Under the Special ARDA Program, to July 31, 1977, the following federal moneys were expended: $59,071.98 to Delta Fishermen's Federation; $36,196.03 to Delta Fishermen's Association.

2. Financial assistance was committed on February 11, 1974 to the Delta Fishermen's Federation, under Section 1(d) of the Canada/Manitoba Special Rural Development Agreement, dated July 20, 1971, as follows: "The development of viable supplementary or alternative primary producing activities for the purpose of improving marginal or submarginal incomes of disadvantaged people engaged in such activities." Financial assistance was committed on November 3, 1975 to the Delta Fishermen's Association, under Section 1(d) of the Canada/Manitoba Special Rural Development Agreement, dated July 18, 1975, as follows: "The development of viable supplementary or alternative primary producing activities for the purpose of improving marginal or submarginal incomes of disadvantaged people engaged in such activities."

SPECIAL ARDA PROGRAM—THE BARREN LAND BAND

Question No. 2,968—**Mr. Epp:**

1. Under the Special ARDA Program entered into under agreement between the government and the Province of Manitoba, what amounts of federal moneys were granted to The Barren Land Band at Lac Brochet, Manitoba?

2. On what dates were the moneys granted and under what terms and conditions?

Mr. Ed. Lumley (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): The reply for the Department of Regional Economic Expansion is as follows: 1. Under the Special ARDA Program, to July 31, 1977, $11,882.77 of federal moneys were expended to assist The Barren Land Band.

2. Financial assistance was committed on November 10, 1972 under Section 1(d) of the Canada/Manitoba Special Rural Development Agreement, dated July 20, 1971, as follows: "The development of viable supplementary or alternative primary producing activities for the purpose of improving marginal or submarginal incomes of disadvantaged people engaged in such activities."

SPECIAL ARDA PROGRAM—THE MOAK LODGE

Question No. 2,969—**Mr. Epp:**

1. Under the Special ARDA Program entered into under agreement between the government and the Province of Manitoba, what amounts of federal moneys were granted to The Moak Lodge at Grand Rapids, Manitoba?

2. On what dates were the moneys granted and under what terms and conditions?

Mr. Ed Lumley (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): The reply for the Department of Regional Economic Expansion is as follows: 1. Under the Special ARDA Program, to July 31, 1977, $59,362.57 of federal moneys were expended to assist Moak Lodge.

2. Financial assistance was committed on May 30, 1973 under Section 1(e) of the Canada/Manitoba Special Rural Development Agreement, dated July 20, 1971, as follows: "The establishment, expansion or modernization of any commercial undertaking engaged in the utilization of primary resources, in processing, in manufacturing or in the provision of services, including tourist facilities, provided that (i) the undertaking is expressly organized so that at least two-thirds of those employed are disadvantaged people who have previously had little or no access to regular earning and employment opportunities; and (ii) there is adequate provision for such counselling, training and other adjustment measures as are necessary to the employment of disadvantaged people in the undertaking."

SPECIAL ARDA PROGRAM—OAK POINT FISHERMEN'S AND TRAPPERS' ASSOCIATION

Question No. 2,970—**Mr. Epp:**

1. Under the Special ARDA Program entered into under agreement between the government and the Province of Manitoba, what amounts of federal moneys were granted to The Oak Point Fishermen's and Trappers' Association in Manitoba?

2. On what dates were the moneys granted and under what terms and conditions?

Mr. Ed. Lumley (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): The reply for the Department of Regional Economic Expansion is as follows: 1. Under the Special ARDA Program, to July 31, 1977, $33,236.57 of federal moneys were expended to assist The Oak Point Fishermen's and Trappers Association.

2. Financial assistance was committed on December 14, 1972 under Section 1(d) of the Canada/Manitoba Special Rural Development Agreement, dated July 20, 1971, as follows: "The development of viable supplementary or alternative primary producing activities for the purpose of improving marginal or submarginal incomes of disadvantaged people engaged in such activities."

SPECIAL ARDA PROGRAM—CORMORANT FISHERMEN'S CO-OP

Question No. 2,971—**Mr. Epp:**

1. Under the Special ARDA Program entered into under agreement between the government and the Province of Manitoba, what amounts of federal moneys were granted to The Cormorant Fishermen's Co-op in Manitoba?

2. On what dates were the moneys granted and under what terms and conditions?

Mr. Ed. Lumley (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): The reply for the Department of Regional Economic Expansion is as follows: 1. Under the Special ARDA Program, to July 31, 1977, $3,170.90 of federal moneys were expended to assist The Cormorant Fishermen's Co-op.

2. Financial assistance was committed on December 13, 1972 under Section 1(d) of the Canada/Manitoba Special Rural Development Agreement, dated July 20, 1971, as follows: "The development of viable supplementary or alternative primary producing activities for the purpose of improving marginal or submarginal incomes of disadvantaged people engaged in such activities."

SPECIAL ARDA PROGRAM—INDIAN RICE PRODUCERS

Question No. 2,972—**Mr. Epp:**

1. Under the Special ARDA Program entered into under agreement between the government and the Province of Manitoba, what amounts of federal moneys were granted to The Indian Rice Producers in Manitoba?

2. On what dates were the moneys granted and under what terms and conditions?

Mr. Ed. Lumley (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): The reply for the Department of Regional Economic Expansion is as follows: 1. Under the Special ARDA Program, to July 31, 1977, $56,324.00 of federal moneys were expended to assist The Indian Rice Producers.

2. Financial assistance was committed on May 10, 1973 under Section 1(e) of the Canada/Manitoba Special Rural Development Agreement, dated July 20, 1971, as follows: "The establishment, expansion or modernization of any commercial undertaking engaged in the utilization of primary resources, in processing, in manufacturing or in the provision of services, including tourist facilities, provided that (i) the undertaking is expressly organized so that at least two-thirds of those employed are disadvantaged people who have previously had little or no access to regular earning and employment opportunities; and (ii) there is adequate provision for such counselling, training and other adjustment measures as are necessary to the employment of disadvantaged people in the undertaking."

SPECIAL ARDA PROGRAM—CAMPERDUCK TRAPPERS ASSOCIATION

Question No. 2,973—**Mr. Epp:**

1. Under the Special ARDA Program entered into under agreement between the government and the Province of Manitoba, what amounts of federal moneys were granted to The Camperduck Trappers Association in Manitoba?

2. On what dates were the moneys granted and under what terms and conditions?

Mr. Ed. Lumley (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): The reply for the Department of Regional Economic Expansion is as follows: 1. Under the Special ARDA Program, to July 31, 1977, the following federa! moneys were expended: $3,430.38 to Camperduck Trappers Assoc., $9,322.46 to Camperduck Local Fur Council.

2. Financial assistance was committed on December 2, 1972 to the Camperduck Trappers Assoc., and on October 24, 1974 to the Camperduck Local Fur Council, under Section 1(d) of the Canada/Manitoba Special Rural Development Agreement, dated July 20, 1971, as follows: "The development of viable supplementary or alternative primary producing activities for the purpose of improving marginal or submarginal incomes of disadvantaged people engaged in such activities."

SPECIAL ARDA PROGRAM—NIKKELS ACTION CENTRE

Question No. 2,974—**Mr. Epp:**

1. Under the Special ARDA Program entered into under agreement between the government and the Province of Manitoba, what amounts of federal moneys were granted to Nikkels Action Centre at Marchand, Manitoba?

2. On what dates were the moneys granted and under what terms and conditions?

Mr. Ed. Lumley (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): The reply for the Department of Regional Economic Expansion is as follows: under the Special ARDA Program, to July 31, 1977, no federal moneys were expended to assist Nikkels Action Centre.

SPECIAL ARDA PROGRAM—THE OAK POINT HOTEL

Question No. 2,975—**Mr. Epp:**

1. Under the Special ARDA Program entered into under agreement between the government and the Province of Manitoba, what amounts of federal moneys were granted to the Oak Point Hotel in Manitoba?

2. On what dates were the moneys granted and under what terms and conditions?

Mr. Ed. Lumley (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): The reply for the Department of Regional Economic Expansion is as follows: 1. Under the Special ARDA Program, to July 31, 1977, $57,145.00 of federal moneys were expended to assist the Oak Point Hotel.

2. Financial assistance was committed on April 9, 1974 under Section 1(e) of the Canada/Manitoba Special Rural Development Agreement, dated July 20, 1971, as follows: "The establishment, expansion or modernization of any commercial undertaking engaged in the utilization of primary resources, in processing, in manufacturing or in the provision of services, including tourist facilities, provided that (i) the undertaking is expressly organized so that at least two-thirds of those employed are disadvantaged people who have previously had little or no access to regular earning and employment opportunities; and (ii) there is adequate provision for such counselling, training and other adjustment measures as are necessary to the employment of disadvantaged people in the undertaking."

SPECIAL ARDA PROGRAM—LAC DU BONNET TRAPPER'S ASSOCIATION

Question No. 2,976—**Mr. Epp:**

1. Under the Special ARDA Program entered into under agreement between the government and the Province of Manitoba, what amounts of federal moneys were granted to Lac du Bonnet Trappers' Association in Manitoba?

2. On what dates were the moneys granted and under what terms and conditions?

Mr. Ed. Lumley (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): The reply for the Department of Regional Economic Expansion is as follows: 1. Under the Special ARDA Program, to July 31, 1977, $6,339.39 of federal moneys were expended to assist Lac du Bonnet Trapper's Association.

2. Financial assistance was committed on November 13, 1972 under Section 1 (d) of the Canada/Manitoba Special Rural Development Agreement, dated July 20, 1971, as follows: "The development of viable supplementary or alternative primary producing activities for the purpose of improving marginal or submarginal incomes of disadvantaged people engaged in such activities."

SPECIAL ARDA PROGRAM—TRI-STAR CONSTRUCTION COMPANY LTD.

Question No. 2,977—**Mr. Epp:**

1. Under the Special ARDA Program entered into under agreement between the government and the Province of Manitoba, what amounts of federal moneys were granted to Tri-Star Construction Company Ltd. in Manitoba?

2. On what dates were the moneys granted and under what terms and conditions?

Mr. Ed. Lumley (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): The reply for the Department of Regional Economic Expansion is as follows: 1. Under the Special ARDA Program, to July 31, 1977, $17,114.00 of federal moneys were expended to assist Tri-Star Construction Company Ltd.

2. Financial assistance was committed on June 12, 1973 under Section 1(e) of the Canada/Manitoba Special Rural Development Agreement, dated July 20, 1971, as follows: "The establishment, expansion or modernization of any commercial undertaking engaged in the utilization of primary resources, in processing, in manufacturing or in the provision of services, including tourist facilities, provided that (i) the undertaking is expressly organized so that at least two-thirds of those employed are disadvantaged people who have previously had little or no access to regular earning and employment opportunities; and (ii) there is adequate provision for such counselling, training and other adjustment measures as are necessary to the employment of disadvantaged people in the undertaking."

SPECIAL ARDA PROGRAM—WABOWDEN TRAPPERS ASSOCIATION

Question No. 2,978—**Mr. Epp:**

1. Under the Special ARDA Program entered into under agreement between the government and the Province of Manitoba, what amounts of federal moneys were granted to Wabowden Trappers Association in Manitoba?

2. On what dates were the moneys granted and under what terms and conditions?

Mr. Ed. Lumley (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): The reply for the Department of Regional Economic Expansion is as follows: 1. Under the Special ARDA Program, to July 31, 1977, the following federal moneys were expended: $15,561.46 to Wabowden Trappers Association; $9,362.75 to Wabowden Local Fur Council.

2. Financial assistance was committed on November 10, 1972 to the Wabowden Trappers Association, under Section 1(d) of the Canada/Manitoba Special Rural Development

Agreement, dated July 20, 1971, as follows: "The development of viable supplementary or alternative primary producing activities for the purpose of improving marginal or submarginal incomes of disadvantaged people engaged in such activities."

Financial assistance was committed on October 22, 1976 to the Wabowden Local Fur Council, under Section 1(d) of the Canada/Manitoba Special Rural Development Agreement, dated July 18, 1975, as follows: "The development of viable supplementary or alternative primary producing activities for the purpose of improving marginal or submarginal incomes of disadvantaged people engaged in such activities."

SPECIAL ARDA PROGRAM—FISHER BAY FISHERMEN'S ASSOCIATION

Question No. 2,979—**Mr. Epp:**

1. Under the Special ARDA Program entered into under agreement between the government and the Province of Manitoba, what amounts of federal monies were granted to Fisher Bay Fishermen's Association in Kootatak, Manitoba?

2. On what dates were the monies granted and under what terms and conditions?

Mr. Ed. Lumley (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): The reply for the Department of Regional Economic Expansion is as follows: 1. Under the Special ARDA Program, to July 31, 1977, $2,900.00 of federal moneys were expended to assist Fisher Bay Fishermen's Association.

2. Financial assistance was committed on May 24, 1972 under Section 1(d) of the Canada/Manitoba Special Rural Development Agreement, dated July 20, 1971, as follows: "The development of viable supplementary or alternative primary producing activities for the purpose of improving marginal or submarginal incomes of disadvantaged people engaged in such activities."

SPECIAL ARDA PROGRAM—CRANE RIVER FEEDLOT

Question No. 2,980—**Mr. Epp:**

1. Under the Special ARDA Program entered into under agreement between the government and the Province of Manitoba, what amounts of federal moneys were granted to Crane River Feedlot in Manitoba?

2. On what dates were the moneys granted and under what terms and conditions?

Mr. Ed. Lumley (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): The reply for the Department of Regional Economic Expansion is as follows: 1. Under the Special ARDA Program, to July 31, 1977, $40,395.00 of federal moneys were expended to assist Crane River Feedlot.

2. Financial assistance was committed on September 5, 1972 under Section 1(e) of the Canada/Manitoba Special Rural Development Agreement, dated July 20, 1971, as follows: "The establishment, expansion or modernization of any commercial undertaking engaged in the utilization of primary resources, in processing, in manufacturing or in the provision of services, including tourist facilities, provided that (i) the undertaking is expressly organized so that at least two-thirds of those employed are disadvantaged people who have previously had little or no access to regular earning and employment opportunities; and (ii) there is adequate provision for such counselling, training and other adjustment measures as are necessary to the employment of disadvantaged people in the undertaking."

SPECIAL ARDA PROGRAM—PINETREE INN

Question No. 2,981—**Mr. Epp:**

1. Under the Special ARDA Program entered into under agreement between the government and the Province of Manitoba, what amounts of federal moneys were granted to Pinetree Inn at Richer, Manitoba?

2. On what dates were the moneys granted and under what terms and conditions?

Mr. Ed. Lumley (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): The reply for the Department of Regional Economic Expansion is as follows: 1. Under the Special ARDA Program, to July 31, 1977, $21,274.00 of federal moneys were expended to assist Pinetree Inn.

2. Financial assistance was committed on June 7, 1973 under Section 1(e) of the Canada/Manitoba Special Rural Development Agreement, dated July 20, 1971, as follows: "The establishment, expansion or modernization of any commercial undertaking engaged in the utilization of primary resources, in processing, in manufacturing or in the provision of services, including tourist facilities, provided that (i) the undertaking is expressly organized so that at least two-thirds of those employed are disadvantaged people who have previously had little or no access to regular earning and employment opportunities; and (ii) there is adequate provision for such counselling, training and other adjustment measures as are necessary to the employment of disadvantaged people in the undertaking."

SPECIAL ARDA PROGRAM—ARCTIC GRAIN

Question No. 2,982—**Mr. Epp:**

1. Under the Special ARDA Program entered into under agreement between the government and the Province of Manitoba, what amounts of federal moneys were granted to Arctic Grain at Churchill, Manitoba?

2. On what dates were the moneys granted and under what terms and conditions?

Mr. Ed. Lumley (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): The reply for the Department of Regional Economic Expansion is as follows: under the Special ARDA Program, to July 31, 1977, no federal moneys were expended to assist Arctic Grain.

SPECIAL ARDA PROGRAM—E. MONKMAN

Question No. 2,983—**Mr. Epp:**

1. Under the Special ARDA Program entered into under agreement between the government and the Province of Manitoba, what amounts of federal moneys were granted to E. Monkman at Loon Straits, Manitoba?

2. On what dates were the moneys granted and under what terms and conditions?

Mr. Ed. Lumley (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): The reply for the Department of Regional Economic Expansion is as follows: 1. Under the Special ARDA Program, to July 31, 1977, $800 of federal moneys were expended on November 4, 1974 for fishing equipment; and $375 of federal moneys were expended on March 9, 1976 for training equipment, to assist E. Monkman.

2. Financial assistance was committed on November 4, 1974 for fishing equipment under Section 1(d) of the Canada/Manitoba Special Rural Development Agreement, dated July 20, 1971, as follows: "The development of viable supplementary or alternative primary producing activities for the purpose of improving marginal or submarginal incomes of disadvantaged people engaged in such activities." Financial assistance was committed on March 9, 1976 for trapping equipment under Section 1(d) of the Canada/Manitoba Special Rural Development Agreement, dated July 18, 1975, as follows: "The development of viable supplementary or alternative primary producing activities for the purpose of improving marginal or submarginal incomes of disadvantaged people engaged in such activities."

SPECIAL ARDA PROGRAM—A. MACAULEY

Question No. 2,984—**Mr. Epp:**

1. Under the Special ARDA Program entered into under agreement between the government and the Province of Manitoba, what amounts of federal moneys were granted to A. MacAuley in Manitoba?

2. On what dates were the moneys granted and under what terms and conditions?

Mr. Ed. Lumley (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): The reply for the Department of Regional Economic Expansion is as follows: 1. Under the Special ARDA Program, to July 31, 1977, $5,186.00 of federal moneys were expended to assist A. MacAuley.

2. Financial assistance was committed on May 31, 1972 under Section 1(e) of the Canada/Manitoba Special Rural Development Agreement, dated July 20, 1971, as follows: "The establishment, expansion or modernization of any commercial undertaking engaged in the utilization of primary resources, in processing, in manufacturing or in the provision of services, including tourist facilities, provided that (i) the undertaking is expressly organized so that at least two-thirds of those employed are disadvantaged people who have previously had little or no access to regular earning and employment opportunities; and (ii) there is adequate provision for such counselling, training and other adjustment measures as are necessary to the employment of disadvantaged people in the undertaking."

SPECIAL ARDA PROGRAM—NORTHERN MEAT AND SAUSAGE

Question No. 2,985—**Mr. Epp:**

1. Under the Special ARDA Programme entered into under agreement between the government and the Province of Manitoba, what amounts of federal monies were granted to Northern Meat and Sausage at Scanterbury, Manitoba?

2. On what dates were the monies granted and under what terms and conditions?

Mr. Ed. Lumley (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): The reply for the Department of Regional Economic Expansion is as follows: 1. Under the Special ARDA Program, to July 31, 1977, $58,635.00 of federal moneys were expended to assist Northern Meat and Sausage.

2. Financial assistance was committed on August 27, 1973 under Section 1(e) of the Canada/Manitoba Special Rural Development Agreement, dated July 20, 1971, as follows: "The establishment, expansion or modernization of any commercial undertaking engaged in the utilization of primary resources, in processing, in manufacturing or in the provision of services, including tourist facilities, provided that (i) the undertaking is expressly organized so that at least two-thirds of those employed are disadvantaged people who have previously had little or no access to regular earning and employment opportunities; and (ii) there is adequate provision for such counselling, training and other adjustment measures as are necessary to the employment of disadvantaged people in the undertaking."

SPECIAL ARDA PROGRAM—INTERLAKE CUSTOM KILLING

Question No. 2,986—**Mr. Epp:**

1. Under the Special ARDA Program entered into under agreement between the government and the Province of Manitoba, what amounts of federal moneys were granted to Interlake Custom Killing at St. Laurent, Manitoba?

2. On what dates were the monies granted and under what terms and conditions?

Mr. Ed. Lumley (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): The reply for the Department of Regional Economic Expansion is as follows: 1. Under the Special ARDA Program, to July 31, 1977, $43,240.71 of federal moneys were expended to assist Interlake Custom Killing.

2. Financial assistance was committed on September 12, 1973 under Section 1(e) of the Canada/Manitoba Special Rural Development Agreement, dated July 20, 1971, as follows: "The establishment, expansion or modernization of any commercial undertaking engaged in the utilization of primary resources, in processing, in manufacturing or in the provision of services, including tourist facilities, provided that: (i) the undertaking is expressly organized so that at least two-thirds of those employed are disadvantaged people who have previously had little or no access to regular earning and employment opportunities; and (ii) there is adequate provision for such counselling, training and other adjustment measures as are necessary to the employment of disadvantaged people in the undertaking."

Order Paper Questions

SPECIAL ARDA PROGRAM—MR. LAUBMAN

Question No. 2,987—**Mr. Epp:**

1. Under the Special ARDA Program entered into under agreement between the government and the Province of Manitoba, what amounts of federal moneys were granted to Mr. Laubman at Pikwitoei, Manitoba?

2. On what dates were the moneys granted and under what terms and conditions?

Mr. Ed. Lumley (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): The reply for the Department of Regional Economic Expansion is as follows: 1. Under the Special ARDA Program, to July 31, 1977, $14,800.72 of federal moneys were expended to assist Percy Laubman.

2. Financial assistance was committed on August 8, 1972 under Section 1(e) of the Canada/Manitoba Special Rural Development Agreement, dated July 20, 1971, as follows: "The establishment, expansion or modernization of any commercial undertaking engaged in the utilization of primary resources, in processing, in manufacturing or in the provision of services, including tourist facilities, provided that (i) the undertaking is expressly organized so that at least two-thirds of those employed are disadvantaged people who have previously had little or no access to regular earning and employment opportunities; and (ii) there is adequate provision for such counselling, training and other adjustment measures as are necessary to the employment of disadvantaged people in the undertaking."

SPECIAL ARDA PROGRAM—THE YELLOW QUILL CO-OP

Question No. 2,988—**Mr. Epp:**

1. Under the Special ARDA Program entered into under agreement between the government and the Province of Manitoba, what amounts of federal moneys were granted to The Yellow Quill Co-op at Swan Lake, Manitoba?

2. On what dates were the moneys granted and under what terms and conditions?

Mr. Ed. Lumley (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): The reply for the Department of Regional Economic Expansion is as follows: 1. Under the Special ARDA Program, to July 31, 1977, $66,334.00 of federal moneys were expended to assist the Yellow Quill Co-op.

2. Financial assistance was committed on June 13, 1973 under Section 1(e) of the Canada/Manitoba Special Rural Development Agreement, dated July 20, 1971, as follows: "The establishment, expansion or modernization of any commercial undertaking engaged in the utilization of primary resources, in processing, in manufacturing or in the provision of services, including tourist facilities, provided that: (i) the undertaking is expressly organized so that at least two-thirds of those employed are disadvantaged people who have previously had little or no access to regular earning and employment opportunities; and (ii) there is adequate provision for such counselling, training and other adjustment measures as are necessary to the employment of disadvantaged people in the undertaking."

[Mr. Lumley.]

SPECIAL ARDA PROGRAM—THE HOLE RIVER TRAPPERS' ASSOCIATION

Question No. 2,989—**Mr. Epp:**

1. Under the Special ARDA Program entered into under agreement between the government and the Province of Manitoba, what amounts of federal moneys were granted to The Hole River Trappers Association in Manitoba?

2. On what dates were the moneys granted and under what terms and conditions?

Mr. Ed. Lumley (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): The reply for the Department of Regional Economic Expansion is as follows: 1. Under the Special ARDA Program to July 31, 1977, the following federal moneys were expended: $26,256.81 to Hole River Trappers' Association; $9,345.49 to Hole River Local Fur Council.

2. Financial assistance was committed on November 2, 1972 to the Hole River Trappers Association under Section 1(d) of the Canada/Manitoba Special Rural Development Agreement, dated July 20, 1971, as follows: "The development of viable supplementary or alternative primary producing activities for the purpose of improving marginal or submarginal incomes of disadvantaged people engaged in such activities." Financial assistance was committed on May 14, 1976 to the Hole River Local Fur Council under Section 1(d) of the Canada/Manitoba Special Rural Development Agreement, dated July 18, 1975, as follows: "The development of viable supplementary or alternative primary producing activities for the purpose of improving marginal or submarginal incomes of disadvantaged people engaged in such activities."

SPECIAL ARDA PROGRAM—ST. AMBROISE FISHERMEN'S ASSOCIATION

Question No. 2,990—**Mr. Epp:**

1. Under the Special ARDA Program entered into under agreement between the government and the Province of Manitoba, what amounts of federal moneys were granted to The St. Ambroise Fishermen's Association in Manitoba?

2. On what dates were the moneys granted and under what terms and conditions?

Mr. Ed. Lumley (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): The reply for the Department of Regional Economic Expansion is as follows: 1. Under the Special ARDA Program, to July 31, 1977, $22,565.24 of federal moneys were expended to assist the St. Ambroise Fishermen's Association.

2. Financial assistance was committed on December 13, 1972 under Section 1(d) of the Canada/Manitoba Special Rural Development Agreement, dated July 20, 1971, as follows: "The development of viable supplementary or alternative primary producing activities for the purpose of improving marginal or submarginal incomes of disadvantaged people engaged in such activities."

SPECIAL ARDA PROGRAM—THE DODGE TRADING COMPANY

Question No. 2,991—**Mr. Epp:**

1. Under the Special ARDA Program entered into under agreement between the government and the Province of Manitoba, what amounts of federal moneys were granted to The Dodge Trading Company in Manitoba?

2. On what dates were the moneys granted and under what terms and conditions?

Mr. Ed. Lumley (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): The reply for the Department of Regional Economic Expansion is as follows: under the Special ARDA Program to July 31, 1977, no federal moneys were expended to assist The Dodge Trading Company.

SPECIAL ARDA PROGRAM—THE BROCHET FISHERMEN'S CO-OPERATIVE

Question No. 2,992—**Mr. Epp:**

1. Under the Special ARDA Program entered into under agreement between the government and the Province of Manitoba, what amounts of federal moneys were granted to The Brochet Fishermen's Co-operative in Manitoba?

2. On what dates were the moneys granted and under what terms and conditions?

Mr. Ed. Lumley (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): The reply for the Department of Regional Economic Expansion is as follows: 1. Under the Special ARDA Program, to July 31, 1977, $16,800.00 of federal moneys were expended to assist The Brochet Fishermen's Co-operative.

2. Financial assistance was committed on May 18, 1973 under Section 1(d) of the Canada/Manitoba Special Rural Development Agreement, dated July 20, 1971, as follows: "The development of viable supplementary or alternative primary producing activities for the purpose of improving marginal or submarginal incomes of disadvantaged people engaged in such activities."

SPECIAL ARDA PROGRAM—THE MOLSON LAKE LODGE

Question No. 2,993—**Mr. Epp:**

1. Under the Special ARDA Program entered into under agreement between the government and the Province of Manitoba, what amounts of federal moneys were granted to The Molson Lake Lodge in Manitoba?

2. On what dates were the moneys granted and under what terms and conditions?

Mr. Ed. Lumley (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): The reply for the Department of Regional Economic Expansion is as follows: 1. Under the Special ARDA Program to July 31, 1977, $15,589.28 of federal moneys were expended to assist Molson Lake Lodge.

2. Financial assistance was committed on June 11, 1973 under Section 1(e) of the Canada/Manitoba Special Rural Development Agreement, dated July 20, 1971, as follows: "The establishment, expansion or modernization of any commercial undertaking engaged in the utilization of primary resources, in processing, in manufacturing or in the provision of services, including tourist facilities, provided that: (i) the undertaking is expressly organized so that at least two-thirds of those employed are disadvantaged people who have previously had little or no access to regular earning and employment opportunities and (ii) there is adequate provision for such counselling, training and other adjustment measures as are necessary to the employment of disadvantaged people in the undertaking."

SPECIAL ARDA PROGRAM—GRAND RAPIDS SERVICE STATION

Question No. 2,994—**Mr. Epp:**

1. Under the Special ARDA Program entered into under agreement between the government and the Province of Manitoba, what amounts of federal moneys were granted to Grand Rapids Service Station in Manitoba?

2. On what dates were the moneys granted and under what terms and conditions?

Mr. Ed. Lumley (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): The reply for the Department of Regional Economic Expansion is as follows: 1. Under the Special ARDA Program to July 31, 1977, $123,313.01 of federal moneys were expended to assist Grand Rapids Service Station.

2. Financial assistance was committed August 8, 1974 under Section 1(e) of the Canada/Manitoba Special Rural Development Agreement, dated July 20, 1971, as follows: "The establishment, expansion or modernization of any commercial undertaking engaged in the utilization of primary resources, in processing, in manufacturing or in the provision of services; including tourist facilities, provided that: (i) the undertaking is expressly organized so that at least two-thirds of those employed are disadvantaged people who have previously had little or no access to regular earning and employment opportunities; and (ii) there is adequate provision for such counselling, training and other adjustment, measures as are necessary to the employment of disadvantaged people in the undertaking."

SPECIAL ARDA PROGRAM—THE CORMORANT LOCAL FUR COUNCIL

Question No. 2,995—**Mr. Epp:**

1. Under the Special ARDA Program entered into under agreement between the government and the Province of Manitoba, what amounts of federal moneys were granted to the Cormorant Local Fur Council in Manitoba?

2. On what dates were the moneys granted and under what terms and conditions?

Mr. Ed. Lumley (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): The reply for the Department of Regional Economic Expansion is as follows: 1. Under the Special ARDA Program, to July 31, 1977, the following federal moneys were expended: $13,709.14 to Cormorant Local Fur Council I; $8,827.14 to Cormorant Local Fur Council II.

2. Financial assistance was committed on June 6, 1973 to Cormorant Local Fur Council I, and on December 31, 1973 to

Cormorant Local Fur Council II, under Section 1(d) of the Canada/Manitoba Special Rural Development Agreement, dated July 20, 1971, as follows: "The development of viable supplementary or alternative primary producing activities for the purpose of improving marginal or submarginal incomes of disadvantaged people engaged in such activities."

SPECIAL ARDA PROGRAM—THE NELSON HOUSE LOCAL FUR COUNCIL

Question No. 2,996—**Mr. Epp:**

1. Under the Special ARDA Program entered into under agreement between the government and the Province of Manitoba, what amounts of federal moneys were granted to The Nelson House Local Fur Council in Manitoba?

2. On what dates were the moneys granted and under what terms and conditions?

Mr. Ed. Lumley (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): The reply for the Department of Regional Economic Expansion is as follows: 1. Under the Special ARDA Program to July 31, 1977, $33,774.12 of federal moneys were expended to assist the Nelson House Local Fur Council.

2. Financial assistance was committed on June 4, 1973 under Section 1(d) of the Canada/Manitoba Special Rural Development Agreement, dated July 20, 1971, as follows: "The development of viable supplementary or alternative primary producing activities for the purpose of improving marginal or submarginal incomes of disadvantaged people engaged in such activities."

SPECIAL ARDA PROGRAM—THE SPLIT LAKE LOCAL FUR COUNCIL

Question No. 2,997—**Mr. Epp:**

1. Under the Special ARDA Program entered into under agreement between the government and the Province of Manitoba, what amounts of federal moneys were granted to The Split Lake Local Fur Council in Manitoba?

2. On what dates were the moneys granted and under what terms and conditions?

Mr. Ed. Lumley (Parliament Secretary to Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): The reply for the Department of Regional Economic Expansion is as follows: 1. Under the Special ARDA Program, to July 31, 1977, the following federal moneys were expended: $54,345.11 to Split Lake Local Fur Council I; $47,600.21 to Split Lake Local Fur Council II.

2. Financial assistance was committed on August 12, 1973 to Split Lake Local Fur Council I, and on April 17, 1975 to Split Lake Local Fur Council II, under Section 1(d) of the Canada/Manitoba Special Rural Development Agreement, dated July 20, 1971, as follows: "The development of viable supplementary or alternative primary producing activities for the purpose of improving marginal or submarginal incomes of disadvantaged people engaged in such activities."

[Mr. Lumley.]

SPECIAL ARDA PROGRAM—SHAMATTAWA LOCAL FUR COUNCIL

Question No. 2,998—**Mr. Epp:**

1. Under the Special ARDA Program entered into under agreement between the government and the Province of Manitoba, what amounts of federal moneys were granted to Shamattawa Local Fur Council in Manitoba?

2. On what dates were the moneys granted and under what terms and conditions?

Mr. Ed. Lumley (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): The reply for the Department of Regional Economic Expansion is as follows: 1. Under the Special ARDA Program, to July 31, 1977, the following federal moneys were expended: $10,227.87 to Shamattawa Local Fur Council I; $54,496.98 to Shamattawa Local Fur Council II.

2. Financial assistance was committed on November 14, 1973 to Shamattawa Local Fur Council I under Section 1(d) of the Canada/Manitoba Special Rural Development Agreement, dated July 20, 1971, as follows: "The development of viable supplementary or alternative primary producing activities for the purpose of improving marginal or submarginal incomes of disadvantaged people engaged in such activities." Financial assistance was committed on September 30, 1975 to Shamattawa Local Fur Council II under Section 1(d) of the Canada/Manitoba Special Rural Development Agreement, dated July 18, 1975, as follows: "The development of viable supplementary or alternative primary producing activities for the purpose of improving marginal or submarginal incomes of disadvantaged people engaged in such activities."

SPECIAL ARDA PROGRAM—PRIMADJIHOWIN

Question No. 2,999—**Mr. Epp:**

1. Under the Special ARDA Program entered into under agreement between the government and the Province of Manitoba, what amounts of federal moneys were granted to Project Primadjihowin in Manitoba?

2. On what dates were the moneys granted and under what terms and conditions?

Mr. Ed. Lumley (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): The reply for the Department of Regional Economic Expansion is as follows: under the Special ARDA Program, to July 31, 1977, no federal moneys were expended to assist Project Primadjihowin.

SPECIAL ARDA PROGRAM—SOUTH INDIAN LAKE FISHERMEN'S CO-OP

Question No. 3,000—**Mr. Epp:**

1. Under the Special ARDA Program entered into under agreement between the government and the Province of Manitoba, what amounts of federal moneys were granted to South Indian Lake Fishermen's Co-op in Manitoba?

2. On what dates were the moneys granted and under what terms and conditions?

Mr. Ed. Lumley (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): The reply for the Department of Regional Economic Expansion is as follows: 1. Under the Special ARDA Program, to July 31, 1977, $343,078 of federal

moneys were expended to assist South Indian Lake Co-op Fisheries Ltd.

2. Financial assistance was committed on January 8, 1973, under Section 1(e) of the Canada/Manitoba Special Rural Development Agreement, dated July 20, 1971, as follows: "The establishment, expansion or modernization of any commercial undertaking engaged in the utilization of primary resources, in processing, in manufacturing or in the provision of services, including tourist facilities, provided that (i) the undertaking is expressly organized so that at least two-thirds of those employed are disadvantaged people who have previously had little or no access to regular earning and employment opportunities; and (ii) there is adequate provision for such counselling, training and other adjustment measures as are necessary to the employment of disadvantaged people in the undertaking."

SPECIAL ARDA PROGRAM—GRAND RAPIDS FISHERMEN'S CO-OP

Question No. 3,001—**Mr. Epp:**

1. Under the Special ARDA Program entered into under agreement between the government and the Province of Manitoba, what amounts of federal moneys were granted to Grand Rapids Fishermen's Co-op in Manitoba?

2. On what dates were the moneys granted and under what terms and conditions?

Mr. Ed. Lumley (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): The reply for the Department of Regional Economic Expansion is as follows: 1. Under the Special ARDA Program, to July 31, 1977, the following federal moneys were expended: $17,803.00 to Grand Rapids Fishermen's Co-op I; $24,395.71 to Grand Rapids Fishermen's Co-op II; $4,839.76 to Grand Rapids Fishermen's Assoc.

2. Financial assistance was committed on May 21, 1972 to Grand Rapids Fishermen's Co-op I; and on September 4, 1974, to the Grand Rapids Fishermen's Co-op II, under section 1(d) of the Canada/Manitoba Special Rural Development Agreement, dated July 20, 1971, as follows: "The development of viable supplementary or alternative primary producing activities for the purpose of improving marginal or submarginal incomes of disadvantaged people engaged in such activities." Financial assistance was committed on January 22, 1976 to the Grand Rapids Fishermen's Association under Section 1(d) of the Canada/Manitoba Special Rural Development Agreement, dated July 18, 1975, as follows: "The development of viable supplementary or alternative primary producing activities for the purpose of improving marginal or submarginal incomes of disadvantaged people engaged in such activities."

SPECIAL ARDA PROGRAM—NORWAY NURSING HOME

Question No. 3,002—**Mr. Epp:**

1. Under the Special ARDA Program entered into under agreement between the government and the Province of Manitoba, what amounts of federal moneys were granted to Norway Nursing Home in Manitoba?

2. On what dates were the moneys granted and under what terms and conditions?

Mr. Ed. Lumley (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): The reply for the Department of Regional Economic Expansion is as follows: 1. Under the Special ARDA Program to July 31, 1977, $202,724.47 of federal moneys were expended to assist the Norway House Nursing Home.

2. Financial assistance was committed on October 18, 1973 under Section 1(e) of the Canada/Manitoba Special Rural Development Agreement, dated July 20, 1971, as follows: "The establishment, expansion or modernization of any commercial undertaking engaged in the utilization of primary resources, in processing, in manufacturing or in the provision of services, including tourist facilities, provided that: (i) the undertaking is expressly organized so that at least two-thirds of those employed are disadvantaged people who have previously had little or no access to regular earning and employment opportunities; and (ii) there is adequate provision for such counselling, training and other adjustment measures as are necessary to the employment of disadvantaged people in the undertaking."

SPECIAL ARDA PROGRAM—ST. LAURENT FISHERMEN'S ASSOCIATION

Question No. 3,003—**Mr. Epp:**

1. Under the Special ARDA Program entered into under agreement between the government and the Province of Manitoba, what amounts of federal moneys were granted to St. Laurent Fishermen's Association in Manitoba?

2. On what dates were the moneys granted and under what terms and conditions?

Mr. Ed. Lumley (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): The reply for the Department of Regional Economic Expansion is as follows: 1. Under the Special ARDA Program to July 31, 1977, $20,453.53 of federal moneys were expended to assist the St. Laurent Fishermen's Association.

2. Financial assistance was committed on September 7, 1972 under Section 1(d) of the Canada/Manitoba Special Rural Development Agreement, dated July 20, 1971, as follows: "The development of viable supplementary or alternative primary producing activities for the purpose of improving marginal or submarginal incomes of disadvantaged people engaged in such activities."

SPECIAL ARDA PROGRAM—LAKE MANITOBA'S FISHERMEN'S CO-OP

Question No. 3,004—**Mr. Epp:**

1. Under the Special ARDA Program entered into under agreement between the government and the Province of Manitoba, what amounts of federal moneys were granted to Lake Manitoba's Fishermen's Co-op in Manitoba?

2. On what dates were the moneys granted and under what terms and conditions?

Mr. Ed. Lumley (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): The reply for the Department of Regional Economic Expansion is as follows: 1. Under the

Special ARDA Program, to July 21, 1977, $2,563 of federal moneys were expended to assist Lake Manitoba Co-op Fisheries Ltd.

2. Financial assistance was committed on June 5, 1972, under Section 1(e) of the Canada/Manitoba Special Rural Development Agreement, dated July 20, 1971, as follows: "The establishment, expansion or modernization of any commercial undertaking engaged in the utilization of primary resources, in processing, in manufacturing or in the provision of services, including tourist facilities, provided that: (i) the undertaking is expressly organized so that at east two-thirds of those employed are disadvantaged people who have previously had little or no access to regular earning and employment opportunities; and (ii) there is adequate provision for such counselling, training and other adjustment measures as are necessary to the employment of disadvantaged people in the undertaking."

UIC—KEY DATA

Question No. 3,008—**Mr. Cossitt:**

1. In regard to the possible use of the Unemployment Insurance Commission's computer in Montreal, Quebec by Key Data Canada, was (a) a programme for any particular job labelled LG01 (b) the tape used labelled with the word "KAOTEK" or a similar name?

2. Was (a) Gabriel Charbonneau (b) Elaine Gagné (c) Robert Martin (d) Jean-Pierre Cloutier (e) Michel Soucy (f) Jacques Benoit (g) Yvon Deguire (h) André Boileau involved in the project at any time including after-hours and, if so, was an attempt made to give them $20.00 in addition to their usual UIC salaries in order to involve them in an illegal project?

3. Was this money presented to them in envelopes and, if so, by whom?

4. Did Mr. D. Mainville, Chief of the Computer Section at the time, have knowledge of or anything to do with such a procedure?

5. Was Key Data doing work for a company located in the area of Drummondville, Quebec and, if so, for what reason was it using the UIC computers for such purposes?

6. To the knowledge of the government, did a UIC employee receive a swimming pool at his residence in return for making arrangements involved with this matter and did the employee arrange a promotion for one of his staff for assisting him?

7. Were UIC computer services used by Key Data for a period of approximately two months and were transactions entered on the computer and, if so, how many transactions?

Hon. Bud Cullen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): The matter has been referred to the RCMP for investigation. Upon completion of the investigation the question will be answered.

* * *

[*Translation*]

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS

Mr. Yvon Pinard (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, I ask that questions Nos. 2,482 to 2,529 inclusively and 2,559 to 2,623 inclusively be made orders for returns.

Mr. Speaker, if questions Nos. 29, 30, 160, 181, 212, 360, 487, 592, 643, 715, 725, 747, 771, 784, 786, 877, 941, 948, 955, 1,031, 1,072, 1,189, 1,192, 1,215, 1,224, 1,303, 1,322, 1,338, 1,358, 1,643, 1,737, 1,914, 2,073, 2,344, 2,369, 2,375, 2,378, 2,379, 2,380, 2,381, 2,396, 2,441, 2,531, 2,535, 2,548, 2,551, 2,643, 2,755, 2,756, 2,781 and 3,005 could be made orders for returns, these returns would be tabled immediately.

[Mr. Lumley.]

MINISTER'S USE OF AIRCRAFT

Question No. 29—**Mr. Cossitt:**

1. Since January 1, 1974, have any Department of Transport aircraft been used by Cabinet Ministers and, if so, in each case (a) what is the identity of the Minister (b) what type of aircraft was used (c) what was the purpose of the trip (d) on what date was such trip made (e) what was the (i) point of origin (ii) stop in between and its purpose (iii) point of termination (f) what was the complete cost to the taxpayer (g) what was the name and job designation of all others on board at any time (h) which trip, if any, included attendance at Liberal Party functions or political business of any kind, directly or indirectly?

2. What was the total cost to the taxpayer of all such trips?

Return tabled.

MINISTER'S USE OF AIRCRAFT

Question No. 30—**Mr. Cossitt:**

1. Since January 1, 1974, have any Department of National Defence aircraft been used by Cabinet Ministers and, if so, in each case (a) what is the identity of the Minister (b) what type of aircraft was used (c) what was the purpose of the trip (d) on what date was such trip made (e) what was the (i) point of origin (ii) stop in between and its purpose (iii) point of termination (f) what was the complete cost to the taxpayer (g) which trip, if any, included attendance at Liberal Party functions or political business of any kind, directly or indirectly?

2. What was the total cost to the taxpayer of all such trips?

Return tabled.

TRADE STATISTICS

Question No. 160—**Mr. Forrestall:**

By year, since 1965 for which trade statistics are available, what is the government's best estimate of the amount of cargo with the Canadian origins/destinations routed via east coast American ports by country or origin/destination in terms of (a) dollar value (b) tons?

Return tabled.

DEPARTMENTAL USE OF TAXIS IN OTTAWA

Question No. 181—**Mr. Cossitt:**

1. What was the total figure paid by (a) all departments (b) each department for taxis in the Ottawa area during the last year for which figures are available?

2. What was the total amount received by Blue Line Taxi Company from all departments during the last year for which figures are available?

3. Has Blue Line been used exclusively by the government and, if so (a) for what reason (b) were tenders called for such services and, if so (i) what are the details (ii) if not, for what reason?

4. What was the total amount paid to all other taxi companies in the Ottawa area for all departments for the last year for which figures are available?

Return tabled.

REORGANIZATION OF DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES

Question No. 212—**Mr. Orlikow:**

For each department and agency, what were the dates of the completion of the two re-organizations preceding the most recent one (a) what contracts were

awarded in connection with these re-organizations (b) what was the total cost of each such contract?

Return tabled.

GOVERNMENT ADVERTISING IN ETHNIC NEWSPAPERS

Question No. 360—**Mr. Mitges:**

1. Is there a policy regarding advertising by the government in ethnic newspapers in Canada and is such advertising funnelled through individuals and/or different agencies and, if so, what are their names?

2. What amount was allocated for advertising by the government in ethnic newspapers in (a) 1974-75 (b) 1975-76 (c) 1976-77?

3. Which ethnic newspapers received government advertising in (a) 1974-75 (b) 1975-76 and what was the amount in each case?

Return tabled.

INMATES SERVING INDEFINITE SENTENCES

Question No. 487—**Mr. Hnatyshyn:**

How many inmates in Canada are serving indefinite sentences as (a) dangerous sexual offenders (b) habitual offenders and, in each case (i) how long have they been serving their sentence (ii) what number are currently on parole?

Return tabled.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Question No. 592—**Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich):**

1. (a) How many regional offices are maintained by the Department of Agriculture (b) where is each located (c) for what area is each responsible?

2. On what date was each established and with how many personnel?

3. What is the present personnel strength of each office?

4. In addition to regional offices, are district or other sub-offices maintained and, if so (a) in what locations (b) how many?

5. Are the duties performed by those manning the regional and/or district offices line functions, in the chain of command from Ottawa to the operator in the field, or do they have other functions to perform and, if so, what are such functions?

Return tabled.

MAILING LISTS

Question No. 643—**Mr. Beatty:**

1. What is the policy of the government with regard to the placing of names of individuals or organizations on mailing lists for the sending of unsolicited material during a period of restraint?

2. (a) Approximately how many names are on such lists and how many mailings would each receive over the course of a year (b) what is the total cost to the taxpayer for such mailings?

3. Does the government at least once a year request confirmation by those included on such lists that they, in fact, want the material and, if not (a) in each case, what is the nature of the mailing list and how many names are on it (b) for what reason?

Return tabled.

Order Paper Questions

CONSULTANT CONTRACTS

Question No. 715—**Mr. Coates:**

1. What is the total number of individuals, firms and agencies presently involved in any form of consulting work with the government through any department, agency or Crown corporation as of this date?

2. Of the total number, how many have been employed by the government for a period longer than April 1, 1976 and, in each case (a) what has been the period of involvement to date (b) how long will the contract continue (c) what have been the payments in fees and expenses to date (d) what is the estimated final cost in fees and expenses (e) what is the objective of the work in question?

Return tabled.

GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS

Question No. 725—**Mr. Coates:**

1. Of the total number of persons who hold contracts with the government, its agencies or Crown corporations, how many were former employees of the government?

2. In each case, what is (a) their name (b) the position formerly held (c) the contract presently held (d) the total estimated cost of the contract (e) the amount received to date in fees and expenses (f) duration of the contract?

Return tabled.

SPECIAL ADVERTISING PROGRAMS BY GOVERNMENT

Question No. 747—**Mr. Muir:**

1. How many special advertising programmes have been undertaken by the government or its agencies since April 1, 1972 and what was the purpose and cost of each?

2. In each case (a) what was the name of the firm (b) what amount of the total cost was paid to each (c) of the total cost paid to each, what amount was received in fees and expenses and what percentage was part of the contract awarded to the firm?

3. For each advertising programme (a) in what manner was it determined which firm or firms would participate in the programme and who made the decision (b) were tenders called and, if not, for what reason?

Return tabled.

DEATHS IN PENAL INSTITUTIONS

Question No. 771—**Mr. Leggatt:**

1. Between January 1, 1962 and January 1, 1976, how many persons have died in penal institutions?

2. How many such deaths occurred in (a) maximum security (b) medium security (c) minimum security institutions, and, in each case, what was his or her (i) name (ii) status in the institution (i.e. inmate, guard, social worker, etc.) (iii) cause of death?

3. To the knowledge of the government, by province, how many deaths occurred in provincial institutions and, in each case, what was his or her (a) name (b) status in the institution (c) cause of death?

4. In each case where the victim was an inmate (a) for what crime or crimes had he or she been incarcerated (b) what was the length of sentence he or she had been serving?

5. Between January 1, 1962 and January 1, 1976, how many hostage-taking incidents have occurred in penal institutions and, in each case (a) on what date (b) what was the number of hostages (c) what was the name of the institution?

Return tabled.

Order Paper Questions

SERVICES LEASED BY GOVERNMENT FROM TELEPHONE COMPANIES

Question No. 784—**Mr. Bawden:**

1. What are the details of the services leased by the government from (a) Bell Canada (b) Trans-Canada Telephone System (c) other telephone companies in Canada?

2. In each case, what are the cost breakdowns?

Return tabled.

HOUSING UNITS—1968 TO 1975

Question No. 786—**Mr. Gilbert:**

1. For each year 1968 to 1975, what was the total number of housing units in (a) Canada (b) each province?

2. For each of the same years, where applicable, what was the number of housing units in (a) Canada (b) each province classified as (i) low rental (ii) non-profit (iii) cooperative (iv) assisted rental (v) rural and native (vi) federal-provincial (vii) student (viii) public?

Return tabled.

PUBLIC OPINION SURVEYS

Question No. 877—**Mr. Beatty:**

1. Have any public opinion surveys been conducted or commissioned by the government in the past year and, if so (a) what are they (b) in each case (i) what was its purpose (ii) on what date was it conducted (iii) for what body or individual was it conducted (iv) by whom was the survey conducted (v) what was the cost to the taxpayer (vi) what was the sample size (vii) from what group(s) were respondents drawn (viii) what action, if any, was taken as a result of the survey (ix) from whom is a copy of the survey available?

2. What further public opinion surveys are being contemplated for 1976?

Return tabled.

CONTRACT SPEECH WRITERS

Question No. 941—**Mr. Beatty:**

1. From March 1, 1975 to November 5, 1976, on how many occasions did a minister of the Crown employ or otherwise arrange for the services of a freelance or contract speech writer?

2. In each case (a) who was the minister (b) what was the fee (c) what was the occasion of the speech (d) who was the freelance or contract writer?

Return tabled.

CMHC—OUTSIDE CONSULTANTS

Question No. 948—**Mr. Howie:**

Were outside consultants employed by CMHC between January 1, 1975 and November 1, 1976 and, if so (a) how many (b) who were the firms or persons (c) what amount was paid to each (d) for what purpose (e) in each case, is the report available to the public and, if not, will it be published?

Return tabled.

STUDIES OF GOVERNMENT ADMINISTRATION OR SERVICES

Question No. 955—**Mr. Howie:**

1. Have any studies been done on aspects of government administration or services that could be considered for contracting out to the private sector of the economy and, if so (a) on what date (b) by whom (c) has a written report been produced (d) in each case, will it be made public?

[Mr. Leggatt.]

2. Were any such studies prepared by outside consultants and, if so (a) by whom (b) what amount was paid to each?

Return tabled.

DIOXIN

Question No. 1,031—**Mr. Nystrom:**

1. How many products containing the contaminant dioxin are available for sale or may be sold in Canada?

2. Who are the manufacturers who produce these products in Canada and/or the United States?

3. What are the tolerance levels set for dioxin in the various products which contain this contaminant?

4. What procedures are followed to ensure that the various manufacturers of these products stay within the tolerance levels set by the Canadian government?

5. What is the dollar value spent in Canada on research to develop products which do not contain the contaminant dioxin?

6. (a) What is the dollar value of research in Canada currently underway or recently completed on the possible effects on human health of products which contain this contaminant (b) what are the results of this research?

7. Has there been any research on the cumulative effects of products which contain dioxin and, if so, what are the results of this research?

8. Has there been any research in Canada, or in any other country, on the effects of the contaminant dioxin when combined with other chemicals which might be used simultaneously with products containing dioxin and, if so, what are the results of this research?

9. (a) What is the Department of National Health and Welfare's estimate on the volume of dioxin used in Canada over the past five years (b) has the volume increased or decreased during this period (c) what was the volume used last year?

10. (a) What is the Department's estimate on the volume of dioxin used in the US over the past five years (b) has the volume increased or decreased during this period (c) what was the volume used last year?

11. (a) Are there any prohibitions on the use of products which contain the contaminant dioxin near residences (b) are there any other prohibitions on the use of these products?

12. Are there any alternative products which do not contain dioxin and could be used as effectively as those products which do contain this contaminant and, if not, is there any research currently underway on alternative products?

13. Is there any evidence of birth defects, still births or serious illness, in Canada or the US, associated with the spraying of herbicides which contain the contaminant dioxin and, if so, what are the details?

14. Do any government departments use products which contain dioxin and, if so (a) which departments (b) in what quantities (c) are permits required for the use of these products?

15. Has the government considered banning products which contain dioxin and, if not, for what reason?

Return tabled.

PRIME MINISTER AND PRIVY COUNCIL OFFICE PERSONNEL

Question No. 1,072—**Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich):**

1. For the fiscal year (a) 1972-73 (b) 1973-74 (c) 1974-75 (d) 1975-76, what was the personnel strength of the (i) Prime Minister's Office (ii) Privy Council Office?

2. For the same years, in each case, what was the strength by grade, class or category of employee?

3. For the same years, how many in each category in Part 2 were employed as a result of (a) open competition through the Public Servce Commission (b) transfer from other departments (c) Order-in-Council appointment (d) Ministerial or Prime Minister designation?

4. For the same years, in each category, what amount was paid in salaries and travel costs?

Return tabled.

DEPARTMENTAL PUBLICATIONS

Question No. 1,189—**Mr. Beatty:**

1. Which departments publish magazines concerning their activities and policies?

2. In each case (a) what is the (i) name of the magazine (ii) nature of its contents (b) how often is it published (c) what was the (i) press run (ii) size of the distribution list for each issue in the past 12 months (d) what was the total cost to the taxpayer for the (i) preparation (ii) printing (iii) distribution of each issue in the past 12 months?

Return tabled.

GOVERNMENT HOSPITALITY

Question No. 1,192—**Mr. Beatty:**

What was the total amount paid by the government for hospitality in (a) 1975 (b) the first ten months of (i) 1975 (ii) 1976?

Return tabled.

USE OF DOT AIRCRAFT

Question No. 1,215—**Mr. Cossitt:**

1. On how many occasions have DOT aircraft been used by individuals, other than Cabinet Ministers, as far back as records are available and, in each case, what (a) is the name, address and job designation (b) was the point of departure and destination (c) was the cost (d) was the purpose (e) is the name of the highest ranking individual authorizing the flight and what is his job designation?

2. What was the total cost to the taxpayer of all such trips?

Return tabled.

LAWYERS IN BRITISH COLUMBIA

Question No. 1,224—**Mr. Reynolds:**

What are the names of all lawyers used in British Columbia by the government or any Crown corporation?

Return tabled.

AUTOMATION IN POST OFFICE

Question No, 1,303—**Mr. Dinsdale:**

1. At what locations in Canada have machines been installed for the automated processing of mail?

2. What types of machines were installed at each location?

3. How many of each type of machine was installed at each location?

4. On what date was each type of machine installed at each location?

5. What was the original target date for the installation of each type of machine at each location?

6. What were the reasons for the delay, if any, in installing each machine at each location?

7. When was each type of machine at each location fully operative?

8. What was the estimated cost of each type of machine installed at each location?

9. What was the actual cost of each type of machine installed at each location?

10. What were the reasons, if any, for the difference in the estimated cost and the actual cost of each type of machine installed at each location?

11. Who were the suppliers of each type of machine installed at each location?

12. Who were the manufacturers of each type of machine installed at each location?

13. Where was each type of machine installed at each location manufactured?

14. What firms were asked to tender for each type of machine installed at each location?

15. What time frame do the answers to parts 1 to 14 cover?

16. At what locations in Canada does machinery have to be installed in order to fully complete the Post Office's programme of mechanization?

17. What types of machines have to be installed at each of the locations?

18. What quantity of each type of machine has to be installed at each of the locations?

19. What is the estimated cost of each type of machine to be installed at each location?

20. What is the target date for the installation of each type of machine at each location?

21. What factors could delay the installation of each type of machine at each location?

22. Who will be the suppliers of each type of machine to be installed at each location?

23. Who will be the manufacturers of each type of machine to be installed at each location?

24. What time frame do the answers to parts 16 to 23 cover?

Return tabled.

FLIGHTS TAKEN BY PUBLIC SERVANTS

Question No. 1,322—**Mr. Allard:**

1. How many flights were taken by public servants in (a) 1975 (b) 1976 and, of these, how many were first class?

2. For the same years, what amount was spent on air travel?

Return tabled.

"CITIZEN McCAIN"

Question No. 1,338—**Mr. McCain:**

1. What was the total number of employees of CBC involved with the production of the film "Citizen McCain"?

2. What is the name of each person involved with research during any stage of the production of the film?

3. What is the name of each person involved at any stage in the editing of the film?

4. What is the name of the producer of the film?

5. What was the total number of working hours spent by CBC employees on the production of the film, including preparation, editing and public presentation?

6. How many persons were interviewed during any stage of the production of the film and what is the name and address of each such person?

7. How many persons interviewed did not appear in the final version of the film and what is the name and address of each?

8. How many persons travelled to (a) England (b) any other location outside Canada during any stage of the production of the film?

9. What is the name of each location (a) in Canada (b) in England (c) outside Canada other than England, which was visited during any stage of the production of the film?

10. How many locations (a) in Canada (b) in England (c) outside Canada other than England, were visited more than once during any stage of the production of the film and, in each case (i) what is its name (ii) how many times was it visited?

Order Paper Questions

11. What is the name of the location of each warehouse visited (a) during any stage in the production of the film (b) which did not appear in the production of the film?

12. What is the name and location of each television station which has included the film in its programming to date (a) in Canada (b) outside Canada?

13. Has the film been shown by any television station (a) in Canada (b) outside Canada, on more than one occasion and, if so, in each case (i) what is the name and location of the station (ii) how many times has it been shown by the station to date?

14. What percentage of Canada's population will have been covered by the television stations which have included the film in their programming to date?

15. Will the film be shown by any television station in or outside Canada in the future and, if so (a) what is the name and location of the station (b) on what date will it be shown?

16. Has the film been presented to the public other than through the television media in or outside Canada at any time and, if so (a) in what locations (b) to whom (c) how many times?

17. Will the film be presented to the public other than through the television media at any time in the future and, if so (a) in what locations (b) to whom (c) on what date?

18. What was the salary of each person employed by CBC while involved with any stage of the production of the film and what was the total salary cost to CBC?

19. What was the amount paid to each person interviewed during any stage of the production of the film?

20. What was the total cost to CBC for travel, food, lodging and related expenses during any stage in the production of the film (a) in Canada (b) in England (c) outside Canada other than England?

21. What was the total cost to CBC for the use of warehouses or other facilities used during any stage in the production of the film?

22. What was the total cost to CBC for network time required for the public presentation of the film to date and on what basis was the cost calculated?

23. What was the total cost for the complete production and presentation of the film?

Return tabled.

GOVERNMENT ADVERTISING

Question No. 1,358—**Mr. MacKay:**

1. In the year (a) 1974 (b) 1975 (c) 1976, what proportion of the total advertising budget of the government was directed to paid advertising in (i) member papers of the Canadian Weekly Newspapers Association or the Canadian Community Newspapers Association (ii) Canadian daily newspapers (iii) Canadian "ethnic" newspapers (iv) Canadian magazines, excluding *Reader's Digest* (v) Canadian radio (vi) Canadian television (vii) United States publications excluding *Reader's Digest* and other foreign publications (viii) United States television and radio (ix) other Canadian media (x) other foreign media?

2. For the same years, what was the total government expenditure on government information services and publications?

Return tabled.

CROWN CORPORATIONS

Question No. 1,643—**Mr. Herbert:**

Do any Crown corporations incur obligations in the coverage of insured risks and, if so (a) which ones (b) what are the amounts of the contingent liabilities?

Return tabled.

[Mr. McCain.]

MR. JOHN S. STRAITON

Question No. 1,737—**Mr. Gillies:**

1. Did Mr. John S. Straiton join the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources effective June 17, 1974 and, if so, what was his (a) title (b) salary range (c) salary designation level (d) job description (e) past experience?

2. Did Mr. Straiton join the Department under the Executive Interchange Programme and, if so (a) what is a brief description of the concept and terms of the Programme (b) what are the specific details in relation to Mr. Straiton?

3. On what date did Mr. Straiton leave the Department?

4. Is John Straiton and Partners Ltd., Toronto, Ontario incorporated and, if so, since what date?

5. Did Mr. Straiton of John Straiton and Partners Ltd. ever receive any consulting contracts from the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources and, if so (a) were tenders called (b) was there any kind of formal review to assess the contracts and, what is a description of such review?

6. For each consulting contract referred to in Part 5, what (a) were the terms of reference (b) was the time period involved (c) was the time of the actual completion date (d) was the amount paid and the name of the project authority?

7. Did Miss Ethel Teitelbaum serve as special assistant to the Honourable Donald Macdonald and, if so, what was her (a) specific function (b) salary range (c) date of (i) commencement (ii) departure?

8. Is the government aware that in December 1976, John Straiton and Partners announced the appointment of Miss Teitelbaum and in an advertisement stated that she "was the principal liaison" between the Honourable Donald Macdonald and "major federal projects in Toronto", that her former job "brought her into contact with Members of Parliament, Ministers, government departments and agencies, civic and provincial officials"?

9. Did the Prime Minister state in the House on March 24, 1976, that guidelines will have to be established governing the activities of former high level public servants and, if so, will he take into consideration the inclusion of exempt (appointed) staff in such guidelines?

Return tabled.

CMHC USE OF LAWYERS IN HAMILTON-WENTWORTH

Question No. 1,914—**Mr. O'Sullivan:**

1. (a) What are the names and addresses of lawyers who were given work by CMHC in the Constituency of Hamilton-Wentworth since October 1, 1972 (b) in each case, by year, how much was paid?

2. For each year (a) 1972 (b) 1973 (c) 1974 (d) 1975 (e) 1976, what amount was paid to members of the legal profession in the Constituency of Hamilton-Wentworth by the Department of (i) Justice (ii) National Health and Welfare (iii) Labour (iv) the Solicitor General (v) Fisheries (vi) the Environment (vii) Consumer and Corporate Affairs and, in each case, what was the name and addresses of the lawyer?

3. For each year 1972 to date, how many public servants did each Department have working in the Constituency of Hamilton-Wentworth?

4. (a) What are the names of all advertising agencies in Ontario used by the government or any Crown corporation in each year 1972 to 1976 inclusive (b) what were the amounts paid to each (c) in each case, what work was done by the agency?

Return tabled.

CANDU COMMERCIAL REACTORS

Question No. 2,073—**Mr. Crosbie:**

1. In the safety report for a commercial CANDU reactor, is the unavailability of the vacuum building considered as a credible event?

2. Has the vacuum building at Pickering, Ontario ever been unavailable while the reactors were operating and, if so (a) on what dates (b) for how long?

3. Have the vent valves used in the vacuum building for the CANDU commercial reactors been tested at full scale?

4. If the vent valves fail to function due to "common mode" failure would the vacuum building be incapacitated?

5. Has the AECB sufficient independent expertise to evaluate the contents of the computer codes which are used in CANDU safety analysis?

6. (a) How many computer codes are used in CANDU safety analysis (b) what are their names and functions (c) where do they originate?

7. Have any of the computer codes been modified in order to minimize discrepancies with observed phenomena?

8. Is AECL or Ontario Hydro competent to do three-dimensional transient analysis in the course of CANDU safety analysis?

9. Does AECB have the necessary expertise to independently evaluate the use of computers for control functions at the Bruce Atomic Generating Station?

10. What has been the experience with regard to the combined availability of the two computers used for control functions at the Bruce Atomic Generating Station?

11. (a) What is a power tilt and how does it develop (b) can a power tilt get out of control and, if so, what are the results (c) does the Bruce Atomic Generating Station demonstrate a tendency to develop a power tilt and, if so, at what power levels does such a tendency first manifest itself?

12. Is it possible for ballooning fuel rods to block the flow of coolant in a pressure tube and, if so, what would be the result?

13. How many seconds will elapse before a pressure tube deprived of coolant will explode assuming the reactor (a) is operating at full power (b) has just been shut down?

14. Is there any conclusive proof that an exploding pressure tube cannot precipitate similar explosions or failures in neighbouring pressure tubes and, if so, what is it?

15. Has the Lucens accident in Switzerland in 1969, in which an exploding pressure tube collapsed hundreds of other calandria tubes and totally destroyed the core of the reactor, been carefully studied because of its possible safety implications for CANDU reactors and, if so, by whom and with what results?

16. What assurances are there that embrittlement of pressure tubes due to constant or only moderate bombardment with neutrons will not weaken some of the tubes to such an extent that they may explode spontaneously?

17. (a) Are there signs posted in the area of the Pickering Generating Station indicating the nature of the dangers therein or are there simply "No Trespassing" signs in the outer and inner perimeter fences (b) are warning signs posted in English only or in both official languages?

18. Have members of the public wandered within the confines of the inner fence and, if so, on what occasions?

19. (a) What improvements in security have been undertaken since Dr. Morton Schulman made his unauthorized entry into the Pickering Plant (b) how many guards are posted at Pickering (i) by day (ii) by night (c) is there a gap at the western end of the outer perimeter fence where it meets Lake Ontario through which members of the public may and do wander freely onto the grounds at the installation?

20. What laws and regulations are in effect to keep the public outside the grounds of nuclear facilities?

21. What is the maximum credible direct impact of an airplane in terms of size and speed that one of the Pickering reactors could withstand?

22. How many grams of (a) plutonium (b) uranium exist in Canada in a pure state or in a state that would qualify it as "strategic nuclear material"?

23. What is the anticipated amount of "strategic" plutonium that will be in existence in Canada in (a) 1980 (b) 1990 (c) 2000 (d) 2025 (e) 2050?

24. Is it possible for a CANDU reactor to suffer a major release of radioactivity as a result of (a) a conventional artillery or mortar assault (b) a single well placed conventional explosive charge and, if so, approximately how many living people possess the knowledge of where to place such a charge?

25. Does the government have contigency plans for the evacuation of the Toronto metropolitan area in the event of a major radiation release at the Pickering Nuclear Power Station?

26. (a) How long would it take to evacuate the maximum credible area endangered by a CANDU failure (b) what would be the dollar cost of decontamination of such a maximum credible area?

27. (a) Has the government established guidelines for coping with nuclear blackmail (b) what would be this government's reaction to credible evidence that some person or persons in Ottawa were in possession and control of a nuclear bomb?

28. What specific plans and guidelines have been developed for decommissioning CANDU reactors and installations at the end of their useful period of service?

29. What are the anticipated total dollar costs of decommissioning the (a) Pickering (b) Bruce facilities?

30. What progress has been made in the research and development of the fuel processing capability?

31. How much has been (a) spent (b) committed toward R & D of this capability?

32. Is nuclear energy, in the government's opinion, economically viable over the long term (a) without (b) with the development of the fuel reprocessing option?

33. Are any sites in Canada now under consideration for fuel reprocessing facilities and, if so (a) what are they (b) has any land been acquired by the federal or provincial governments at any site?

34. What are the (a) costs (b) conclusions involved in re-using plutonium as reactor fuel in Canada?

35. Has any progress been made in the assessment of the environmental, public health and safety risks involved in re-using plutonium as a reactor fuel and, if so, are these risks greater when plutonium is re-used?

36. (a) Has AECL undertaken development of a second generation CANDU that can use recycled plutonium and, if so, on what date was the decision made and by whom (b) when is this second generation CANDU expected to come on line (c) what are the anticipated R and D costs of such a programme (d) how much has been (i) spent (ii) committed to such a programme?

37. In the government's opinion, is nuclear power economically viable (a) without (b) with second generation development?

38. Is it possible that a fully fuelled CANDU reactor be destroyed by sabotage, error, explosion, or earthquake and, if so, what is the government's estimate of the (a) likely (b) maximum possible, extent of nuclear contamination on the surrounding environment and the affects on public health and safety of such an event?

39. (a) Was there an accident at the Chalk River NRX facility on December 12, 1952 and, if so, what was the extent of the damage that occurred on that date and in the period immediately following (b) have the causes of the accident been traced to (i) human error (ii) mechanical failure (iii) or a combination of both (c) what were the nature and extent of the repairs (d) what amount was spent on the repairs (e) how long was the reactor shut down following the incident (f) was any leakage of nuclear contaminants involved (g) what was the minimum distance that separated significant volumes of radioactive fluids from the Ottawa River in the period until this accident was brought under control?

40. (a) Was there an accident (fire in the NRU refuelling machine) at the Chalk River NRU facility on May 25, 1958 and, if so, what was the extent of the damage that occurred on that date and in the period immediately following (b) have the causes of the damage been traced to (i) human error (ii) mechanical failure (iii) or a combination of both (c) what was the nature and extent of the repairs (d) what amount was spent on the repairs (e) how long was the reactor shut down (f) was any leakage of nuclear contaminants involved (g) what was the minimum distance that separated significant volumes of radioactive fluids from the Ottawa River in the period until this accident was brought under control (h) how many square metres around the NRU building were contaminated?

41. Has the government undertaken any correspondence with the USA regarding the accident that took place at Lagoona Beach, Michigan, in the Enrico Fermi I Reactor?

Return tabled.

Order Paper Questions

USE OF CHARTERED AIRCRAFT BASED AT FORT FRANCES, ONTARIO

Question No. 2,344—**Mr. Reid:**

1. For the years 1975 and 1976, how many times has the Department of (a) National Health and Welfare (Medical Services Branch) (b) Indian Affairs and Northern Development (c) Public Works (d) the Environment (Water Resources Branch) used chartered aircraft based at Fort Frances, Ontario?

2. For each such flight, what was the (a) date (b) place of origin (c) destination (d) length (e) name of the operator of the aircraft?

3. Were any of the flights shared and, if so (a) with whom (b) to what destination (c) on what date (d) who ordered the aircraft (e) what was the name of the charter company?

Return tabled.

BICYCLES

Question No. 2,369—**Mr. O'Sullivan:**

1. Are imported (a) bicycles (b) bicycle parts and components recorded by size and/or specification?

2. What was the total number of (a) 10-speed bicycles (b) 10-speed bicycle parts and components imported in (i) 1968 (ii) 1970 (iii) 1972 (iv) 1974 (v) 1976?

3. What are the countries of origin of such items and, for each country, what is the percentage of the total supplied?

4. How many (a) 10-speed bicycles (b) 10-speed bicycle parts and components are manufactured in Canada annually?

5. How many Canadians are directly employed in the manufacture of bicycles?

6. What are the tariff rates on (a) 10-speed bicycles (b) 10-speed bicycle parts and components?

7. Does the government subsidize the bicycle manufacturing industry and, if so, to what extent and by what direct or indirect means?

Return tabled.

KITCHENER ARTS CENTRE

Question No. 2,375—**Mr. Beatty:**

1. Did the government refuse a request for a grant to build an Arts Centre in Kitchener, Ontario and, if so, for what reason?

2. (a) Under what programme was such a request made (b) what is the present total budget of the programme (c) what commitments have been made to projects under the programme in the current fiscal year and what are the projects?

3. Is the government prepared to provide financial assistance for a Kitchener Arts Centre and, if so, under what programme and to what extent?

Return tabled.

EMPLOYMENT OF NATIVE PEOPLE

Question No. 2,378—**Mr. Holmes:**

1. For each year 1970 to 1976, how many (a) Status Indians (b) Native people have been employed by (i) the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development (ii) other departments (iii) agencies?

2. For the same years, how many (a) Status Indians (b) Native people held positions as (i) Assistant Deputy Ministers (ii) Director Generals (iii) Directors (iv) Chiefs of sections in the government?

3. For the same years, what was the total amount received in salaries by (a) Status Indians (b) Native people employed by the government?

Return tabled.

[Mr. Crosbie.]

ASSISTANCE TO BALLET SCHOOLS AND COMPANIES

Question No. 2,379—**Mr. Holmes:**

1. For each year 1970 to 1976, which (a) ballet companies (b) ballet schools have (i) requested (ii) received financial assistance from the government and, in each case, in what amount?

2. For the same years, by province and territory, what amount did Canadian (a) athletes (b) sports organizations receive from government departments and agencies?

3. For the same years, were there (a) Status Indians (b) Native people (i) athletes (ii) sports organizations that received money and are included in the reply to Part 2 and, if so, what amount did each receive?

Return tabled.

EXPENDITURES IN CONSTITUENCY OF ALGOMA

Question No. 2,380—**Mr. Foster:**

1. What amounts were spent by each department and agency in the Constituency of Algoma during the past five fiscal years for community betterment projects, housing and economic development programmes?

2. In which municipalities, unorganized townships or Indian reserves were such expenditures?

3. Were such funds in the form of a loan or a grant and, if a loan, what were its terms?

4. If it was a federal-provincial project, what portion was paid by the government?

5. How many jobs were created by each project or programme?

6. What is a description of each project or programme which received government aid?

Return tabled.

REACTOR SAFETY ADVISORY COMMITTEES

Question No. 2,381—**Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands):**

1. What is the extent of Atomic Energy Control Board's independent expertise necessary to evaluate the reliability of the ECCS?

2. Have the AECB or its Reactor Safety Advisory Committees ever questioned the ability of the ECCS to prevent fuel failures?

3. Have AECL or Ontario Hydro answered satisfactorily all questions concerning the ability of the ECCS to prevent fuel failures?

4. If all of the radioactive gases and volatile substances from a single failed fuel bundle were to escape into the atmosphere surrounding the plant, what would be the maximum possible health effects (per thousand) among the surrounding population within a radius of (a) ten miles (b) five miles (c) two miles?

5. In the event of a loss-of-coolant accident in a CANDU reactor, assuming that the ECCS works as planned, can it be categorically asserted that no fuel failures will occur?

6. In the event of a loss-of-coolant accident in a CANDU reactor, assuming that all other safety devices function properly, what would be the probable consequences to the reactor if the ECCS were unavailable for any reason?

7. Is it considered possible that steam binding could prevent the ECCS from functioning as planned and, if not, for what reason?

8. Has the ECCS been tested under realistic operating conditions?

9. In the event of an inlet header rupture without emergency cooling, what would be the probable consequences in terms of the release of fission products from the fuel bundles?

10. Is the WR-1 reactor at the Whiteshell Nuclear Research Establishment protected against an inlet header rupture and, if so, in what way?

11. In the event of a loss-of-coolant accident in a CANDU reactor, what would be the probable consequences of a failure to scram?

12. In the event of a design-basis loss-of-coolant accident at the Bruce A Generating Station, what would be the probable consequences if only one of the two scram systems were available?

13. In the event of a loss-of-coolant accident in a CANDU reactor, within how many seconds must the reaction be shut down in order to prevent fuel failures from occurring and in what way does this time depend upon the design and/or the megawatt rating of the reactor?

14. How many scram systems are in the Pickering A. Generating Station?

15. Has consideration been given to the possibility of retrofitting the Pickering A reactors with an additional scram system for safety reasons?

16. What is the estimated dollar cost of retrofitting an existing 500 MWe reactor with an additional scram system?

17. In applying for a reactor license from AECB, is the licensee required to consider "failure to scram" as a credible event?

18. (a) What is the maximum loss-of-containment assumed in the safety report for a commercial CANDU reactor (b) under what circumstances would a loss-of-containment occur and what would be the effects?

19. In the context of a design basis accident, involving a loss-of-coolant accident coupled with a partial loss of containment, what would be the maximum health effects if the ECCS does not function as planned at the (a) Pickering site (b) Bruce site?

Return tabled.

COST OF PRODUCTION OF ANNUAL REPORTS

Question No. 2,396—**Mr. Cossitt:**

1. What was the total cost in each of the past three years for printing, designing, mailing and circulating etc., the annual reports of all departments, agencies, Crown corporations etc. and what was the total cost of such reports for the three years combined?

2. (a) What were the six most costly reports in each year (b) what was the total amount in each case for each year (c) what was the total cost of all of them for three years?

3. Does the government plan taking any steps to cut down the expense to the taxpayer of such annual reports by using less glossy or fancy formats etc. and (a) if so, what are such plans (b) if not, for what reasons?

Return tabled.

MR. VICTOR CHAPMAN

Question No. 2,441—**Mr. Cossitt:**

1. What is the complete government employment record of Mr. Victor Chapman, including dates and annual salaries received?

2. Has Mr. Chapman served the Prime Minister as a press officer and/or has he served the Prime Minister or his family in any other capacity?

3. Since April 20, 1968, has Mr. Chapman and/or Intertask Limited, Ste. 700, 71 Bank Street, Ottawa received any business from the government and, if so, in each case, what (a) is a full description of the services performed (b) was the amount of money received?

4. What was the total amount received for all such business?

Return tabled.

CANADA'S CONTRIBUTION TO MOZAMBIQUE

Question No. 2,531—**Mr. Caouette (Villeneuve):**

1. What has been the nature and dollar value of Canada's contribution to Mozambique under the terms of the agreement made at the Prime Ministers' Conference in Jamaica in 1975?

2. Since 1975, how much aid has Canada accorded Mozambique through (a) CIDA (b) any other government agency?

Order Paper Questions

3. Since 1975, what is the value and nature of Canadian exports to and imports from Mozambique?

Return tabled.

STUDENT SUMMER EMPLOYMENT

Question No. 2,535—**Mr. Young:**

1. How many students were hired for part-time, temporary or summer help as Canada Customs or Canada Immigration staff at the (a) Niagara Falls (b) Fort Erie port of entry in (i) 1972 (ii) 1973 (iii) 1974 (iv) 1975 (v) 1976?

2. For each of the same years (a) how many applications were received (b) were interviews or examinations held and, if so (i) on what dates (ii) in what locations?

3. Which government office was in charge of selections and which officers made the selections?

4. Were any of the students hired related at the time to present or former employees of Canada Immigration or Canada Customs and, if so, how many?

5. (a) What are the usual criteria for selection (b) did all such employees hired between 1972 and 1976 meet the criteria?

6. What were the usual home addresses, by city, as opposed to the university-attended addresses, of those who were successful in gaining such employment?

Return tabled.

MR. IAN C. WALKER

Question No. 2,548—**Mr. Neil:**

1. What was the cost of the preparation of the publication by Mr. Ian C. Walker, *Clay Tobacco-Pipes, With Particular Reference to the Bristol Industry*, in 4 Volumes, and published by National Historic Parks and Sites Branch, Parks Canada, Department of Indian and Northern Affairs in 1977?

2. How many sets were published?

3. What was the cost of publication?

4. How many sets of the volumes have been distributed?

5. Is Mr. C. Walker an employee of the Department?

Return tabled.

PRIVY COUNCIL AND FEDERAL-PROVINCIAL RELATIONS OFFICES

Question No. 2,551—**Mr. Cossitt:**

For the fiscal year 1976-77, what are the (a) duties and job designations (b) salaries (c) names of those employed by, under contract to, or on loan to the Privy Council and Federal-Provincial Relations Offices?

Return tabled.

FEDERAL AIRPORT ASSESSMENTS

Question No. 2,643—**Mr. Elzinga:**

1. On what basis is the assessment for federal airports made?

2. Does the (a) method (b) rate of assessment vary from one airport to another?

3. Is the municipality reimbursed, if taxes are not paid on the property occupied by the Air Force and, if so, in what manner?

4. What is the amount of reimbursement to the municipality in which each federal airport is located?

Return tabled.

Order Paper Questions

SASKATCHEWAN RESIDENTS APPOINTED TO GOVERNMENT BOARDS OF DIRECTORS

Question No. 2,755—**Mr. Hnatyshyn:**

In each year since 1968, were Saskatchewan residents appointed to government boards of directors or the equivalent by Order in Council or to the boards of government agencies and Crown corporations and, if so, in each case, what (a) is his/her name (b) was the salary or per diem payment received?

Return tabled.

POST OFFICES IN TERRITORIES

Question No. 2,756—**Mr. Nielsen:**

1. How many post offices are in the (a) Yukon Territory (b) Northwest Territories?

2. What is the grade of each post office?

3. How many personnel are employed in each post office and, in each case, what is his/her (a) grade or classification (b) salary?

4. In each case, what amount is paid for (a) rental (b) costs, other than rental of premises, and for what goods or services are such amounts paid?

Return tabled.

GRANTS TO OFFICIAL LANGUAGE MINORITY GROUPS

Question No. 2,781—**Mr. Neil:**

1. For the fiscal year (a) 1974-75 (b) 1975-76 (c) 1976-77, what was the total amount of grants paid under the Official Language Minority Groups Directorate, Secretary of State Department?

2. For the same years, what was the name of the recipient and the amount in each case?

Return tabled.

PHASE II ALLOCATIONS UNDER CANADA WORKS PROGRAM

Question No. 3,005—**Mr. Alexander:**

In calculating Phase II allocations under the Canada Works Programme, for each constituency, what was the (a) labour surplus (i) number of beneficiaries (ii) number of unemployed Inuit (iii) number of unemloyed Status Indians on Reserves and Crown lands (iv) number of unemployed Non-Status Indians and Metis (v) total labour surplus (b) labour force (c) labour surplus rate?

Return tabled.

* * *

[*Translation*]

STARRED QUESTIONS

Mr. Yvon Pinard (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, the answers to starred questions Nos. 1,992, 2,773 and 2,839 are lengthy, so I ask the consent of the House to have them printed in the official record of the House of Commons as if they had been read.

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker: The hon. parliamentary secretary is now seeking the same result with respect to the starred questions which he just enumerated. Is it the pleasure of the House that the said starred questions be treated in that way?

[Mr. Elzinga.]

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

[*Editor's Note: The answers to the starred questions enumerated are as follows:*]

*CRTC HEARINGS—ALLEGED BIASED NEWS REPORTING BY CBC

Question No. 1,992—**Mr. Jones:**

1. Was there a CRTC hearing with respect to the English speaking Radio Station CFCF Montreal and, if so (a) what facts led to such hearing (b) what were the findings and decision of CRTC?

2. Have (a) Members of Parliament (b) Cabinet Ministers complained in the House of Commons with respect to allegations of biased news reporting by the CBC French Network, Radio Canada and, if so, in each case (i) how many (ii) what is his/her name?

3. Does CRTC plan a similar inquiry, investigation and hearing of alleged biased news reporting on the CBC French Network, Radio Canada and, if not, do such hearings by CRTC only apply to minority English speaking radio stations in Quebec?

Mr. Fernard E. Leblanc (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State for External Affairs): I am informed by the Radio-television and Telecommunications Commission and the Department of the Secretary of State as follows: 1. Yes. On March 31, 1976. (a) The reasons for that hearing are exposed in its Public Announcement of January 12, "CFCF and Bill 22" and in its Notice of Public Hearing of February 23, 1976 for the Renewal of licence of CFCF. (b) The results and conclusions of CRTC are given in Decision 77-121 (February 24, 1977) and the accompanying Public Announcement "REPORT ON ISSUES RAISED BY CFCF'S ANTI BILL 22 CAMPAIGN".

2. During the period of November 15, 1976 (the Quebec election) to March 4, 1977, there have been no direct references or allegations in the House of Commons to biased news reporting on the French Service Division of the CBC by federal Members of Parliament or Cabinet Ministers. There have been, however, a number of questions concerning charges of bias in CBC programming. The following can be found in *Hansard*: February 18, 1977, page 3188; February 25, 1977, page 3419; March 4, 1977, page 3660.

3. In its Press Release of March 8, 1977 and its Public Notice of March 14, 1977 "COMMITTEE OF INQUIRY INTO THE NATIONAL BROADCASTING SERVICE" the Commission decided to undertake an inquiry and stated three major principles to be safeguarded during this Inquiry: "The first is the principle of freedom of expression, restricted only by specific legal requirements and prohibitions. Second, professional ethics and competence are paramount. Discrimination by reason of race, national origin, colour, religion, sex, or political views has no place in broadcasting. And thirdly, the Commission reaffirms its commitment to the principle of public broadcasting in Canada". Also "The Commission determined that the Committee's mandate should be as follows: (i) The Committee will examine and take into consideration all representations from the public submitted in response to this Announcement. The appeal to the public is based on the fact that the national broadcasting service in its entirety is owned and maintained by the people of Canada; (ii) The Committee will conduct interviews with members of the CBC and of the

public in order to gain a fuller understanding of how information and other programming is perceived by them, and actually carried out; (iii) The Committee will undertake research on specific matters related to programming and scheduling, as well as on the historical relationship between the French language and English language services of the CBC; (iv) The Committee may selectively analyze particular programmes". Then the public has hereby been invited to submit information and comment preferably by April 25, 1977 (Public Notice of March 24, 1977). Finally, the Commission stated that the Committee will submit its final report to the Commission before July 1st, 1977.

*CHARGES LAID BY CANADIAN WHEAT BOARD

Question No. 2,773—**Mr. Murta:**

1. In the past 3 years, what was the increase in staff in the Inspection Services Branch of the Canadian Wheat Board and what did this represent in expenses?

2. In each of the past 3 years, how many producers and companies have been charged under the "Delivery Regulations" and, in each case, what was the amount of the charges and the total amount collected?

3. What was the total amount collected in fines by the Canadian Wheat Board for enforcing the "Inspection Service" and what was the amount in expenses to the Canadian Wheat Board for enforcing such service?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): Insofar as the Canadian Wheat Board is concerned: 1. Over the 3 year period July 1, 1974 to June 30, 1977 the inspection staff of the Canadian Wheat Board declined in number from 25 to 20.

2. In each of the past 3 years, the following number of charges were laid and fines collected for violations of "delivery regulations" under the Canadian Wheat Board Act:

Crop Year	No. of Producers Charged	No. of grain Companies Charged	No. of Elevator Managers Charged	Total No. of Charges	Total Amount of Fines Collected
1973-1974	52	0	16	116	$10,914.36
1974-75	31	1	2	48	$ 4,636.24
1975-76	21	3	3	88	$10,019.59

3. The total amount collected in fines for violations of the Canadian Wheat Board Act is as above in (2). These fines were not collected by the Canadian Wheat Board but are levied and collected by the Courts. The Board's inspection staff and legal department perform many and varied tasks in addition to their inspection function. Records are not maintained with respect to the time and expense devoted to the task of "enforcing the inspection service".

*CBC COVERAGE OF ONTARIO LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

Question No. 2839—**Mr. Douglas (Bruce-Grey):**

1. With reference to the answer to Question No. 2,345, for what reason does CBC have only three English language reporters assigned to cover the Ontario Legislative Assembly while it has seven French language reporters assigned to cover the Quebec National Assembly?

2. How many (a) English (b) French language reporters are assigned to cover the Parliament of Canada?

Hon. John Roberts (Secretary of State): I am informed by the CBC as follows: 1. The CBC's French radio and television networks serve the Francophones of Canada, of whom 85 percent are concentrated in the province of Quebec. The steady flow of news generated by the Quebec government's policies is of intense interest to this audience in both the provincial and Canadian contexts. Nevertheless, the CBC's plans as enunciated in the June 14, 1977 statement by the President of the Corporation, call for greater use of French network news correspondents throughout Canada. The Ontario legislature is one of nine mainly English-speaking assemblies covered by the CBC's English Services Division. That has a total of 18 full-time and one part-time radio and television reporters covering provincial legislature across the country. In the case of the Ontario provincial legislature in particular, the CBC's English Services headquarters in Toronto are located within a few blocks of the provincial legislature and extra staff can be and are assigned at very short notice when required.

2. (a) Eight television reporters and four radio news reporters plus one radio agriculture commentator. (b) Three radio reporters and three television reporters. It is planned to assign two more television reporters in coming months.

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House that the questions listed by the hon. Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Privy Council, which list has now been filed with the House by agreement, shall be deemed to have been replied to today, and that the questions subsequently referred to by the hon. parliamentary secretary shall be deemed to have been made orders for return, with the returns to be tabled forthwith?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: Shall the remaining questions be allowed to stand?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Cossitt: Mr. Speaker, I rise with regard to an assurance given by the government to this House on at least four or five occasions by the Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Privy Council. He is the predecessor of the present parliamentary secretary, I realize, but nevertheless a commitment was made by the government which I am sure could not have been made by his predecessor had it not been approved by the President of the Privy Council and the Deputy Prime Minister.

I refer to *Hansard* at page 7790 of July 19, 1977, when at that time I brought the matter up for about the fifth time. I should like to quote one sentence therefrom when I asked why the answers to certain questions were being withheld. These answers were of an important nature and the Canadian people were entitled to know the truth. He replied: "May I indicate that I intend to provide answers to all questions standing on the order paper before the present session ends".

The present session will end in several minutes. There are 45 questions of mine and I am sure there are many other ques-

tions by various members that were on the early order paper. I have some that go back two years on the order paper. These are questions concerning travel by cabinet ministers on government aircraft for their own personal use. There are also questions concerning ministers' car allowances for cars they do not have.

There are other various important things which have not been brought in, as we were assured they would be. Before this session adjourns this afternoon, it is time for us to have a complete and utter explanation from this government as to why they welshed out on a promise, given at least five times in this House, that we would be given answers to questions which the Canadian people are entitled to have.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Cossitt: I should like to cite one further example which may seem somewhat frivolous. I raised on a previous occasion one question which the Minister of Transport had not answered, concerning the five pretty girls who came in on a government aircraft behind him on a government aircraft from Saskatoon. For over a year he had not answered that question. He said that the answer has been ready for months. That was three months ago. Where is the answer?

Mr. Alexander: Who were the girls?

Mr. Cossitt: In conclusion, all these things involving expense by cabinet ministers to the Canadian people for which we, as members of parliament, and all the citizens of Canada are paying from our pocketbooks, should be made known to this House. The government has played around with the truth and has withheld information.

Mr. Alexander: Shame.

Mr. Cossitt: If it were not unparliamentary, I would say the parliamentary secretary to the minister, and the Deputy Prime Minister, have lied to this House. But because it is unparliamentary, I will not say it.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Goodale: It is also untrue.

Mr. Cossitt: The truth hurts.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Paproski: That is why we have a new parliamentary secretary.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Yvon Pinard (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, in support of the numerous questions I have answered a few minutes ago, I have here two boxes of papers which will be tabled and many of those have the answers to the questions asked by the hon. member. If he could only wait for these papers to be available and read them, he would receive an answer to the very numerous questions that he himself has asked. I still appeal to his courtesy and his patience and also to his common sense and hope he realizes that I was sworn in at 10 o'clock this very morning. This afternoon I answered some 500 questions. I would appreciate it if he were to ask again the questions to which he has not yet received an answer. They will be on the order paper tomorrow and we will make a particular effort to provide accurate and comprehensive answers.

* * *

[*English*]

PRIVILEGE

MR. BLACKBURN—MINISTERS AND BACKBENCHERS TRAVELLING ON GOVERNMENT AIRCRAFT

Mr. Blackburn: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege. It is my understanding that three Liberal backbenchers and three cabinet ministers are flying to Brantford this evening, which is in my constituency. On a political junket such as this, I should like to know if it is proper for those three members and those three cabinet ministers to be travelling on government aircraft.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Perhaps that is information which can be sought at some other time, but it certainly does not constitute a question of privilege.

An hon. Member: The ghost of Otto Lang lives.

MR. GOODALE—MRS. CAMPAGNOLO—POSSIBLE QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE RESPECTING MR. COSSITT'S REMARKS

Mr. Goodale: Mr. Speaker, with reference to the remarks made just moments ago by the hon. member for Leeds, at this stage I should like to reserve the opportunity to raise a question of privilege tomorrow with respect to what he said. I should like to check carefully the report of his language in *Hansard* to determine if my privileges as a member of this House have been breached.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mrs. Campagnolo: Mr. Speaker, I should like to reply to the statement made by the hon. member for Leeds. Indeed, the question was answered concerning the "five pretty girls". I would like him to know that they were my staff and myself.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mrs. Campagnolo: There were four, and not five. He is ill-equipped to tell the difference between girls and women, as he is ill-equipped to tell the facts as to why most of these women travelled on business which was essential to the people of Canada.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Paproski: The next prime minister's speech.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: What were you doing in Saskatoon? I should like to know that. I do not care if you are pretty or not.

Mr. Cossitt: Mr. Speaker, I should like to correct, briefly, two things. The Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Privy Council, I hope unintentionally, misled the House when he said that the answers to the 45 questions were in a box which he was tabling. Might I say that I knew, before the questions were answered, the numbers that would be answered, and none of those 45 was in the box to which he referred or I would not have raised the matter.

● (1520)

In reply to the minister who asked why I used the phrase "pretty girls", let me say that I was using the phrase which her colleague, the Minister of Transport, had used, apparently, in connection with her.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

PROROGATION OF PARLIAMENT

[*English*]

A message was delivered by the Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod, as follows:

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

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

● (1530)

Then, the Deputy Governor General was pleased to close the second session of the thirtieth Parliament of Canada with the following speech:

[*French text*]

Honourable Members of the Senate:

Members of the House of Commons:

The Second Session of the Thirtieth Parliament opened on October 12, 1976. In the 370 days since then, the Senate has held 103 sittings and the House of Commons has held 175 sittings. Of the 64 bills brought before Parliament by the Government in this session, 44 have been enacted. In addition, 13 bills proposed by private members have been passed into law.

Members of the House of Commons

During this session you took the decision to permit the television and radio broadcasting of your proceedings. Citizens in every corner of Canada will now

have regular opportunities to see and hear you transact the business of the nation. Their response to what they observe will provide great incentive to you to organize your business in a manner that reflects the needs and interests of contempory Canadians.

[*English text*]

Honourable Members of the Senate:

Members of the House of Commons:

During this session, Canadians have focussed their attention more sharply on the future of Confederation. The Government of Canada has appointed a Minister of State for Federal-Provincial Relations and created a Task Force on Canadian Unity. You have approved the appointment of a new Commissioner of Official Languages and enacted a new Federal-Provincial Fiscal Arrangements Act and Established Programs Financing Act. The development of our federal system, however, will continue to be evaluated and, perhaps, altered in the next several years and Canadians in every province and territory will have to exercise great understanding and reason as they plan their future together.

The Canadian economy has been in this session, as in all, an area of major interest. The program of controls of prices and incomes has been extended through its second year while the Government has engaged in discussions with the provinces, with labour and with industry about the removal of controls and the guidance of the economy afterward.

You have enacted measures to restrain government expenditures and to give greater authority to the Auditor General. The Government has appointed a Royal Commission on Financial Management and Accountability.

[*French text*]

The less fortunate people in society have not been forgotten in this session. You have created a new Department of Employment and Immigration and a Canada Employment and Immigration Commission which together will assist Canadians in finding employment, assist those who cannot and administer the new Immigration Act, passed in this session. You have also enacted a Canadian Human Rights Act and have amended the Old Age Security Act and the Canada Pension Plan to improve benefits under those programs.

Canada has continued to attempt to bring together the rich and the poor nations of the world so that all may agree on a system of organizing the international economy so that all nations may share prosperity and live in peace. The Conference on International Economic Co-operation was chaired by Canada and our country played leading roles at the Commonwealth Conference of Heads of Governments and at the economic summit conference of the seven greatest industrial countries.

[*English text*]

Many other actions of great importance have been undertaken during this session.

Members of the House of Commons:

I thank you for the provision you have made for the public services in the previous and in the current fiscal year.

Honourable Members of the Senate:

Members of the House of Commons:

May Divine Providence continue to bless our country.

This concluded the second session of the thirtieth parliament.